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Religious groups use strong doctrinal markers to ensure and maintain their integrity and more importantly, their identity. The Ohio Valley Friends counted themselves among the traditional pacifist denominations throughout the United States in the twentieth century. With the onset of World War II, they dutifully followed this doctrine of pacifism incarcerating their youth in their own sponsored conscientious objector camp in Coshocton, Ohio. Driven by this central tenet of pacifism, through an ageist struggle to maintain identity, the Friends lost both their identity and their youth. Within two years of the entrance of the United States into the war, a sudden shift in the Ohio Valley Friend’s collective affirmations caused them to try to abandon the camp’s sponsorship, and patriotically support the U.S. militarist goal of victory. Their monthly newsletters and actions showed no changes in their theology nor radical reordering of their allegiance to their supernatural God, but rather the embrace of this same God, co-opted into a newly founded nationalist civil religion.
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CHAPTER I

THE FALL OF THE OHIO VALLEY FRIEND’S PACIFISM TO U.S. CIVIL RELIGION DURING WORLD WAR II

In April 1946, a remnant group of twenty-six incarcerated conscientious objectors left a remote converted Civilian Conservation Corps camp in the low hills of southeastern Ohio. The United States’ Selective Service Administration (SSA) counted them among the millions of demobilized soldiers returning from World War II, from which a newly dominant United States had emerged as victor. The SSA released them, after having entered into a partnership years before with a Christian religious group called the Friends.

This liberated remnant of conscientious objector (CO) camp internees stood as a stark testimony to the over 300 incarcerated youth placed in the camp at the behest of their parents and their nation. They left not only their years of youth behind them, but also any identity the Friends had once held as pacifists. The twenty-six men, no longer youth, had been overwhelmed in the wave of an aggressive national foreign policy cloaked in civil religion. Concurrently, the Friends themselves had been overcome by an emerging theistic nationalism that forged a new identity linking the United States of America and God as one. In this new conceptualization, God had granted the safety and victory of the people of the United States in World War II. The same God that rebelling
colonists had evoked 150 years earlier as the “Providence” in their Declaration of Independence had granted present-day United States triumphant victory over fascism. This same God of the United States, the one who had given this stunning victory, consequently replaced the Friends’ previous pacifist mentor – Jesus Christ the Prince of Peace. The Friends’ pacifist identity dissolved into nationalism.

The Friends had a separate identity throughout their time in the Americas. Having lived through 300 years of episodic persecution and marginalization since their founding in England, the Friends, or “Quakers,” as they were widely known, had developed a series of bulwarks and strategies to maintain their “peculiar” identity.¹ Arriving in the Americas in the seventeenth century, they quickly rose to prominence both politically and economically. Their reputation for honest business dealings in early eighteenth-century Philadelphia equaled their ardent pacifist stance. Though trusted by First Nation peoples, this pacifism led to their radical estrangement from much of the American populace, one that thrived on continuous violent aggression in foreign and domestic relations.² Rebuffed for their failure to join in a series of French and Indian wars, reviled for excusing themselves from the Revolutionary War, maligned for their lack of military support in the Civil War, and incarcerated and tortured for lack of patriotic zeal in World War I, the Friends as a group developed a set of strategies for dealing with their hostile fellow citizens.

As the United States in tandem with Europe prepared for World War II, the Friends sought to isolate their own youth in an effort to preserve their pacifist identity. This effort included incarcerating them in complicity with the United States government. Occupying, administering, and maintaining one of the many American Friends Service
Committee (AFSC) conscientious objector (CO) camps of 1941, they sought in Coshocton, Ohio, to save their youth and preserve their identity as a pacifist people of God. By 1943, in the heat of U.S. wartime patriotism, they exhausted this zeal for their pacifism, asking the SSA to be relieved of the camp, as they collapsed into deference to the new nationalism intensified by global war. In the minds of a vocal number of Friends, the U.S. involvement in a world war had changed them from a pacifist abhorrence to a war to support an endeavor solidly for God and by God. Who were the Ohio Valley Friends to dare say otherwise? In 1946, three delayed years later, their youth left the CO camps of the SSA.

This event in a small town in Ohio played across a huge landscape of foreign policies, domestic policies, questions of who truly was “of God” and religious debates over Jesus and pacifism. The event also raises some historical questions. Why did the Ohio Valley Friends abdicate their central pacifist tenet so soon into World War II, bowing to the nationalist zeal of violent foreign policy? Why in their quest for societal identity were they willing to sacrifice their own youth? How can historians explain religious motivation as a cultural and social activity without lapsing into opaque denigration, contempt, and dismissal?

For the historian, this seemingly remote event, repeated throughout the war years in multiple other CO camps on U.S. soil offers an intriguing yet difficult challenge. Camp Fresno in Coshocton offers the historian the dilemma of acknowledging that two mighty mind-sets - religion and nationalism - came to an impasse within these minimally secured camp perimeters. An almost 300-year-old tradition of pacifism, undergirded by the undeterred belief in the supernatural, came to direct loggerheads with an newly
forming tradition of militarism and nationalism, manifested through foreign policy, and
nurtured by an emerging national U.S. identity as a World Power, a new national identity
shedding its shell of non-intervention and Great Depression paralysis. How could a
group, with such a heritage and tradition of religious fervor, succumb to such an infidelity
to their central tenets and doctrines? How could 300 years of established and endured
separateness melt away in just two years of the twentieth century?

It is the premise of this study that the dissolution of resolve for pacifism in the
Ohio Valley Friends stemmed from the overwhelming force of a competing nationalism.
Propelled by their ageist obsession with their youth and their perceived relocation of God,
the Friends would re-align their identity with the nationalist Civil Religion of the United
States. This American construct of Civil Religion as it found expression in the twentieth
century offered a crucial bridge for the Friends’ transition and adaption to a growing
national identity. For the Ohio Valley Friends, national identity would trump religious
identity.

The pertinence of such an investigation is not lost today. Two major U.S. foreign
wars have transpired in the past decade, both undergirded with the strong backing of
religious fervor. Yellow ribbons abound calling for troop-directed prayer and
omnipresent beseeching of “God Bless America.” Mainline denominations and
independent denominations embrace a U.S. foreign policy using war as a means both to
achieve diplomacy and exact oblique revenge. Religious conceptualization underscored a
foreign policy in an oil rich Middle East, transcending mere economic pursuit with an
overlay of religious destiny. Mainstream journalism of the 1990s calls for the dawn of the
“Clash of Civilizations” with its attendant undertone of Christian vs. Muslim religious
conflict. Scholarships continually re-explores a theme of “Jihad vs. McWorld,” underscoring that the McWorld’s economic ripples are echoed out in religious contexts. Branches of the U.S. military have been under scrutiny for religious zealotry and the Pentagon reprimanded the Air Force Academy for its blatant evangelism and proselytizing. Kindergarten through twelfth grade curricula across the United States defer to the religious zealotry of the Texas Board of Education’s dominating influence over textbooks, which subsequently calls for the reshaping of historical narratives of the U.S. to include its seminal “foundations” of Christianity. Books announce the worldwide “anarchy” induced by religion. Current foreign policy grapples with the intruding aspect of religion, positing that Christianity and Islam are one in the same in their nature. Architectural development of an Islamic cultural center within blocks of the World Trade Center site is mired in First Amendment rights of both free speech and religious freedom. Strains of current historical scholarship and journalism attempt to untie this Gordian knot of “Church and State” - and more crucially National Identity - as merely competing views contesting the religiosity of “Founding Fathers”.

Into this ideological and social maelstrom, the history of a small pious group of religious followers in the Ohio Valley brings striking insight into a timely cultural topic. The history of the Ohio Valley Friends and their pacifism leading up to and through the storm of World War II offers a window into how religion interacts socially and historically, how its operates on its individual adherents and on those around them in society, and how it is mutable throughout its interaction with the secular.
THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF CIVIL RELIGION

Civil Religion provides a focal point for this study. Cultural, political, and social history address how religion actually intertwines into an otherwise rationalist culture. Observation of the interaction of religion in a cultural landscape is often obstructed by Naturalism in present-day thought. Historians often dismiss religious history both from agnostic and atheistic motives. Objectively, this dismissal can hardly be sustained, given that religion is and has been a seminal cultural component of countless societies and their subsequent histories. Allowing analysis of the Naturalist components of a supernatural phenomenon is the departure point for understanding the history of a religious group’s abandonment of pacifism and their embrace of an emerging wartime Civil Religion.9

Donald G. Jones and Russell E. Richey, writing less than thirty years after the transformation of the Ohio Valley Friends, suggested a framework to explicate Civil Religion.10 They devised a “taxonomic” model of categorizing religion as seen in America as “Particular” and “General.” Particular religion includes “churches, synagogues, missionary movements, denominations, and the like.”11 The category “General” covers what they define as “democratic faith, societal religion, the American Way, generalized religion, common faith, American Shinto, and now civil religion”.12 This mode of analysis sought at least to divide Civil Religion away from its metaphysical counterpart, to separate naturalist manifestations from supernatural manifestations, and thereby to create a working structure to appraise religion in social and political history. Jones and Richey argued, for example, that such a division allows a more coherent parsing of the emergence of words from presidents such as Franklin Roosevelt to John Kennedy who all seemed to speak in the language of such a Civil Religion.
Robert Bellah’s seminal work “Religion in America” underscores lack of any study into the phenomenon. His foundational statements are worth repeating:

Some have argued Christianity is a national religion, and others that churches and synagogues celebrate only the generalized religion of the ‘American Way of Life’. Few have realized that there actually exists alongside of each a rather clearly differentiated form separate from the church, an elaborate and well-institutionalized Civil Religion in America.

Using this distinction he went on to argue that not only does Civil Religion exist, but more so as a “religious dimension” having its own seriousness and integrity requiring as much understanding as the other manifestations of supernatural religion. Creating a functional taxonomy, Bellah furthered separated out and validated a working construct of Civil Religion.

Jones and Richey point out that as far back as the 1950s J. Paul Williams and Robin Williams along with Lloyd Warner and Will Hertberg used terms such as “common faith of America.” In the late 1950s and 1960s, religious writers such as Martin Marty, Gibson Winter, Roy Eckhardt, and Sidney Mead started to use this term Civil Religion, yet not necessarily as a taxonomic tool. Richey and Jones point out it had been more a response to the “Eisenhower America”, defining it more an idolatry of the American Way of Life rather than an exaltation of a God in heaven. The “American Way
of Life,” well worth millions of dollars in defense spending to the soon to be designated “military-industrial-complex,” constituted an exaltation of democracy, national unity, free enterprise economics and social egalitarianism, all imagined pillars of an imagined edifice of a nation. These imagined immaterial substructures constituted the altar for the faith and worship of the American Way of Life that could then be found in the material reality of middle class prosperity. Such an approach was later significantly expanded in the work of Benedict Anderson as he posited the actual construct of the “Imagined Community.”

Historians continued to struggle with how to divide the Naturalist thought away from supernaturalist theology. Sidney Mead in “The Nation with the Soul of a Church” attempted to root Civil Religion in theology. Conversely W. Lloyd Warner in “An American Sacred Ceremony” reduced Civil Religion to an act of ritual. Both seemed to be blurring any meaningful discrimination in working taxonomy. Richey and Jones, in disagreement, continued to underscore Bellah’s structural-functional category defining Civil Religion as “a particular religion in American society” as the most accurate and useful.

Other 1980s historians borrowed this approach. Winthrop Hudson wrote that the nineteenth-century homogeneity of the United States would spread out into its immigrant delta of varying ecclesiastical diversity along such divides as “North/South” and “Liberal/Conservative,” all straining the very notion of a single U.S. Civil Religion. Once again, exogenous factors such as constituted the fabric of civil religion. Similarly, during the 1980s Richard Neuhaus put forth the construct of the “public square” as the basis to understand Civil Religion. His three primary theses were:
1) that we Americans are an incorrigibly religious people whose national life is premised upon a belief in God,  
2) that, by an outrageous denial of our fundamental identity, this public piety has been ousted from the marketplace of ideas and values,  
3) and thus the chief political duty of contemporary church is to reforge the ancient link between democratic freedom and Judeo-Christian faith.

Essentially a reworking of Bellah’s structural functional model of explanation, Neuhaus effectively replaced the common people with the government as the benefactor of the effects of Civil Religion, while at the same time endorsing Hudson’s political schematic of ‘liberal/conservative’. This thesis earned Neuhaus the infamous tag given by to him by William F. Buckley, newly appointed religion editor for the National Review, “a liberal mugged by reality”. Neuhaus averred, “In helping to sustain the democratic experiment, the churches act not only in their own interest but in the interests of humankind”. The State becomes the beneficiary of Civil Religion. Reaffirming this thesis from a previous work *Time toward home: The American Experience as Revelation*, Neuhaus set the stage for a nation serviced by faith. But which faith was implied in his idea of Civil Religion?

Such distinction was similarly challenged at the time in the work of Ralph Wood in “The Crowded Public Square: A Critique of Richard John Neuhaus on Civil Religion.” Wood argued, as others that the “crowded public square” was not only made up Protestants, Catholics, Jews, (and tacitly Quakers) but more to the point, liberals and conservatives, all needing to see Civil Religion “fused into the American grain”, where essentially God equaled the United States.

By the 1990s, scholarship challenged this fused notion espoused by Neuhaus and his critics. Civil Religion was still the manifestation of historical and current events,
within the purview of the historian, but Philip Hammond argued that religion operated in arenas somewhat removed from its domain. Civil Religion was merely a harnessed apolitical discourse operating through alien discursive formation of politics and society, not through its own endemic formations.\textsuperscript{24} Such an analysis allowed for the writings that engaged Civil Religion, not as a manifestation of the polis, but as manifestations of the faith within the individuals of this polis.

Using individual faith as an analytical construct allowed the furthering of another of Neuhaus’s constructs in the historiographic analysis of the nature of Civil Religion - ‘Transcendence’. Bruce Murray writing in his 2008 book \textit{Religious Liberty in America} used a mechanical-functional approach suggesting that to examine the difference between religion and “America’s civil religion” one needs to see the latter as “a belief system that binds the nation’s deepest held values with “transcendent” meaning.”\textsuperscript{25} This echoes the 1960s work of Herbert Marcuse. As a member of the Frankfurt school, Herbert Marcuse argued for the reification of the U.S. discourse of democracy to be seen beyond the one-dimensional of acts of voting, ardent citizenship and allegiance, and more so in a second dimension of “context”, where such civil acts are acted out in a transcendent context in the citizens’ minds.\textsuperscript{26} Those who participated in the alternate pursuits of the cultural revolution of the 1960s, though embracing Marcusian thought, deferred to psychotropic drugs and eros. Recent and past political and social turmoil over relationship between church and state, freedom of expression, are all suffused with the revival of ideals that are particularly deigned as American and transcendent, but not necessarily of God.

Historical theologians such as Linell Cady and Richard Bernstein similarly have approached the construct of Civil Religion by examining how this transcendence operates
through the postmodern structures of discursive formations and identity acquisition. Cady posits that behind Civil Religion can be “Public Theology” that serves as a “prism” by which to refract internecine social activities, such as jurisprudence and congressional activity.\textsuperscript{27} Using such a prism precludes the marginalization of religion. Similarly reacting to Neuhaus, Bernstein draws heavily on the mechanico-structural approach to Civil Religion, suggesting that, in line with Jurgen Habermas and Hannah Arendt, the Civil Religion of America offers people a strong identity, one that helps that identity of Americans to transcend mere identity of the nation.\textsuperscript{28}

The work of Mark Noll similarly elevates the examination of Civil Religion to one of a transcendent universal experience, throughout geographic areas of North America.\textsuperscript{29} Comparing what he sees as an ill-served study of “Christianity” as opposed to religion, he compares peoples in the same geographic area, such as Canada and the U.S., and shows how differing Civil Religions can be the byproduct of the same headwater – transcendent Christianity wherever it may be found in the continent.

Seeing Christianity in this light, as a religious artifact and not a political and sociological artifact, served as the basis for scholarship that could reach back as far as the 1960s as scholars from the late twentieth century would try to interpret the earlier years. Randall Balmer has emerged as a modern dean of such scholarship, writing extensively to place religion into Bellah’s model by further categorizing aspects of Christianity. Essential to his form of historical analysis was identifying sub-categories of the Christian religion in the United States. Within American Protestant Christianity, specific vibrant strains came into direct social and political contact with American culture. Most significant of these strains were fundamentalism and evangelicism.
As early as the 1960s historians such as Louis Gasper accurately depicted the social interaction between 1930’s fundamentalism and the surrounding cultural landscape. Though interconnected and entwined with various branches of Protestantism, fundamentalism was a substrate that actively engaged the culture at large by attacking the secular modernism that encroached directly on faith. Conflict points between fundamentalism and secular modernism included Darwinism, communism, Marxism, unionism, socialism and an eventual perceived world religion embodied in a newly forming United Nations. Historians could already identify these confrontations looking back to World War II.

Confrontation did not have to be only with modernism. Martin E. Marty, a preeminent Lutheran scholar, furthered this realist approach to religion in America by positing that the map of religious America, be it colonial, ante- or post-bellum, intra-wars, or rebelling 60s, needed to be seen as the visible loyalties of peoples as evidenced in their beliefs and social behavior, all buttressing a group identity in a specific social location. Social sub-groups’ identities could be sought as a counterpoint to a national identity replete with transcendent ideals at odds with the nation state. Work in the 1980s only furthered this approach, through a prominent concurrent Western Marxist lens. James Hunter posited a direct connection between identity capital and the struggle against modernity. Lost in an alienation and anomie perpetrated by the nation state, the individual’s only recourse for identity integrity was resistance to and rejection of the artifacts of the state’s transcendent discourse.

Tracing the arc of religion in the Americas, Randall Balmer chose to follow evangelicalism backwards arguing that its origins markedly determined the make-up of
even modern day religious culture. His seminal work, *Blessed Assurance*, argues that Western civilization, as it is known and accessed today, was founded primarily on such Protestant thought.\(^{35}\) (These insights were by no means new, as Max Weber had already posited such arcane economic theories with his construct of the Protestant work ethic.\(^ {36}\)) Given such a undergirding, it is no surprise that religion should be a crucial shaper of politics and civil society, and therefore a state, buttressed by religion, became quite explicable both in a World War II period and today.

Balmer joins Grant Wicker and Jon Butler in arguing that such a dynamic of a belief in “supernatural forces, amid a powerfully shaped people and society that would become the United States, moved within the grain and not against it.”\(^ {37}\) Such historical events as the American Revolution, abolition, Civil War, corruption of the Gilded Age, progressivism, rising of Big Business, response to labor movements, racism, anti-Catholicism, anti-Semitism, the civil rights crusades of the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, and the ascendant conservatism of Ronald Reagan and George Bush all have their connection to this religious dynamic. The multiple movements and activities of these epochal events had their basis in a supernatural dynamism. As late as 2007, Tracy Fessenden, in her primarily secular analysis *Religion, The Secular and American Literature*, concurred, tracing the same arc not through political but cultural manifestations. Citing the *New England Primers, Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, the works of nineteenth-century Mark Twain to twentieth-century F. Scott Fitzgerald, Fessenden saw these as latent manifestations of an American evangelical religion.\(^ {38}\)

Three recent works crystallize the line of argument with which this dissertation both agrees and extends. Kenneth Collins, in his book, *The Evangelical Moment: The
Promise of an American Religion, makes the case concerning an ‘American Religion’ that “Evangelicalism (despite glib answers offered in the culture) is an extraordinarily complex phenomenon”, a cultural movement that has always been “diverse, flexible, adaptable, and multiform”. 39 He further argues the need for …seeing evangelicalism not as an isolated entity one defined apart by itself in terms of attributes or traits…[rather] as an historical movement that has not only a number of distinct social locations but also a number of “dialogue partners” across generations. In other words American Evangelicalism if it is ever to break through the myths and stereotypes, must be considered not a static way, simply in terms of self identified attributes and traits, but in a dynamic and relational way as a movement engaged in various conversations. Some of them quite heated, all of which are for the sake of reform. Simply put, given the mission of Evangelicalism, which is intimately tied to its identity, the movement must always reckon with “the other” whether it is Roman Catholicism or theological liberalism, whose contrast in turn helps to illuminate, at least in part, the major features of this American Religion. 40 Evangelicalism – the proto American Civil Religion – is to be seen as a cultural dynamic, a sum of discourses involved in a relational dyad with “others.”

George Marsden expands this examination posing the crux of the question as whether Christianity and the Bible should be viewed through the lens of cultural development or should culture be viewed through a lens of scripture? Is religion basically the identity forming through causative, natural, and historical cultural elements, a mere sum of “isms”? 41 Does the explanation of the Ohio Valley Friends’ abandonment of
pacifism lay in the mere intertwining of Christianity with “isms” and not in sweeping internal doctrinal debates or new startling timely revelations from their God? Lynn Bridgers concurs with this cultural approach, giving the analysis a post-colonial inclination in which the tensions between a center and the periphery are all contested arenas of inter-religiosity, inter-denominationalism, multiculturalism, and experientialism, all along lines of authority.\textsuperscript{42} In this mode, it is simple to see that the Friends set themselves distinctly in a cultural tension with the U.S. government and its foreign policy wherein the Friends comprised a religious periphery, and the U.S. a center core that offered profound identity validation. Walter Russell Mead brings this full circle to a state v. individual dyad in a pivotal 2006 \textit{Foreign Affairs} article, “Religion & U.S. Foreign Policy”.\textsuperscript{43} Here he defines a central arena where this dyad confrontation occurs: incessant social engineering on behalf of both the “core” and a “periphery”.

This dissertation will pursue these three latent lines of cultural analysis. Simply put, the Friends were involved in abject social cultural engineering, using a facet of foreign policy for identity formation and preservation, taking on the ‘other’ of modernism reified in the United States government. No profound revelations from God by modern prophets, nor any exhaustive internecine debates, nor heroic stands caused their embrace of the Civil Religion of nationalism as they laid down their pacifism. Through a complex maze of cultural discourses the Friends lost their identity. Each chapter of this work will seek to unravel a part of this complexity. Chapter 1 examines the underpinnings of how religion has historically been analyzed in twentieth-century U.S. history and outlines how the latter forms of analysis will inform this dissertation. Chapter 2 traces the pacifist heritage, traditions and integrity of the Ohio
Valley Friends, from their predecessors in Europe. Chapter 3 details their inception from the original Mt. Pleasant Meeting in the Ohio Valley leading up Ohio Yearly Meeting of World War II. Chapter 4 details the creation of the conscientious objector camp, Camp Coshocton, an AFSC CO camp existing within the local environs of the Ohio Valley Friends, the very camp in Ohio where the Friends collaborated with a United States foreign policy of militarism. Chapter 5 details how strenuously the Friends intertwined their strain of pacifism into Camp Coshocton. Chapter 6 explores the demise of this camp with respect to any zeal or commitment to pacifism. Chapter 7 demonstrates the actual collapse of pacifism and embrace of Civil Religion in the collective thought of the Ohio Valley Friends. Chapter 8 offers a conclusion that summarizes this collapse.

The uses in this dissertation of cultural history demonstrate that religious groups are often unwillingly driven and shaped by mass culture, popular culture, and even foreign policy. At times, such cultural effects can completely ablate any internal influence from holy texts, scriptures, or tradition. When religious groups shift their doctrine, it can be the result of an effect from external culture and not from internal introspection or revelatory directives from their God. The Friends’ abandonment of pacifism was a complete refutation of their core divinely-given doctrines and tenets. Cultural historical analysis allows historians a far more nuanced insight into a religious group’s identity and actions. In the case of a group called the Ohio Valley Friends of the early twentieth century, their cultural quest for power, driven by their fading religious identity as pacifists, imploded in the face of U.S. nationalism during WWII. The Ohio Valley Friends set aside any integrity of their scriptures and heritage, while at the same time cannibalizing their own youth. In short, the pacifist teachings of their God were jettisoned and abandoned in
ideological deference and obeisance to U.S. foreign policy and jingoism, which trumped any sacred texts of previous millennia. A religious group altered a central doctrinal tenet and mainstay of identity in the face of an overwhelming force of an emerging world power, one that co-opted their God.
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CHAPTER II

THE QUAKERS’ 300 YEARS OF PACIFIST HERITAGE

On a July morning in 1939, over 320 junior and senior high school Quaker youth gathered in a large assembly hall at Beulah Beach Campground on Lake Erie. The heat of the day was offset by lake swimming, recreation in ball fields, and camping activities. That morning’s group study session was one of many throughout four days of sessions that included such topics as “The Scriptural Basis for Missions,” “The Sanctity of Home,” “Young Christians and Business Life,” and an especially significant Saturday 10:00 a.m. class, “The Case for the Conscientious Objector.” All the youths assembled to hear a speech, titled “YOUNG FRIENDS, WHAT ABOUT WAR?” given by a high school senior named Betty Osborne.

Pacifism was a central tenet of the Ohio Yearly Meeting (OYM) identity. The Spring 1939 issue of the OYM monthly newsletter, The Evangelical Friend, had announced an “Oratorical Contest” for the Meeting’s youth to write speeches to be presented at the camp, on the topic of “The Position of a Young Quaker in Case of War.” The winning oration on pacifist fidelity described an entwined notion of pacifist resistance where the enemy was not only fascist powers causing war throughout Europe but also the prevalent United States culture of jingoism. Young Osborne declaimed:
Today we live in a troubled world. War is no longer a far off possibility, but a dread reality...No one knows at what hour the world may be plunged into another universal war. What will you as young men do? What will we as young women encourage you to do? These questions cannot be decided later amidst the hysteria of modern war propaganda. No they must be decided now - in the light of God’s Word and with the help of the Holy Spirit. And when we have once come to a decision, may we let neither earth, nor hell, nor men’s opinion sway us.

This winning submission evidenced a firm collective understanding of pacifism among Ohio Valley Friends, both young and old. This speech, judged by adult Friends, was heard by all the attendees at the 1939 annual youth conference. The adults and youth agreed. The pacifist attitudes of the young men equaled the consensus of the old. Though a subtext of gender underscored the obligations of the young women who were relegated to a role of supportive encouragement of the young men, pacifist attitudes between young and older women were equally aligned. Girls and boys, men and women, stood in common opposition to any possible violent foreign policy of the U.S. government. Women may not be sent to foreign soil to fight for God, but they could quite effectively fight the same nemesis as their male peers - a home nation. Osborne’s speech underscored that both adult Friends, as well as their inculcated youth, agreed that no young male Friend could ever fight in any war, and would have to stand against any state that asked such a duty. There could be only one correct decision. They were not to be swayed in their pacifist conviction, by “neither earth, nor hell, nor men’s opinion”.

These concerns carried an undercurrent of memory of times when Friends’ pacifism had previously been in jeopardy. Osborne continued citing injustices by this same government:
Whether Christians recognized the weight and the import of the Lord’s teachings thus in regard to war or not, the United States government did. During the [First] World War the federal authorities forbade the publication of the ‘The Sermon on the Mount’ for free distribution without mote or comment. They said it would have a detrimental effect upon the war spirit.3

It is telling that she would cite such a censorship concern. It is more telling that, like the orator, Friends judges and *Evangelical Friend* publishers alike believed the charge to be true, and allowed it to stand unchallenged. Such a charge highlighted OYM Friends’ perceived victimization of the Friends ‘Biblical Truth’ at the hands of The United States and its previous foreign policy efforts.

Osborne further underscored this antagonism by citing how their pacifist heritage is one of time and integrity. Her speech reminded the listeners that Jesus was the sole guide for their pacifism: “Obedience to the commands of Jesus does not make one a killer. Obedience to the commands of the militarist does”.4 She directly linked this same Jesus with the Friends’ founder of 300 years previous when she declared, “May we as young Christians dear so close to the cross of the Lord Jesus that the divine love there expressed will flow through our entire beings until we can say with George Fox, the founder of our church, ‘I am in love with all men, and cannot fight any.’”5 She further underscored an equally dangerous foe of peace beyond war itself, a nation ensnared in nationalist fervor: “For war will come. The multitudes swayed by hysteria of hate and revenge will rush into the awful debacle…In that day let us, as followers of the lowly Nazarene, hold fast to his commands of love and peace.”6

Such words and their enthusiastic reception show how embedded pacifist practice and rhetoric could be among Ohio Valley Friends. Such extolling and exhortation of
pacifism as presented to youth attending the 1939 OYM Youth Conference, clearly defined the Ohio Valley Friends’ understanding of peace. It was an understanding deeply rooted in 300 years of heritage and two millennia old scriptures. It was a collective mindset shaped and reshaped by centuries of cultural discourses, from the seventeenth to the twentieth century. All these cultural strains were crystallized in the summer-camp speech of an adolescent Friend on the eve of World War II.

Osborne’s speech highlights two shaping discourses of those preceding centuries. Identifying nationalism as a construct of the state allied against the Friends’ pacifism was pivotal in both initially defying and then cooperating with the U.S government. The reference to “multitudes swayed by hysteria” was certainly a charitable acknowledgement of those caught up in the same nationalist fervor Friends would be forced to weather. The discourse of nationalism with its stepchildren, patriotism and jingoism, was a known nemesis, fully identified and described in this 1939 prophetic oration. The Friends had a potent understanding of the state as adversary as had their iconoclastic predecessors of the European seventeenth century and pacifist resisters of the American eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries. As the speech singled out the trials young men would endure in the event of war, it also underscored the Friends complete acceptance of an ageist attitude towards their youth. The identity and actions of Friends’ youth would become the field of contest to fight for the Friends’ pacifist identity, all in opposition to a state trying to draft them. Yet even knowing such foes and accepted cultural constructs did not protect the Friends from the eventual sway of these same nationalist and ageist discourses. Young Osborne’s speech shows an Ohio Yearly Meeting inextricably entwined in discourses both of their past and the present. And so powerful were the pulls
of these discourses that it would propel Friends’ youth to enter incarceration under the
care of their own parents, defying and denouncing a foreign policy bent on the ungodly
destruction of humanity and the repeated challenge to their 300-year-old pacifist identity.

The crux to the effect of these discourses was the Friends’ alterity in relation to
the culture around them. Multiple facets formed this alterity as they saw themselves in
opposition to a nation politically, a society socially, and a world religiously. Their
embrace of a discourse of the supernatural put them at odds with predominant rational
and naturalist U.S collective thought. Their holding to the concurrent, fundamentalist
evangelicalism similarly put them at odds with prevalent U.S. mainline Christianity.
Their pacifist alterity put them into direct conflict with any re-emergent war-based
foreign policy the U.S. government feigned with quasi militarist lend-lease interventions
in support of besieged nations. And their youth-centered course of liberating their own
youth from military service had put them into an ambiguous opposition even with their
own scriptures, which ostensibly required obedience to the state in any form.

Such a desperate and hazardous endeavor could hardly be undertaken without the
deep foundation of Friends’ pacifism based in powerful discourses from a European
heritage. This study will posit that five major extant discourses shaped the origins of the
Friends. The sum of this heritage can be seen in the five major cultural trends from
seventeenth-century Europe with which Quakerism invested itself at its inception:
populism, iconoclasm, individualism, pietism and evangelicalism. The Ohio Yearly
Meeting Friends valued this extensive history, tradition, and heritage, an endowment that
contributed significantly to this radical twentieth-century showdown with the U.S.
government. Over 300 years of previous Quaker convictions stood behind them,
undergirding them for the overwhelming task they set before themselves. All these discourses are found at the foundation of Quaker tradition and thought, yet later these would both serve and condemn them in their 1930’s ordeal.

From the beginning of the seventeenth century, religious populism abounded both in England and Europe. It was the catalyst for the Quakers’ very inception. The vestiges of religious populism remained apparent in the 1930s travails of the Ohio Yearly Meeting. The prominent corporate reformed movements of the seventeenth century all had this foundational element of populism, including the included reformist movements of Germany’s Martin Luther, Switzerland’s Guillaume Farel, Scotland’s John Knox, France’s John Calvin, as well as the anarchic resistances of Thomas Munzer and other failed splinter Anabaptists groups of the time. In any form or guise, these reform movements of the Reformation all laid down deep tracks of populist, anti-elitism against a Catholic Church’s form of Christianity, one perceived by reformers to be ruled by an aristocracy of wealth and contrived learning.⁷

The iconoclasm undergirding these reform movements, both in their symbolic attack on a dominant church and in its raw form meted out through the smashing of idols and desecration of Eucharist materials, set the patterns for the well-entrenched repeated struggles between dominant and subdominant groups. No material object or signifier of the dominant churches, specifically Roman Catholic, escaped. Statues, windows, chalices, and icons all became fair game for desecration. The immaterial was similarly not immune. The writings of cardinals, popes, and priests were reviled and devalued. Symbols evoking the authority of the church were attacked and debased. Religious or political iconoclasm had been widely prevalent social expressions throughout the early
decades of the Society of Friends. The Ohio Valley Friends of the World War II would repeat this mindset in their defiance of the overbearing State and its military.

The primacy of personal salvation versus corporate salvation anchored the Friends’ investment in individualism. The individual became the site for both sanctification and all spirituality. The individual had the sole contact and access to God. The corporate locus for salvation and practice, as dramatically imaged in performed masses and awe-inspiring architecture, merely reaffirmed the accretion of purloined power transferred to the ever-ascending hierarchy of clergy that stood between the people and their God. Once the individual could be seen as a person with a personal single identity, rooted in a direct relationship with God (or a nation state), the individual could act out of this power without the need for the corporate structure of parishes, led by priests and the Church. The concept of personal singular identity became both sufficient and necessary for this birth of the Friends and later served in the creation of a pacifist conscientious objector during World War II.

The pietism these reforming groups spawned reduced the sum of all religious practice and ritual to a highly personalized experience that took place completely within the mind and ‘spirit’ of the individual. This foundation, where a God who dealt with each individual on a one-to-one basis through a sole mediator of a Jesus Christ and a Holy Spirit, radically contested and replaced the corporatism of a dominant church, where God effectively dealt with the incorporated group of people in a local parish or bishopric. Pietism allowed for an arena of activity that drew on the power of the individual acting out their relationship to God, not being merely a passive spectator in the corporatism of the established church. The Ohio Valley Friends of the 1930s directly inherited this role
as they passionately objected to a U.S. militarist foreign policy, standing against all violence because God told them to be peaceful.

Evangelicalism, in its most elemental state – “Sola Scriptura” - Scripture Alone” – stood as a profound mindset, dovetailing out of the iconic transfer of authority from the body of the priest, bishop, or Pope, to the inanimate object of the Bible. The ‘Word’, or ‘logos’, had power within both the human mind and condition. In its early form, the evangelicalism of Luther and other reformers, fundamentally changed Christianity by presupposing that all theological authority was rooted in Scripture, and not the extended hierarchy and learning of the Catholic Church. The Friends of 1930s Ohio held this central tenet of evangelicalism as their central core. The words of seventeen-year-old girl at a summer camp in 1939 echoed this perfectly and would resound in the cabins of Camp Coshocton as well as continuing issues of *The Evangelical Friend* leading up to the war.

These five potent ideologies served as foundations for Quakers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as well as the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Multiple groups before had engaged all these ideas to varying degrees. Virulent strains of such opposition would drive myriad Europeans to revolt, rebel, sail to North America’s Jamestown and Plymouth, and ultimately purloin British Crown colonies. This Enlightenment posturing, espoused in a Declaration of Independence and U.S. Constitution by these various opposition groups, in actuality, carried with it these manifestations of populism, iconoclasm, individualism, pietism, and some evangelicalism, all which had been pulsing through European continent since the 1300s.⁹

A religious group, or any political or social group for that matter, cannot function in
certain manners and movements unless it collectively has the necessary presuppositions within each individual’s mind. One cannot see oneself as an individual in a populace unless one already has a preconception of that populace’s identity. Following, one cannot be an individualist unless one has a notion of the ‘Individual’ to start with. One cannot oppose an iconic force unless one can define it as ‘Other’. One cannot be a Pietist unless one has an outside measure of piety to abide by. And one cannot cling to a ‘Word of God’ unless one has a concept of what a ‘Scripture’ is. Such mindsets are necessary precursors to any practice, be it opposition or consensus.

Populism divides this essential pairing of authority and the individual and then provides the force for people to act. Over the centuries, countless manifestations of this perception rested on a concept of the individual, whether ‘massed’, or ‘mobbed’ (Boston 1773). In concert with distinct individuals, one can challenge entrenched authority, in as much as the authority can been pilloried as elitist and ignorant of the ‘will of the people’ (or ‘The Mob’). Populist movements from the sixteenth to the twentieth-century filled European landscape all trying to shake off vestigial feudalism, aristocratic decay, monarchic and ecclesiastical despotism. The driving force of the Ohio Valley Friends could be found in the heritage of early founding Quakers in their own English homeland. They eventually witnessed the Civil Revolution and sweeping cultural changes of Cromwell, as well other religious populist ferment, pulsing in itinerant movements opposed to the Church of England. These included the Ranters, primitive Methodists, Congregationalists, and Puritans. Eighteenth-, nineteenth- and twentieth-century North America was equally replete with this persistent populism, giving rise to colonial rebellions, Tea Parties, Whiskey, Shays’, and later Coxey rebellions. This dissertation
asserts that populism is the realization of the individual, in concert with other such individuals, opposing established orders. (Populism can be seen discharging itself in the likes of the 1968 Woodstock festival 40 years after the 1920s culturally-struggling group of Ohio Valley Friends). The key to this social impetus was the ascendancy of the individual, banded and enabled within a group of many. Populism imparts a powerful agency to the individual, as the member of a larger group of individuals. Practicing pacifism can include incarceration in a government camp with other pacifists.

Individualism would have an even more profound effect, positing as it did the power of the ‘Individual’. Liberating the faceless, anonymous, powerless individual, it allowed for new empowering identities to emerge such as ‘citizen’, ‘comrade’, ‘frere’, ‘souer’, ‘communard’, or – ‘child of God’. For an individual, most predominantly tethered to the land in an agricultural identity subservient to a lord, land owner, manor baron, prince, king, or bishop, there was power in taking on a new role and acting on one’s own behalf out of a new identity. Such investment carried with it both a compelling and impelling change. The individual gained power and control. The conscientious Friend pacifist in 1940s United States stood as singularly as the soldier did. Importantly, each stood invested with a state-validated individual identity. An individual Ohio Valley Friend, be they elder, parent, youth at summer camp or CO camp, would draw identity through this dynamic by direct opposition to the United States government. Opposition to the state and its violent foreign policy augmented one’s individual identity as a pacifist as it was the state that created the situation in which pacifism could be realized.

Iconoclasm created an essential means through which these two concepts of populism and individualism could operate. The very notion of an ‘Icon’, well represented
in its religious-specific Eastern Orthodoxy, positions an artifact as the point for veneration and spiritual focus. The stylized image of a saint becomes not only the depiction, but in its iconic nature, the actual object worthy of veneration. This form of thinking, embedded for centuries in religion, also had expression in cultural thought, as this iconic veneration could be transferred to institutions (“The Church”), symbols of power (“The Crown”) or symbols of Wealth (“The Manored Estate”). The physical manifestation of all institutions or power become the physical icon of the sum of their effects. The church is a building and also the sum of the warp and woof of cultural currents. Yet once there is an icon, there can be a focus for resistance and opposition. The communard can take to the barricades because she or he is in opposition to a “Crown.” The serf might attack the magistrate because of his association with the manor house. Manifestations include Marxist-defined classes engaged in a dialectic struggle between laborers and the ‘Ruling Classes’ of owners or bourgeoisie. Identity as a proletariat is vouchsafed by the existence of other group class identities and their economic effects on the laborer. Whatever the group, each serves as an icon for opposition, an icon seen as the sum of all the effects. In all cases, the power status quo, the entrenched elite, is identified as ‘Other’ and subsequently opposed. This central dynamic, resistance to the perceived power icon was crucial for all these oppositional groups, including the early Friends. Later pacifist Friends in the Ohio Valley were natural re-enactors of this legacy of resistance as they opposed the U.S. government and its armed forces, the icon of its errant militarized foreign policy.

Pietism, a term ascribed to predominantly seventeenth- and eighteenth-century movements, positioned the spiritual experience of religion as primary. It most certainly
had roots as far back as the devotional excursions within the Catholic Church as practiced in monastic orders and convents. Anabaptist groups similarly followed a pietist path during the Reformation, more often than not to their detriment as some reformers, including Luther and Calvin, persistently persecuted such “enthusiasm.”

The earliest followers of George Fox, founder of the Society of Friends, were no exception as ‘proto-pietists’, seating the focus of their spirituality not within ritual or materiality, but within the soul and its interaction with the soon-to-be promulgated Quaker “Inner Light.”

The Ohio Valley Friends were in all actuality living out this variation of pietism within a 1940s conscientious objector camp.

Evangelicalism was similarly widespread and crucial among Quakers, but hardly in the vein of its connotation as known today in the twenty-first century. With its earliest roots in the monastic orders of the Catholic Church, the reordering of revelation known as ‘evangelicalism’ crystallized out of Luther’s Reformation. Decrying and dethroning the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, evangelicalism sought to replace the verbal authority seated in priests, bishops, cardinals and popes with the authority of the Word of God, as it was set materially in the text of the Bible. This substitution was both a remarkable and prodigious undertaking considering the prevalence of illiteracy at the time. Yet with tandem forces of populism, individualism, and iconoclasm, evangelicalism would triumph making this profound shift. No longer would the teachings of God be mediated by Church rulings, papal bulls or illiterate local priests, but rather they would be drawn from the living ‘Word of God’ as translated into the popular tongues of multiple European peoples. This central core of evangelicalism carried through into the twentieth century through the guise of Fundamentalism. It continued further into the twenty-first
century undergirding the extensive variety of contemporary non-denominational ‘Meta Churches’ and ‘Mega Churches.’ Today, some inheritors include the descendents of Luther’s first reformation, the largest body of Lutherans calling itself in name “The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America”. Similarly, the twenty-first century inheritors of the OYM are the “Evangelical Friends Church - Eastern Region” based in Canton, Ohio, alongside their own Malone University.11

Europe served as an arena in which all these major cultural perceptions of populism, individualism, iconoclasm, pietism, and evangelicalism were acted out and contested. The contribution of early European reformers was extensive. As far back as the mid 1300s, the English scholar John Wycliffe translated the Bible into English, enabling access to the otherwise distanced Latin Bible. In the late 1400s, William Tyndale, also English, translated a highly useful version of the New Testament, similarly placing the ‘Word of God’ in the hands of the people. John Knox’s Presbyterian reformation in Scotland lent great weight to iconoclasm, symbolically tearing down the power of the Anglican Church (in actuality the ‘Anglicized’ Roman Catholic Church) while literally tearing down the multitude of vestigial gothic artifices and ornamentation.12 It is essential to see that in the process of propagating these ideologies, the early seventeenth-century Friends were also being forged by them. Into this disruptive cultural breach stepped George Fox, the founder of The Society of Friends or Quakers. In 1643, at nineteen, Fox declared himself dissuaded and dismayed by the dominance of the ritualized and hierarchal underpinnings of the Anglican Church. Being the intellectual crystallization of these cultural expressions of populism, individualism, iconoclasm, pietism, and evangelicalism, George Fox set into motion yet another
manifestation of the era’s widespread insurgent ideas of the time - ‘The Society of Friends’.¹³

Pietism was pivotal to Fox’s founding principles, as shown by his foundational precept of the singularity of Jesus Christ as the answer to all questions—the Truth. In his journal he noted his despair:

I had forsaken the priests, so I left the separate preachers also, and those esteemed the most experienced people; for I saw there was none among them who could speak to my condition. When all my hopes in them and in all men were gone, so that I had nothing outwardly to help me, nor could I tell what to do, then, oh, then I heard a voice which said, ‘There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition’; and when I heard it, my heart did leap for joy. ¹⁴

Aspects of these reformation ideologies can be seen in the foundation for Society of Friends in the seventeenth century and in the Ohio Valley Friends of the early twentieth century as well. Seventeen-year-old Betty Osborne, as well as her peers at the summer camp, knew these precepts by heart, and would rehearse them for each other and for their parents in speeches, classes, and the daily acts of proper living.

Fox was the classic iconoclast. Born in the town of Drayton-in-the-Clay, Leicestershire, England, the founder of the group to be known as the Society of Friends was a shoemaker and a shepherd. Devoid of higher ecclesiastical and academic learning, he personified the iconoclasm that permeated the splinter groups of the day. Challenging preachers in their pulpits every Sunday or on the streets during the week, repeatedly thrown in prison, iconoclasm drove Fox and early Friends. He served as the lightening rod for similarly discontented and disenchanted English, as they watched and endured the raging turmoil of civil war in Cromwell’s England, and the revivified power of the Church of England.
Individualism also undergirded Fox’s views of a renewed church. It is insightful to consider the words of an influential and prominent twentieth-century Friend, Rufus T. Jones, in an essay printed in a 1924 Ohio Yearly Meeting publication. He enjoined OYM Friends to remember Fox’s yearnings as to what a true church could be as they struggled in their own time:

….a church as little organized as possible in which each Christian would have a wide area of freedom and personality, they wished for return of the way of the life of the Galilean, the gospel of the sermon on the mount. They abhorred technical theology and hoped to realize a faith born of experience and freshly fed and guided by the immediate presence of the Spirit. 15

Jones was rehearsing twentieth-century Friends adherents in the thought patterns of a seventeenth-century English reform movement. Through their very practice of historical memory and remembrance, he and his contemporary Ohio Valley Friends of the 1920s were actually remembering and re-enacting these potent seventeenth-century discourses of populism, individualism, pietism, iconoclasm, and evangelicalism, hearkening back to Fox’s time.

Such hagiography as Jones articulated is a key indicator of the influence of seventeenth-century culture on the twentieth-century Ohio Valley Friends, who lionized Fox’s mindset. Fox hagiography was articulated in their 100th, 125th, 150th, and 175th anniversary missives and celebrations. His individualism and iconoclasm entranced them and betrayed their persuasion as they wrote:
Fox stands forth as a true specimen of an apostolic leader and heroic reformer, absolutely sincere, honest, brace, uncompromising and with an eye single for the light of God in his soul. He proposed to return as far as possible to the simple basis of the New Testament, to put life and fellowship in the place of system and organization.

His populism intrigued them:

With all this in mind George Fox undertook as far as possible to let the new life of Christ take its own free and untrammeled course of development. He shunned rigid molds, crystallized forms and static systems. For that reason he refused to head a new sect, or to start a new denomination, or to begin a new church. He would not build an organization of any kind.

His pietism and evangelicalism similarly enamored them:

At first, his movement remained a simple fellowship, the members of which called themselves “Children of the Light” somewhat as the first Christians called themselves “those of the Way” (Acts 9:2). Gradually and almost unconsciously they began to call themselves “Friends” and the while body was named “the Society of Friends” the term “Society” being used as we should now use the word fellowship or group.\textsuperscript{16}

These were the writings of Friends in early twentieth-century Ohio, trying to order their world in reference to the mindset of seventeenth-century reformers.

It is therefore revealing to see how this twentieth-century group of Ohio Valley Friends, chose to remember and tell itself its essential identity in shared historical stories which both shaped Fox and sustained the Friends over the centuries. The social mindsets which had forged Fox in the seventeenth century, and subsequently still forged the Friends of the twentieth century before World War II, seeped into the twentieth-century
conflict between a succeeding Friends and their state. They were actually living out their founding keystones of 300 years before.

The Ohio Valley Friends were products of 300 year-old mindsets renewed in twentieth-century “Invented Traditions”, crucially created their own “Imagined Communities.” 17 Once again, corporate hagiographic centennial recitation shows how the Ohio Valley Friends remembered their past, and more important how they saw their identity:

It is a common error of older religious groups that become more concerned with preserving their organization than with fulfilling their ministry. Each generation either discovers and experiences for itself the reality and life and power that gave rise to the organization, or they substitute in their place traditions, forms and expediency. …The most profitable look into our future involves an examination of our past. What was it that made our Quaker forefathers effective in the service of Christ? In brief form the answer may be given as follows…. 18

They called for the need for ongoing communal care, unity, guidance, concern, and devotion to Jesus Christ, thereby crystallizing all identity rooted in the seventeenth century. Recasting and re-synthesizing these foundations cemented the identity of the Friends’ pre-war years pacifist resistance.

It would be short-sighted to overlook how much the Friends as a ‘People of the Word’ were a people who not only possessed a distinctive ‘language’, and at the same time were a product of that language. The shaping power of nomenclature stands at the genesis of the Friends. Multiple splinter groups filled the religious landscape in the 1650s in England, a consequence of the Reformation’s fracture of Christianity throughout Europe over the previous 100 years. Counted among diversely-named English populist religious groups such as the ‘Ranters,’ the ‘Society of Friends’ was distinguished from
these others by their infamous moniker, “Quakers.” The spiritual awakening of seventeenth-century England allowed for much labeling and maligning of counter culture groups. Curious, and un-amused, British society at large would label and berate the Friends as “Quakers” declaring that they saw them ‘quake’ as they prayed. Regardless of the accuracy of such observations, the name created and reinforced their identity. In the Ohio Valley, the less-derogatory label “Friend” still bore the weight of this name and with it the inherent pacifist connotation within the American culture.

The term “Quaker” gained even greater currency with Fox’s own choice to use it. Assailing local parish priests in their Church of England pulpits, he developed both a large following and the ire of local authorities. Standing before Judge Bennett of Derby County, who reprimanded Fox with the pejorative term “Quaker,” Fox in turn chastised the court to “quake” before God. A curious slippage occurred here as the term “Quaker” became superimposed on the identity Fox had chosen, “Society of the Friends of Jesus”. In Fox’s choice, the term “Friends” constituted not a reference to sociability, but a direct designation made by Jesus Christ in John 15:15: "No longer do I call you slaves, for the slave does not know what his master is doing; but I have called you friends, for all things that I have heard from My Father I have made known to you.” Yet “Quaker” came to be accepted alongside “Friend” as an identity. Use of language mediated culture even at the very inception of the Friends--or Quakers.

The early twentieth-century Ohio Valley Friends were not be immune to these linguistic possibilities and difficulties. After the initial founding of the Society of Friends, further nomenclature problems arose, both in the identifications and word usages Friends chose. The term “meeting house” substituted for contemporary and culturally accepted
terms including “church” and “kirk.” The Friends called non-Friend church buildings “steeple houses,” a slight to the grander edifices of the time. Friends reduced terms such as “congregants” and “congregations” in their own nomenclature to the categorical term “meetings.” Authority effacing usage of “thee” and “thou” took on specific purposes for address to differentiate the Quakers from the rest of the world, resulting in day-to-day self inflicted ostracizing through their very use of language. The Ohio Valley Friends continued these linguistics anomalies in the 1920s and 1930s even in the course of dealing with local authorities and writing to the United States government. Similar parallels are evident in modern language such as contemporary Spain’s Catalan divide, or U.S. hip-hop slang.\(^{23}\) Practice elided into the realm of language wherein one’s held ideologies, whether iconoclasm or pietism, could be acted out through language. The very effect of their language choices involved their identity. The Ohio Yearly Meetings adherence to these oddities already set them apart as their “meetings” across the towns of eastern Ohio could stand within a block of another group of local townspeople who would rather call themselves a “congregation” or “church.” One further identity construct would be even more determining, the Quakers’ fundamental embrace of the discourse and tenet of Peace with its subsequent practice of pacifism. Both locals and the state knew the Friends, without question, to be of one of the “traditional peace churches.” Pacifism, which stood as a crucial and singular identifier for the Friends, had a long continental history leading into the twentieth century. The pacifism embraced by the Ohio Yearly Meeting carried a lineage that dated back to the seventeenth century and was an outgrowth of contemporary communist or socialist provocateurs of the Depression, as critics sometimes charged. Pacifism in seventeenth-century Europe emerged in a variety
of geographies including Switzerland, the Netherlands, England, and Russia. All these lands had endured centuries of recurring and relentless wars, yet ironically, these same lands would also bear the groups that would launch myriad strains of European pacifist movements.  

Later groups would trace themselves back to these European pacifist movements. England’s Peace Societies in the 1800s could trace themselves back to the obscure shoemaker in Cromwell’s England, George Fox, founder of the Friends. The Baptist denomination founder, John Smythe, dying in 1612, embraced pacifism, though this heritage passed minimally into the descendent Baptist branches of twentieth-century United States. The Russian author of War and Peace, Leo Tolstoy, in an under developed pacifism, called for a self-proclaimed Christian anarchism and the dismantling of all governments. His call to rid the world of governments would ostensibly erase war from the world. His legacy of Tolstoyian Societies survived into nineteenth- and twentieth-century United States, attracting contemporaries of the Ohio Yearly Meeting such as Clarence Darrow, William Jennings Bryant, and Jane Addams. Menno Simons of Frisa, Netherlands (d. 1561), founded the pacifist tradition of the later-named Mennonites and drew their sources from Anabaptists struggling against the reforms of Zwingli in sixteenth-century Zurich. Pacifist strains had sprung up from multiple religious and secular European roots, some eventually flowing towards North America.  

One clue into the pacifist collapse of the Friends in twentieth-century United States comes from the comparison of two similar European pacifist groups as they each grappled with their governments. The political choices of the Quakers of England and the Mennonites of northern Europe on how to interact with their respective states
demonstrates precisely how the practice of pacifism was not so much a relationship realized between a devout group and their God, but rather the relationship between a devout group and a ruling state.

Both Quakers and Mennonites possessed the same biblical passages underwriting and strongly supporting their understanding of earthly government. Mennonites, as much as Quakers, held to a position that the state, wherever and whenever, stood as the scripturally ordained instrument of God’s will on earth. Pivotal verses from the New Testament defined a very precise standing for the state. In his letter to the Romans Paul admonishes, “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.\(^{26}\)

From such a vetted textual mandate, both Mennonites and Quakers of seventeenth-century Europe, as also Friends in the United States, saw an absolute affirmation of an ordained power vested in a natural state by a supernatural God. Further, they read into such a text an affirmation of the state actually acting at the behest and pleasure of God. Consequently one could only be disobedient to this state if it called one to act in violation of other scriptural imperatives. The state could not require you to sin, be it through lying, stealing, drunkenness or killing. The state as part of God’s plan must be given recognition and due allegiance. These foundational passages advocating governmental obedience did not, though, result in similar actions by Mennonites and Quakers. Reading the same verses, whether in Paul’s letter to the Romans and other New Testament books did not convince Mennonites that participation in government was necessary in a Christian
pursuit. The Quakers, however, were far too often convinced propelling to them to repeatedly enter the political arena.27

From two different perspectives, Mennonites and Friends would end up in the same 1940s CO camp in Coshocton for differing, but similarly-based reasons. The Biblical mandate for the practice of civil obedience would entail a head-on confrontation with the state, if that state mandates militarist violence. Aside from an abortive attempt to overthrow the German city of Munster’s magistracy in 1531, the Mennonites saw it far more in accordance with scriptural directives to ostensibly withdraw from civil society, to adhere to an attitude of “Let the governments be composed of the less wicked so as to punish both the more wicked and if need be the righteous.”28 They saw their identity in a cautious wary opposition to the state, one that acknowledged and acted out of this tension. Even as a state acted contrary to God’s laws and will, that same state had to be recognized as placed in power at God’s behest.

Quakers in contrast saw government as a mode, a tool by which to transform the world into “a community of saints.” Government need not be held at arm’s length but engaged. This God-ordained institution did not have to be held at arm’s length, but could be actually appropriated and used for good. Such an approach over centuries, as even in the ensuing 1940s, would be part of their eventual social and economic downfall, as they saw their identity, at repeated times and places, intertwined with the state, while attempting to infuse spiritual Quaker tenets into political realities and agendas. For a sustained period from the 1680 to 1750s, their calculated moves brought the Friends into remarkable prominence. The Quakers of the Pennsylvania colony became financially prosperous and a potent force in the politics, economics, and social fabric of William
Penn's “Holy Experiment”.

Major modes of business transactions and finance drew from Quaker sources, such as the act of pricing instead of haggling. Political structures rooted themselves in Quaker processes striving for consensus rather than dictum.


Tracing these arcs of pacifism from Europe to the Americas shows the subtle, yet similar sources for pacifism yet also can provide clues to the demise of pacifism in the Ohio Yearly Meeting. North America proved to be fertile ground for multiple variations of pacifism, including the Quakers. It offered a new space, a vast distance from the enduring and entrenched war institutions forged over centuries of confrontations in Europe. Pacifist groups could find a physical place to practice ‘Peace’. The Quakers’ tenet of pacifism readily bloomed in the North America. Yet their choice to wed pacifism to their political ambition contributed to their twentieth-century abdication of the same. Trying to forge an identity in symbiotic relation to the state, the Quakers eventually lost not only their political but much social and economic footing.

A major deviation in doctrinal sources reveals how the Quakers in the Americas followed a different trajectory than the Mennonites. The Mennonites clung tenaciously to scripture for their sources of authority. Simply, if a God had pronounced it in scripture, it stood as pure, vetted, untainted truth. An absolute text, solidified in a codified text, remained unassailable, and ironclad. If someone recorded in the Bible a resurrection from the dead, it stood as fact. If the Bible mandated “Offer the other cheek” and “Return not evil for evil”, then there was no debate, nor mediation of the text. Affirming the same truth of the exact same texts, the Quakers, though, also cleaved to a peculiarity of another
of their tenets, “The Inner Light” found in each individual which granted him or her further insight and affirmation into truth.\textsuperscript{31}

This Inner Light from the days of their founding had been a central tenet of Quakerism, one that would also presage their downfall. To the Quakers, Jesus granted each follower this Inner Light by virtue of an indwelling of the Holy Spirit of God, enabling them to not only discern truth when read in Scripture, but also to generate this same truth from within themselves. An early Quaker could know truth (and practice pacifism) without any reference to the Bible. The impetus behind the repeated accounts of itinerant early English Friends preaching and verbally assaulting the pulpits of ‘learned’ preachers exhibited this mechanic of the Inner Light. There was no need for ecclesiastical or higher academic training if one had this Inner Light. The Society of Friends’ first seminal statement to King Charles II in January 1661, underscored this dynamic, declaring that their pacifism as “based upon the Spirit of Christ which leads us into all truth”.\textsuperscript{32} The ‘Inner Light’ in each individual, which also could impart truth – and a pacifist stand – augments the Bible in its uncontested authority. This peculiarity of the early Quakers’ idea of the veracity of the Inner Light crossed the Atlantic and became a mainstay of Pennsylvania Friends. Though eventually rejected in the twentieth century by the Ohio Valley Friends, it remains today in their eastern cousin, the Society of Friends. Predecessors of the twentieth-century Ohio Valley Friends excised this accessory source of the Inner Light in a nineteenth-century schism, turning them once again to see Biblical scripture as the sole source for authority, yet it would still resurface in an CO camp in World War II.
Quaker and Mennonite interactions with governments therefore proved markedly
different. Mennonites, despite their pacifist position, had far fewer legal difficulties in the
colonies. They took no umbrage at paying a fine for substituting a non-Mennonite for a
conscripted Mennonite in service in the Crown’s army. The Quakers, in contrast, resisted
this conscription vehemently, and argued that it was immoral to be coerced to pay a fine
for an act against one’s conscience. Quakers also took exception to the morality of
slavery and became divided among themselves over the keeping of slaves in the early
1700s. The Quakers’ ensuing decline as a political force came in the mid 1700s as the
ascendancy they achieved in such political hubs as Philadelphia quickly waned.
Colonists, still inextricably tied to imperial Britain, could hardly countenance Quaker
political meddling or opposition in areas of slavery and conscription. Decrying slavery
(an economic faux pas) and refusing to fight in the army of the Crown or even raise a
colonial militia undermined the social and political status of the Quakers. Manumission
of slaves might be a personal choice but hardly a legislatively mandated one. By the time
of the French and Indian War, their pacifism had undone their political influences and
ambitions of the “Holy Experiment”, to create a world for saints by using the
government. 33 In the end, both Quakers and Mennonites, due to their pacifism, fell out of
any prominent political sphere of influence in the British America colonies, one by
choice, one by default.

Two different strategies to forge a religious identity resulted in different ends. As
the Mennonites had set up a quiescent oppositional identity with the state, the Quakers
had set up a symbiotic one where they would both use, and be used, by this same state.
Vetted with the same scripture verses - and ardent pacifism - the Mennonites uneasily regarded the state as an adversary. The Quakers, similarly, contrived to both use, and be used by the state. The demise of the eighteenth-century Quakers in the British American colonies as a political force similar to what they had in eastern Pennsylvania, resulted in social ignominy, economic loss, and political dissipation. The Mennonites, however, remained in the same position vis-a-vis the state from where they had started. Two deliberate choices, born out of a similar pacifist ardor, resulted in two different choices of identity relationship to the state - and a very telling devolution for Quakers, one they would repeat as the Ohio Yearly Meeting.\textsuperscript{34}

Out of this struggle of government entanglement and quest for identity came the Ohio Yearly Meeting in 1812. With their arrival in the Ohio Valley, Quakers still continued their active engagement within their culture. They did not retreat, nor retire as a utopian group, but rather continued as active participants and agents within the culture of their times. Riding the crest of the geographical wave afforded by the 1783 Treaty of Paris, and the 1787 Northwest Ordinance, the Ohio Country proved fertile ground for Quakers to reestablish communities and increase adherents. In 1800, the 800 Quaker families living in the Ohio Territory largely eclipsed the meager seventeen families of the dissipated extended Philadelphia Yearly Meeting noted to be living in Pittsburgh in 1780.\textsuperscript{35} Yet it was this same Pittsburgh Meeting that would “send” a seed congregation into the new territory, providing in Mt. Pleasant, Ohio, the germ for the Ohio Valley Friends of the Ohio Yearly Meeting.
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CHAPTER III

THE OHIO YEARLY MEETING: A PEOPLE OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND IN THE UNITED STATES, 1812 – 1939

The Mt. Pleasant Friends Meeting stands as an example of a religious group struggling to uphold both right doctrine and right practice in a larger U.S. cultural context. Within such a struggle lay both their quest for identity and their stand for a pacifist heritage of three centuries tracing back to the inception of the Quakers of England. The Mt. Pleasant Friends, founded in 1812, would be the beginnings of the Ohio Yearly Meeting (OYM) of the 1930s. In both these forms, the Ohio Valley Friends comprising these meetings weathered deep-reaching cultural trends throughout those 130 years until World War II. Nineteenth-century remnants of earlier Puritanism, piety and Presbyterianism combined with emerging early twentieth-century discourses of New Biblical Criticism, American evangelicalism, fundamentalism, Pre-millennialism and Post-millennialism to reshape the Ohio Valley Friends. These major cultural trends coursed from the cultural epicenters of east coast New York, Princeton, Philadelphia, and mid-west Chicago and Cleveland. Throughout the effects of all these, the Ohio Valley Friends found their most central tenets, including pacifism, initially affirmed but ultimately contorted. These forces set them up for their pacifist last stand in a CO camp
followed by their sudden abandonment of their pacifism as they subordinated long-standing Quaker precepts to a new U.S. Civil Religion.

The experiences of the Mt. Pleasant Meeting in the early 1800s shaped the Ohio Valley Friends from their outset. Founded in 1812 they immediately stood as a pacifist religious group striving to fuse right doctrine and right practice on the eve of yet another national war. The east coast Baltimore Yearly Meeting established the Mt. Pleasant Meeting for Friends west of the Allegheny Mountains in Virginia, Pennsylvania and Ohio. This initial group was comprised of families from the remnant Pittsburgh Meeting. Newly settled Ohio provided fertile, yet hostile, soil for the growing meeting. In 1812, James Madison was president, and the United States was embroiled in war with Britain. Their first yearly meeting in 1813 in Short Creek (Mt. Pleasant, Ohio) benefited from the provision of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 that provided land grants for settlers, schools, and more importantly, freedom of religion. What could be more fertile an area for a religious group that counted both their youth and pacifist religious practice as hallmarks? Yet another of their cultural tenets found home in this new territory – a provision concerning the evils of slavery.

The Friends of previous national meetings had encoded abolition as a central hallmark in their doctrinal books. The Continental Congress concurred with a similarly encoded proscription in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. Ardent abolitionists since the early eighteenth century, the Ohio Friends reveled in the newly formed federal government’s affirmation of one of their own Quaker tenets. The federal state affirmed a Friends’ supernatural mandate. Ohio could also offer refuge to the many Southern Quakers on the wrong side of political debate with their abolitionism, ongoing
manumission, and exhortation of fellow slaveholders to believe and act accordingly. Subsequently, not only Eastern Friends populated Ohio seeking religious freedom, but Southern Quakers seeking political asylum. By 1812, the population of Ohio was 250,000 and within that number, 800 Quaker families seeded the Mt. Pleasant Meeting by direction of a far off Baltimore meeting.\(^1\)

The Mt. Pleasant Friends were a vibrant, engaged and recognized group in the cultural landscape. The nation at large continually noted their significance. Many significant cultural and political bodies recognized the cultural and political importance of these Ohio Quakers. Minutes of Ohio Yearly Meetings (1913-1934) at Mt. Pleasant, could be found at academic archives and government repositories throughout the United States: The Ohio State Archeological and Historical Society; The Library of Columbus, Ohio; Library of Congress, Washington D.C.; The Friends’ Historical Library, Friends House, London; Haverford College Library, Haverford, Pennsylvania; University of Chicago Library, Chicago; Friends’ Historical Library, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania; Earlham College Library, Richmond, Indiana; Guilford College Library, Greensboro, North Carolina; Harvard University Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Indiana State Library, Indianapolis, Indiana; and the Historical and Philosophical Society Library, Cincinnati, Ohio. Recognition by such archives indicates a keen awareness of the significance of the Friends at large. Yet such recognition within twenty years of the founding of the Mt. Pleasant Friends evidences a cultural status granted to the Friends far greater than fringe utopian religious group of later times such as the Transcendentalists and Millerites.\(^2\) These Mt. Pleasant Friends would eventually be the source for all Friends
meetings west of Ohio from Indiana, through the Mid-West and into the present day Southwest and Northwest.

While a cultural catalyst in themselves for the surrounding areas, the Ohio Valley Friends were also caught in their own internal Friends’ debates pulsing through the national Quaker community in the first half of the nineteenth century. As the Second Great Awakening of the 1830s burned across America, the Mt. Pleasant Friends became an epicenter for what would become a pivotal theological split within Friends nationally and the Friends of Ohio. The side the Mt. Pleasant Friends chose in the split showed how many underpinnings of their long heritage had not faded. This major split in American Friends reflected both national and internal changes of the times, and also highlighted the durability of the Ohio Valley Friends’ roots.

Itinerant Quakers, Elias Hick, John Wilbur, and John Gurney, started a controversy among all Friends as to which of the conflicting enduring tenets and foundational premises of their group should be embraced or jettisoned. Adherents of Hicks affirmed a far more materialist view of Quakerism, one that sought to address and solve the material problems of this present world. Issues of poverty and oppression were far more important beyond just spiritual purity and simplicity. Adherents of this view would stream into the later American Friends Service Committee and other powerful relief organizations associated with the East Coast Society of Friends of today. Another spark came from itinerant Wilbur, who advocated fervently for a return to the overarching emphasis on Fox’s “Inward Light”, over and against any scriptural authority. Vigorous dissension followed, as these ‘Wilburites’ embraced a tradition where the Inner Light took primacy over the infallibility of the Bible. What a Friend might
receive as revelation in the silence of a group meeting or in a walk in a field took
precedence over any doctrinal tenet based on Biblical injunction. In due course a third
group saw this position as heretical. Adherents to the teachings of John Gurney,
advocated for the authority of the Bible in all matters of faith practice, placing the
Gurneyites in direct conflict with Wilburites. Debates originating in the Second Great
Awakening refined the Ohio Valley Friends as much as later twentieth-century forces
associated with fundamentalists such as Dwight L Moody and Charles Finney would
similarly refine them. The conundrum of the final authority for supernaturally revealed
truth was, once again, being contested, as it had when Fox challenged the authority of the
dominant Church of England. Wherein does any final authority for truth lie: in the
Church, the individual, or the actual ‘text’ of the Bible?

As Quakers across the United States settled into their chosen affirmations of these
various strains, so did the Ohio Valley Friends. Following a series of bizarre
maneuverings, including building takeovers and the physical structural division of the
Mt. Pleasant Friends Meeting House in 1828, the triumphant section of the Ohio Yearly
Meeting settled firmly into the ‘Gurneyite’ tradition. This turn further strengthened their
pacifism, forever affirming that scripture, as George Fox had averred, stood solely as the
final authority, over any individual’s “Inward Light” or inclination. The die was cast for
their pacifism in the U.S. Civil War less than twenty-five years later, followed by more
conflicts and two world wars within the next 100 years. God through Scripture distinctly
called the Ohio Valley Friends to pacifism. No inner light, nor higher ecclesiastical body,
nor civil religion could dictate otherwise. An internal conflict within the American
Friends, born out of Great Awakening tremors, further solidified the heritage and
conviction of the Ohio Valley Friends’ pacifism and their eventual stand in World War II.  

The names and theological peculiarities of the debate are not as significant as the recognition that, in their choices during the later separation in 1854, the Gurneyite Ohio Valley Friends laid down deep ideological grooves leading them to the later showdown in a CO camp. By choosing the Gurneyite adherence where scripture was paramount for direction and practice, the Ohio Valley Friends were following in their previous founding tradition of evangelicalism. The OYM had affirmed and solidified adherence to supernatural revelation as encoded in the Bible. This decision, which solidified their Biblically mandated pacifism, set the stage for the later enlisting in the ranks of the emerging Pre-Millennialist movements raised by Dwight L. Moody and Charles Finney. Biblical fidelity, through it forms of fundamentalism, Pre-millennialism, American evangelicalism, or teachings of Friend John Gurney, lay at the foundation of the Ohio Valley Friends’ understanding of their religion.

Along with a discourse of Biblical adamancy, a discourse of youth similarly compelled the Mt. Pleasant Friends. Obsession with their youth drove the Ohio Valley Friends in extreme cultural pursuits. Such ageist concerns were at odds with a culture that saw children in a far more economic light. Once established and prosperous beyond mere subsistence farming in the Ohio Valley, the Mt. Pleasant Friends set about to further care for and educate their youth beyond a mere labor force. Discussions of the education “of children” appear in meeting minutes as early as 1814. A Mt. Pleasant Boarding School proposal came in 1820. By 1824, Thomas Rotch of Kendal Friends Meeting of Massillon, Ohio, donated $5,000 to start a boarding school designed for both boys and girls; along
with their views on education, the Friends held highly enlightened views of gender. The school opened on January 23, 1837, and accommodated 120 students ($68 a year for room and board). The school was a huge endeavor and stunning achievement for an 800-family group, and a testament to their desire to set their ‘Youth’ apart, and educate them into ‘Adults’.

The school demonstrated remarkable pedagogic foresight and diligence, as it did not limit curriculum to only arcane theological vagaries of splits and dissensions. Coursework included Chemistry, Logic, Astronomy, Political Economy, Natural and Moral Philosophy, Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Bookkeeping, Latin, Greek, and French. Teachers were sought from across the nearby states. Only a devastating fire in 1857 brought the endeavor to a close, yet the Friends’ zeal for their youth reinvented itself immediately in Damascus Academy of the Friends in Damascus, Ohio. Once again, the Friends embedded their obsession for their youth as expressed in the school charter of 1857, where Damascus Academy of the Friends provided all eight grades, four years of high school, and 2 years of normal school, all for $5.00 a course plus $2.00 a week room and board. Their ongoing concern for youth was not a quirk or passing fancy of the nineteenth-century or twentieth-century Ohio Valley Friends – it was part of their identity.  

Their concern for “guarded education” brought about the implementation in 1859 of the First Day Schools – or in more common parlance ‘Sunday Schools’. Though the Damascus Academy closed in 1910, their obsession for cultivating their youth emerged quickly in the Friends’ pursuit of “Christian Education”. While the secular culture of Ohio expanded education through the start-up of multiple colleges and regular schools,
the Friends expanded their concept of what youth education should be. The state of Ohio and surrounding states were similar forges for the Sunday School movement. Sunday School initiatives abounded throughout other denominations and religious groups and were quite similar in their anti-modernist approach to activities initiated by Ohio Valley Friends.8

The twentieth-century Ohio Valley Friends’ idea of Christian Education extended beyond Sunday Schools into published monthly newsletters reaching all congregations. Teacher training and published weekly lesson plans in these monthly newsletters, (monthlies which would eventually become the 1930s newsletter The Evangelical Friend) supplemented this weekly Sunday School education. Monthly newsletters, sent to all local meetings, became the medium for communication among Ohio Valley Friends leading up to World War II. Education plans included weekly lessons and teacher training, but also encouragement, exhortation, bolstering scripture verses and strident lessons in pacifism for all grades. Such ongoing educational imperatives filled the year in various “Junior Church” programs every Sunday, and seasonal summer Junior Camps. Throughout the early twentieth century, children and youth comprised a distinct concern among the Friends, a category which continued to evolve into the intensely youth focused programming of the pre-World War II period.9

Abolition proved a vivid example of how Friends’ identity and distinct tenets could be so intricately bound into action. The Civil War struggle over slavery pulled the early Mt. Pleasant Friends into a cultural spotlight testing their allegiance and stridency towards their supernatural mandates. The very first copy of Discipline minutes of the
Ohio Yearly Meeting confirmed the Friends diligence in adhering to their tenets. A section on “Quakers and Slavery” affirmed:

As a religious society, we have found it to be an indispensable duty to declare to the world our belief of the repugnancy of slavery to the Christian religion. It therefore remains to be our continued concern, to prohibit our members from holding in bondage our fellow-men… we believe also that proper regard to this testimony would lead out members to avoid acting as executors or administrators to estates where slaves are bequested, or being accessory to any step whereby their bondage may be prolonged.  

In accordance, both Salem and Mt. Pleasant Friends maintained active participation in the extensive Ohio Underground Railroad. Denominational tenets such as “Guarded Education” and “Abolition” were not only discussed but practiced by these ardent Ohio Valley Friends, along with their pacifism.

Taking as equal an importance as abolition or education, the Friends affirmed their tenet of pacifism in their article “Quakers and War” in the same original Discipline of 1819:

...it is the earnest concern of the Yearly Meeting, that Friends may adhere faithfully to our ancient testimony against wars and fighting. That furnishing wagon or other means for conveying military stores is a military service…. And that a tax levied for the purchasing of drums, colours and for other warlike uses cannot be paid consistently with our Christian testimony. It is further the sense and judgment of the Yearly Meeting, that it is inconsistent with our religious testimony and principle for any Friend to pay a fine or tax, levied on account of their refusal to muster or to serve in the militia, although such a fine or imposition may be applied toward defraying the expense of the civil government.  
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The Ohio Valley Friends were not involved in arcane passive philosophical speculation or seclusion, but rather in the direct practice of their doctrine, an endeavor that set them both in contest and at odds with the dominant state and culture around them.

To engage this state and culture proved no small task for a group as remote as the Ohio Valley Friends. Yet it was a task they never avoided. In 1862 the Friends affirmed their pacifism in a letter sent to President Lincoln, whose mother was a Quaker. The “Address” as the Friends called it, took a stand against the government’s policy on waging war, setting them once again in an adversarial role with a state:

The Ohio Yearly Meeting of Friends convened at the Pleasant Jefferson County Ohio. 9th month 1862 respectively represents that owing to the present unhappy conditions of our country and the enrollment of names in order to draft these from thousands to be placed in the army, many of our members who are now sharing in common with these good citizens the trials of the times are subject to the still greater trial of having conscience sake to decline in this particular to obey the authorities of a government under which we enjoy many privileges and blessings and to which we hope to be found loyal. We would briefly call the attention of the President to the fact with which he in no doubt acquainted that our society has from its rise (a period of more than two hundred years) borne a testimony against all wars and fighting believing them to be at variance with the pure and peaceable dispensation of the Gospel of Christ and having constantly under all governments felt constrained to refuse to bear arms or pay an equivalent in lieu thereof. 12

The Ohio Valley Friends used both their heritage and the authority of their supernatural God, to challenge the president the United States in an act of letter writing that could hardly be qualified as vague philosophical debate; practice and doctrine for the Ohio Valley Friends were seen a one, irrespective of diligence in adherence.
Codifying central tenets of doctrine became the foundation of the OYM’s practice. By 1850, The Ohio Valley Friends published an ongoing, frequently-updated manual entitled *The Book of Faith and Practice*. Though still fraught with the Quaker theological splits endemic to the Meetings of Ohio, Indiana and Philadelphia, the Ohio Valley Friends could maintain their individual identity even in a state that sustained three Quaker factions in disagreement. Continuing through periodic revisions into the twentieth century the *Book of Faith and Practice* of the OYM offers valuable insight into both the structure and the practice of the Ohio Valley Friends.

Abandoning the traditions of the church structure they had left in England, Quakers embraced very low-level hierarchical structures of congregationalism, quite similar to the congregationalism of earlier New England religious groups. Such local governance of course placed Friends in opposition to colonial Episcopalism, modeled on the distant, but still influential, Church of England or other reformed groups. Each Friends meeting (‘congregation’) stood as autonomous. Collections of meetings (non-capitalized), would then convene in a Quarterly ‘Meeting’ (capitalized) with other nearby congregations. All Friends’ meetings would come together in one ‘Yearly Meeting’ (hence “The Ohio Yearly Meeting”) in such places as Mt. Pleasant or Damascus, Ohio. During these multi-day conventions, or “Yearly Meetings”, they would diligently assess their adherence to Quaker principles. Practice in line with doctrine stood as a pillar of Quakerism. The Yearly Meeting constituted the true feeling and direction of the multiple local meetings, showing a clear picture of a collective conscience.13

Other groups across the U.S. religious landscape saw and organized themselves quite differently, determining what cultural forces to which they might be susceptible.
This dissertation avers that the division between such hierarchical national and local control was what enabled the fracture in the Ohio Valley Friends’ conception of pacifism; the OYM had to make their own choices. Episcopalian and Presbyterian systems discussed doctrine and practice over greater geographic areas. Hierarchical groups would hand down collective decisions. Inevitably, a small Presbyterian congregation in Ohio could be living by the standards of a group decision from Boston. Living in rural Ohio, such a congregations could be following urban practice of a city many states away. The encoded manuals of these larger denominations would not show the varied response to local cultural shifts, being in actuality the amalgam of broader geographical areas. To the contrary, such books as *Faith and Practice* showed quite accurately the deliberations and actions of the local members of the OYM. The collective thought of such meetings would be the sum and consensus of the individual members and not far removed ruling bodies.

The religious landscape of the United States after the Second Great Awakening has been well documented from multiple historical, social, political, and economic angles. All these cultural effects are crucial to understanding the Ohio Valley Friends cleaving to pacifism. Pacifism as a doctrine, though essential to Friends’ practice, concurrently evolved in parallel to three major religious trends: American Evangelicalism, Fundamentalism, and the arcane theological peculiarities of Premillennialism / Post-millennialism.¹⁴

American Evangelicalism carried within it the very seeds of the Friends’ identity and also the seeds for their headlong confrontation with the U.S. foreign policy of World War II. Tracing its arc from the seventeenth century, ‘American Evangelicalism’ mutated from the ‘Evangelicalism’ spawned by Martin Luther’s theses of detraction. European
Evangelicalism ossified into new monolithic national religious edifices as found in the state religions of Norway, Sweden, the fleeting theocracies of Switzerland, and other countries. A crucial keystone to American evangelical essence rested in state/religion dynamic of dis-establishmentism. The absence of a state sanctioned religion allowed for much religious itinerancy across, firstly, the British colonial territories, and then, U.S. territories. Such a provision that precluded a state sanctioned religion would be the key spark to inflame the friction between of the Ohio Valley Friends and the United States government. The provision itself had been embedded in the first amendment of the U.S. constitution, among freedoms for press, speech, assembly and petition.\textsuperscript{15}

Dis-establishmentism eschewed the previous pathological relationships between church and state as seen in Europe. This tandem of church and state had created many chimeras of civil religion throughout Europe, from the local religions of Saxon Princes to the Church of England and a past Holy Roman Empire. These civil religions allowed a lowly subject to call on God to “save the King”. Yet in the Americas, dis-establishmentism allowed for the flourishing of itinerancy and ‘circuit back riders’ who could promote religion unrestrained by state control. These were the preachers and revivalists who crisscrossed the patchwork of former colonies, states, and territories. The Second Great Awakening saw an especially significant rise in these individuals. If there was not a standard religion by which others were defined, at least officially in legislation, law, or ordinance, then there existed a far greater potential for itinerancy to rise up in multiple guises, including rampant, organic, indigenous American Evangelicalism.\textsuperscript{16} The Ohio Valley Friends inherited this autonomous religion in that their doctrine and practice functioned at a low level of organization, an Ohio Yearly Meeting.
American Evangelicalism drew from the wellsprings of three religious roots from Europe: Puritanism, pietism, and Presbyterianism. Puritans obsessed over the need for the individual to introspect continually, an ongoing practice evidenced in the Friends Yearly Meetings and books of *Faith and Practice*. This was custom they would never abandon. Self-awareness, self-evaluation, and self-criticism proved essential in the Puritanical relationship with God. Pietism lent the ardor that would eventually expand into the charismatic movements of the early twentieth century seen in the California Azusa Street revivals. Pietism also allowed for the primordial “Inward Light” of the George Fox’s founding principles. Presbyterianism with its staunch Reformed position, ironically at counterpoint to Friends’ Arminian traits, gave American Evangelicalism doctrinal scriptural precision, the later bedrock of the Gurneyite branch of the Ohio Valley Friends. The early Friends of Mt. Pleasant, and their successors in the Ohio Yearly Meeting both used and were used by these forces of American Evangelicalism.17

Fundamentalism, a uniquely American ideology emerging in the beginning of the twentieth century, gave the Ohio Valley Friends a crucial platform on which to stand. The “Word of God”, or Scripture itself, became a freed self-verifying entity in its own right. The Fundamentalism of the first quarter of the twentieth century became a virulent intellectual trend locked in a confrontation with nineteenth-century European academia. Determining forces of the nineteenth century – the thought of Darwin, Marx, and Freud-had already taken their toll at the gate of the twentieth century, and mainline American Protestantism increasingly embraced Darwinist theory, Christian heterodoxy, and a new siren - *Heilsgeschichte* - German “Higher criticism”. This continental cross-fertilization allowed a far more contrived literary approach to the Bible, viewing it as a text written by
human hand rather than by a divine spirit impelling human minds. The text could, and should, be read as multiple styles, tropes, and polemics, all contrived and constructed by human beings ensconced in inescapable culture and politics of their own time.\textsuperscript{18} The OYM preachers expressed extreme frustration for this form of thought and would stand firmly against it both in Yearly Meeting statements and within their local towns.

\textit{Heilsgeschichte} pried the text out of supernaturalism and placed it in the disciplines of literary criticism, discounting and detracting from the authorship of many books of the Bible.\textsuperscript{19} Prominent scholars denied Moses’ authorship of the Torah, and in a culturally imperialistic encroachment on Judaism, Isaiah’s authorship of prophetical books came under doubt. Jesus’ disciples’ authorship of the Gospels was questioned. \textit{Heilsgeschichte} also summarily undermined and dismissed the supernatural authority and veracity accorded to Scripture by evangelicalism. The Second Great Awakening’s plethora of circuit riders and itinerants, whose sole visa into the religious lives of the American populace had been a single Bible in a saddlebag or satchel, became un-vetted and ‘defrocked’ wherever they went, their visa revoked. Without the imprimatur of the North American proponents of this adopted continental influence such as a Yale Divinity School, a Princeton Seminary, or an Harvard Divinity School, one could not pose as a spokesman for God amidst accepted mainline and twentieth-century American religion. In the 1900s, Princeton Theological Seminary itself became the site of a crucial showdown between Higher Criticism and Fundamentalism. Continental Higher Criticism gained the day and the campus buildings. The evicted ‘Christian Orthodoxy’ contingent decamped and founded another seminary - Westminster Theological Seminary. The Ohio Valley Friends were acutely aware of the influences of Higher Criticism, regularly
decrying them in the newsletters and sermons, while excising them from their youth’s reading.

In its shortest and simplest form, Fundamentalism endorsed nine doctrinal “fundamentals”, of which there could be no question or mediation. Each stood on its own as foundational, immutable, and most importantly, Biblical. Written, in cooperation with the remnant of Princeton ‘Christian Orthodox’, and funded by a Lyman and Milton Stewart of Union Oil Company between 1910 and 1915, *The Fundamentals*, were ardent pamphlets that defended these basic nine simple fundamentals:

1) The inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture, 2) The Trinity, 3) The deity and virgin birth of Christ, 4) The creation and fall of man, 5) The sacrifice of Jesus, 6) The bodily resurrection and ascension of Christ, 7) The renewal of believers, 8) The personal and imminent return of Christ, 9) Final assignment of all humans to heaven or hell.

Such affirmations were quite simplistic, hardly recalling the Augustinian permutations of Condition of Man, or Thomastic debates over the perpetuity of spiritual virginity. These “Fundamentals” needed to be seen as a set tenets codified in reaction to another set of competing ones, which, for all intents and purposes threatened to deprive a large segment of the American Christian community of crucial components – Truth and Identity. If one could not master that alchemy of the new Higher Criticism set as a standard by the academic institutions and other hierarchical denominations across the U.S. religions landscape, one ceased to be a bona fide ambassador for God. The power granted by a new body of knowledge sidelined the evangelical believer / preacher / circuit rider. The evangelical community, under attack by these parallel academic authorities on the Bible, codified essential tenets of thought subsumed in ‘Christian Orthodoxy’. In doing so, they set up a straw man that academics could call “Fundamentalism” that would eventually be
used by these same academic adversaries espousing ‘Higher Criticism’. Fundamentalism came out of a power struggle that would beget even further struggles. The OYM would readily embrace the original ‘fundamentals’ as affirmed in 1915. Yet this fundamentalist struggle lay at the root of the Ohio Valley Friends clinging to one of their pinions of identity, pacifism.

At the turn of the twentieth century, Millennial thought affected both OYM and the nation at large.21 In a far larger social and theological scale, the Friends found themselves caught between Pre-millennial and Post-millennial views emerging at the turn of the century. The nineteenth-century religious landscape had a significant share of millenial thought with multiple utopian groups all espousing a millennialist hope for a radically changed society. The twentieth-century Progressive Movement also espoused these same hopes. Both of these views of pre-and post-millennialism, though arcane in Christian thought, produced far-reaching social and religious effects, effects that churned through 1930s political parties, houses of finance, and fanatical millenarian groups. Similarly they inspired and propelled even such progressive small eddies as Chicago’s Hull House. Their effect of the OYM was equally pronounced. American Evangelicalism’s constructs of Pre-millennialism and Post-millennialism both begged the question, “How does one act if one knows the future may end in certain ways?”

The Biblical notion of “The Millennium”, and its stepchildren ‘Pre’ and ‘Post’ millennialism, reordered the entire concept of time from a circular to a linear notion of progress. European Medieval thought held a circular notion of time wherein the time and the place one started would be the one in which he or she would also end. Born in a village as a peasant, one would live (and love) as such, and die as such, with the cycles of
the seasons the only mile markers one would ever know. Absent was any utopian, later-
to-come Enlightenment-Hegelian-Marxist progress of time towards the final achievement of humanity. And God (and the Church) hovered over this massive cycle. One’s position in time stood as fixed as one’s position in an economy. Time revolved in a circle.22 Yet multiple previous splinter groups - Catholic, reformist, and secular – entered into the radical endeavor of the reconstruction of a linear discourse where time would not continue cyclically, but would rather stretch out into a distant future horizon. In it, utopias would be realized; for some this was a Biblical Millennium. Jesus Christ – both God and Son of God - would return, abolish an entire world order (including, in some scenarios, the despotic Catholic Church) and usher in a new age of a 1,000 year rule on the earth. The secular parallels are not obscure, considering multiple secular attempts at political utopias throughout the centuries including many Marxist-inspired attempts. In this Christian millennial view, Christians, both those who had died and those still alive, would return and meet with Jesus on the physical earth. They would join together to rule with their Lord and King (specifically in Jerusalem), awaiting and witnessing a final, cataclysmic, terrible judgment of the remaining world, from which they, in various degrees, would be exempt. The capstone would be the replacing of the entire earth and heaven with a new single Heavenly World.

The 1920s and 1930s Ohio Valley Friends’ endorsement of scriptural authority readily offered them all the scriptural support they needed to embrace pre-millennialism. The bases for this belief ran through many Jewish and Christian traditions. Opaque references figured predominantly in the books of the prophet Isaiah (summarily dismissed, according to Heilsgeschichte, as two timebound ‘books’ by two anonymous
authors) where the nation of Israel is promised both a renewed land and a renewed position in the world. The Book of Ezekiel recounts future battles between titanic forces of Gog and Magog contesting both the power and land of this Millennial Kingdom. The Book of Zechariah lays out specific rendezvous points on a plain at Megiddo (‘Armageddon’ to modern U.S. presidents and evangelicals), where the people of Israel will meet their Messiah. More specific to this emerging Christian evangelical idea of the Millennium were the New Testament references, by Jesus, to cataclysmic end times and a very specific recounting of 1,000 literal year reign in the book of Revelation. Yet the political and social crux of this Millennium was not the actual number of years or activities in it, but when it would actually commence with the returning of Jesus. The implications would have far reaching political, religious and cultural effects in U.S. religious thought.

Pre-and Post-millenial views carried profoundly different implications. If Jesus returned to earth in his second coming before the 1000 year literal Millennium, to gather his own (specifically the Church and a fragment of Israel) and start the glory of the earthly Millennial Kingdom, then this view constituted a Pre-millennialist view. The Millennial Kingdom would be here on earth with Jesus ruling over a drastically altered world and remaining populace. If a group believed Jesus would return at the end of the literal 1000-year Millennium, to gather his own with him into a new heaven and earth, then this constituted a Post-millennialist view. In this view, the Millennium transpired opaquely here on earth, without Jesus present, all the beneficent effects of such a Millennium wrought by human hands with God’s assistance. Many arcane verse permutations and doctrinal machinations run through both Catholic and Protestant
theologies. Some even more elaborate algebraic calculations caused Millerites to suffer the ‘Great Disappointment’ due to their erroneous projection of October 22, 1844 as the date for the return of Jesus. Yet the effects on the modes of thought in the culture, politics, religion and economics of the early twentieth century were extensive. Pre-millennialist and Post-millennialist tremors moved though all these areas of American culture and the Friends were hardly immune to them.

How various individuals or groups, religious or secular, chose a side in this debate had radical implications throughout U.S. culture. If Christian believers chose a Post-millennialist discourse, such as seventeenth-century Puritans, or late nineteenth-century progressive reformers, the impetus to create the Millennial Kingdom’s prosperity of total social welfare would be in human hands. Socially, the abolition of slavery, the promotion of temperance, the building of strong education, zeal for democracy, the improvement of immigrants, became primary issues. Politically, various parties and groups saw themselves acting out a Post-millennial imperative to create the Millennial Kingdom before Jesus arrived. Ideally, the Kingdom could reach its zenith with the absence of slavery, the poor fed and clothed, the stranger (immigrant) welcomed and lifted up, alcohol banished from the earth, all just before Jesus arrived.

Post-millennialism thinking manifested itself across much of the progressive movement. Local Ohio was a pulsing array of such activities with multiple turn-of-the-century education initiatives, Westerville temperance societies, Toledo utopian cities replete with parks and kindergartens, educational institutions and seminaries. A more national example of this Social Gospel form of activism manifested itself in Jane Addams’ Chicago Hull House and the many other works of the progressives in cities
throughout the country. The resurgent populism of William Jennings Bryan stood as an offshoot, as ‘just’ economic wars could be declared on the Barons and Captains of Industry. Ironically some captains such as Andrew Carnegie embraced this Social Gospel, creating over 3,000 local public libraries (many in the state of Ohio) while simultaneously creating the economic factors that bred social despair. This locomotive of Post-Millenial Social Gospel activism might have been unstoppable had it not been derailed by the ill perceptions of a similar social activist movements - Marxism. World War I would deeply damage the notion that Europe and the United States were the world of the apocryphal Millennial Kingdom, and the social engineering undertaken in the name of Social Gospel started to take on an eerie patina of Bolshevism. To the despair and marked frustration a simple alternative offered itself – the cosmic time view of Pre-millennialism.

Pre-millennialism posed a complete obverse view of the return of Jesus. Within Pre-millennialism, Jesus Christ would return to earth, gather his own to him, and only then, he himself would usher in, supernaturally, a Millennial Kingdom of perfect well being and total welfare. There would be no need for human hands to create or effect it. No human effort or subjectivity could bring it about. All of humanity would be passive objects. The charred trenches of France stood as tragic monuments to the failure of any supposed post-millenial human endeavor. The still rotting and expanding slums of major cities at the turn of the century stood as a stark condemnation that Jesus’ work had not even begun and the work of humanity was a complete failure. The appalling concentrated wealth of the ruling class bore little semblance to a land of plenty for all. Jesus, the returning King, the physically present returning landlord of the vineyard, would be the
only one to correct all this blight. Into this post-millennial despair came an itinerant British religious figure carrying the gospel of Pre-millennialism.

Blending, following, and at times steering, other evangelical currents of the time, Pre-millennialism counterbalanced Post-millennial thought. John Nelson Darby, of the Plymouth Brethren, is generally, though contestedly, credited with influencing Pre-Millennial discourse within the American evangelical community. His thought posited simply that if little could be done about the state of affairs, perhaps there were far more important tasks to be completed before Jesus returned. The poor could remain as poor as they were, the rich as they were, as long as they obtained the ‘right’ spiritual condition when Jesus arrived – they were ‘Saved’. The sheer act of winning as many souls as possible into the kingdom before its establishment became the most crucial task. Its primacy spawned the thousands of religious revivals in the 1920s, reminiscent of the earlier nineteenth-century Second Great Awakening. Re-energized in the hands of multitudes of religious figures emulating contemporaries Charles Finney and Dwight Moody, this return to bringing out the masses - and inspiring conversions –was all an extension of a Pre-Millennialist view. The immigrant wallowing in a slum was far better off saved, even if he or she was still starving, lest he or she miss the bigger event – the return and Millennial Kingdom of Jesus. The filthy child of the slum fared better if educated in the vagaries and certainties of salvation rather than in the benefits of democracy. The financial baron hoarding his wealth could still stand before a returning Jesus, dropping his gold from his hand, as long as he was ‘saved’. The Kingdom was to come. The imperative became: set one’s hand to the plow of Pre-millennial soul saving rather than the broken plow of Post-millennial society building.
Acknowledging that these two mindsets could shape powerful political, economic and cultural currents in U.S. society, it is important to underscore how the Ohio Valley Friends’ embrace of Pre-millennialism subsequently warped their heritage in the 1930s. From 1928 to 1945 successive monthly installments of youth curriculums and lessons plans in internal newsletters bore no witness to the Hicksite calls for social action and Quaker social engineering, but rather to the Gurneyite call to individual salvation and piety. All their youth and adult directives emphasized the primacy of the individual’s piety. All their years of preaching, youth education, summer programs, and even conscientious objector incarceration presupposed the expanding Pre-Millennialism of Moody and Finney, as they tried to set their youth ‘right’, including pacifism, before the return of Jesus. One was pacifist not to make the world better but to make oneself better. The Ohio Valley Friends, descendents of ardent Post-millennial engineers of Philadelphia Quakers who led abolition and temperance campaigns, completely turned on this past at the beginning of the twentieth century and embraced the view of Pre-millennialism. Their God and Jesus would not be appeased with their building of better society, but rather by their setting themselves and their children ‘right’ in practice before God. A ‘saved’ Friend youth could hardly be carrying a rifle when Jesus returned to set up his Millenial Kingdom. A ‘saved’ Friend adult could hardly neglect to teach their children the orthodoxy of pacifism and then send them off to war. Withdrawing from, and setting themselves in opposition to the very political system they saw themselves at odds with, due to its rapacious foreign policy, they adamantly endorsed this coming Pre-Millennial Kingdom of Jesus. Rather than following in the paths of abolitionist and temperate Friends’ predecessors, they followed the prominent evangelical paths of Dwight L.
Moody and Charles Finney, as they plied their own Gurneyite tradition, reaching for souls, saving them, and above all, turning the Pre-millenial tradition inward on their youth. Their pacifism did not build a better kingdom; it only vouchsafed the salvation of their children and themselves. Their youths’ souls, washed in the right practice of pacifism, would enter the Millennial Kingdom of Jesus, absent a single drop of blood from any war, be it waged by the British Empire or the United States.

In sum, these modern virulent cultural forms of twentieth-century American Evangelicalism, Fundamentalism, and Millennialism in part in response to the horrors of atheist Bolshevism in Russia reshaped the Ohio Valley Friends’ position in the twentieth century setting them up for the attraction of a U.S. Civil Religion. Both proponent and product of these cultural forces, the Ohio Valley Friends of the OYM garnered crucial identity markers from them. And this quest for that identity would set the stage for their eventual embrace of a counter civil religion.

The Christian believer/Quaker/Friend in the OYM during the first decades of the twentieth century therefore had an exceedingly large stake in pacifism. He or she was the end result of major twentieth-century cultural influences in U.S. that resonated strongly with foundation pillars Friends retained from the seventeenth century. American Evangelicalism, Fundamentalism, and Millennialism furthered solidified Friends’ pacifism. For the Friend, practice was inextricably entwined with faith. Ever-increasing marginalization from mainline Christianity made their survival through practice the more pressing. Ardent practice of those traditions and doctrines reinforced their identity. Youth offered an ample stage to act out a community’s heritage and identity. And the government of the United States, embarking on a militaristic violent foreign policy after
Pearl Harbor offered a perfect foil to their endeavor. A defunct CCC camp in Coshocton is where the government would draft their youth and this could serve as the final stand for the Ohio Valley Friends’ pacifism. U.S. cultural currents of 130 years coupled with 300 years of European cultural currents would set the Ohio Valley Friends’ pacifism in strong stead for World War II.
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CHAPTER IV

THE MAKING OF AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

CAMP COSHOCTON IN OHIO, 1942-1943

Located four miles from a small Ohio crossroads called Fresno, nine miles west of Coshocton, Ohio, a few aging buildings remain as testament to a religious group’s struggle to sustain its domestic identity.\(^1\) Today, these remaining buildings, owned by The Ohio State University, are called the “North Appalachian Watershed Water Station”. Over the years those same buildings had been called “Camp Fresno,” “Camp William Green,” “Civilian Public Service Camp #23,” and “Camp Coshocton.” The tug and pull over both name and proprietorship of the camp betray a greater struggle between religious ideology and national ideology, between centuries-old Christianity and militant nationalism, between individualism and patriotism, between the survival of an enduring pacifist identity and its extinction. The acreage and buildings served as the testing grounds for this struggle, and in the end, a renamed resting place for the ardent pacifism of a religious group, the Ohio Yearly Meeting of Friends.

These names belie an oblique struggle between the United States government and a small group of Quakers. The essential core of the struggle was the Friends’ endeavor to salvage their fading outlier religious identity. Pouring their pacifism into their youth, they
labored under an ageist assumption that their youth would prove their faithfulness to their
divine injunction that they be faithful pacifists. This identity they sought eventually
placed them in direct conflict with the contemporary dominant U.S. militarism. The camp
served as the foil to the imagined patriotic battlefields that sustained an U.S. populace
whose sons fought and died on them. The Ohio Valley Friends could imagine this camp
as an equally imbued battlefield where their pacifist God would strive against a violent
U.S. national foreign policy. In the end of this violent U.S. national foreign policy, this
same God would decamp to the side of the Good War, leaving the Friends to abandon
both the camp and their pacifism for allegiance to a newly formed U.S. Civil Religion
Camp Fresno (late renamed Camp Coshocton) was the embodiment of many years of
Depression-era U.S. government social engineering and like other CCC camps, it would
become one of many conscientious objector (CO) facilities maintained by the Selective
Service Administration (SSA) throughout the continental United States and Puerto Rico
from 1941 –1946. Many of these CO camps had been previous New Deal Civilian
Conservation Corps (CCC) camps that were re-commissioned and re-named as with
mobilization of troops for World War II commenced. Originally conceived as a means to
funnel sorely needed funds into a flagging and depressed U.S. economy, CCC camps
were the sites for an ageist contesting of values, and the concurrent creation of new, civic,
national identities. Teenage boys traveled to the camps within their geographic area
seeking to earn money to send home. In addition they accrued other intangible, albeit
intentional values of cleanliness, stewardship, literacy, camaraderie, and more
significantly, a new form of patriotism – all under the aegis of the U.S. Government. As
Franklin D. Roosevelt explained at the outset of his presidency:
Our greatest task is to put people to work. This is no unsolvable problem if we face it wisely and courageously. It can be accomplished in part by direct recruiting by the Government itself, treating the task as we treat the emergency of war, but at the same time, through this employment, accomplishing greatly needed projects to stimulate and reorganize the use of our natural resources. 3

The Coshocton CO camp inherited multiple discourses embedded in President Roosevelt’s words. The United States was struggling with severe economic distress and with attendant social depression. The President’s foresight, or ambition, set in place the crucial foundation of discourses that would determine the essence of the CO camp following in four years.

Multiple ageist attitudes undergirded the CCC enterprise and ideals: 1) CCC camps stood as ambitious government-run camps to stimulate an economy through youth; 2) CCC camps comprised radical attempts to socially reengineer youth; 3) CCC camps carried the ideals of the Theodore Roosevelt’s American ‘earth’ tradition of conservation; 4) CCC camps were the site of patriotic battles in an imagined war that rallied American males to stand and fight for their country in a time of an economic siege (notably young, mostly white American males); 5) CCC was an extension of proto-militarism by the government into civilian life through the arm of its military - the then so named “War Department.”

This militarist agenda of the CCC was especially pronounced. 4 Military terminology marked youth as “recruits.” A military cadre was present to ensure order maintained through such military trappings as “KP,” “inspections” and “roll-calls.” The use of military uniforms provided clothing for the destitute while simultaneously fused individual identity with a new political person. All these early terms and designations
would set foundations for how later CO camps would be seen, run, and populated, while at the same time creating and setting up the very point of conflict for future COs: the state’s control of the individual as a state controlled body.

Scholarly assessments of this period’s agendas have been insightful, highlighting these dynamics of age and identity. Multiple analyses have isolated many identity agendas through categories of race and gender. Bryant Simon’s “New Men in Body and Soul: The Civilian Conservation Corps and the Transformation of Male Bodies and the Body Public” in Seeing Nature Through Gender underscores this component of gender; Simon argues that the process instituted in the CCC camps was an ambitious attempt to give youth a virile civic identity refracted off a newly emerging discourse of nature. Clean, hard-working youth were a far better citizens than the slovenly, Depression-era, oppressed agricultural workers or dispossessed urban poor. Nature could be a source of virtue and ideal in a citizen rather than just food or just destitution. The land, properly used, could mold such a male, not defeat him. Echoes of Theodore Roosevelt’s previous discourses are examined by Douglas Brinkley in The Wilderness Warrior: Theodore Roosevelt and the Crusade for America, where Roosevelt’s tramping through the wilds of the West presaged this same archetype of the virile American civic male shaped by the land, and not by effeminate parlor debates over political virtue. Similarly, Gail Bederman, in Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States 1880-1917, argues that this civic manliness could also extend along racial lines, yet on the same premise of an ideal American, now along lines of white and male. John F. Kasson concurs in his Houdini, Tarzan, and the Perfect Man: The White Male Body and the Challenge of Modernity in America, where the previous archetypal effete
Victorian parlor male is challenged and radically reshaped for civic pride and duty by contingencies and demands of a newer ‘modern’ world. The crucial crux lay in the ideal male identity being fused with America, both in idea of the land and the nation. Donna Haraway in her work “Teddy Bear Patriarchy: Taxidermy in the Garden of Eden, New York City, 1908-1936” traces this arc into the very camp the Friends were laboring in, where the elder parent imposed the identity onto the child via a discourse of patriarchy. In this forge, one can see how the Friends could have easily succumbed to the perceptions embedded into the CCC enterprise. Using the ageist category of youth, as encased in the entire CCC venture, the Friends plied the same method to sustain their dying pacifist identity.

Envisioned as an ambitious attempt at round-the-clock social engineering to stimulate a moribund economy, the CCC camps paradoxically had an ageist focus only on youth. Each youth was recruited from a family unit in dire financial straits, minimally self-sufficient (the wealthy need not apply) and not necessarily involved in agriculture. The category of “Youth” was defined in CCC ideology as seventeen to twenty-five, single, and male. Significantly, factors such as age, marriage status, and sex constituted what a Youth was in the eyes of the state. Such ageist preconceptions were not peculiar to the government but extensive to the culture.

Youth became agents of the government’s recovery plan. Economically, they served as a conduit for a $25.00 monthly welfare payment. The stipend had to be sent home to a family unit. A youth could keep $5.00 to $8.00 a month, for incidental and personal expenses to be spent in a camp store or a night at the theater or dance hall (admission: 30 cents). A youth lacking family had his money held in escrow until he
finished his time in the camp, an irony in that the money in escrow failed to stimulate the local economies. Throughout this monetary process, a paternalistic father-the government – became the ‘Other’ in relation to a CCC youth in the absence of an existent, or non-existent, family; a youth was defined and shaped by a new father who established the day to day parameters of his life. 11

The CCC camps were not only an economic project but also an ambitious attempt to further the social re-engineering of youth, an echo of previous endeavors from the turn of the century. 12 Theodore Roosevelt ardently tried to instill new social fiber into youth through proto-Boy Scout groups, and other pervasive ‘manly’-oriented programs that evoked nineteenth-century discourses promoting conservation, all to the end of negating the frail “indoors”, and glorifying the strengthening “outdoors”. Theodore Roosevelt, as others of his time period, anguished over fading and extinct traits of manliness. In the midst of the roaring 20s’ excesses and 1930s’ economic and social ennui, obsession over these traits returned with a vengeance in the CCC agendas.

A typical manifest of camp-issued items for CCC inductees conveys how these overarching concerns pervaded the early camp programs. All arriving recruits, many with few or no serviceable clothes, received a standard allotment of shoes, socks, underwear, a blue denim work shirt, and a used World War I-vintage army uniform. In addition, recruits also received a towel, a toilet kit, a steel cot, a cotton mattress, bedding and a metal disk with a service number inscribed on it. 13 The toilet kit contained razor, soap, and shaving brush with mug, a set of articles rare for the day. The recruit, in his ‘youthfulness’ had to be brought to a more civilized mode of personal care and manliness even though he was not even yet categorized as a man. For a CCC recruit, idea of
‘Youth’ was defined in a discourse of proper civility. Similarly “youthfulness” carried an unstated subtext of ill trained. Destitution was an unacceptable adult state in government-engineered America as was a lack of cleanliness as well. An ageist and class-based deployment of this discourse of ‘Youth’ hinged on the discursive formations of the ‘ill kept’ aspiring to and emulating an imagined new ‘well-kept’ civic adult.

Schooling for inductees, previously scant or absent, was similarly crucial. National CCC directives of 1933 called for the replacement of any local area education with camp-based, government-directed education. A single male teacher, usually laboring with inadequate supplies and materials, oversaw on-site, nightly classes. Despite such obstacles, 90 per cent of all CCC enrollees took classes, over 100,000 men learned to read and write, 25,000 received 8th grade completion certificates and 5,000 earned high school diplomas.\(^\text{14}\) The discourse of ‘Youth’ was also defined as a person needing academic skills that had been foregone, either due to lack of funds, or access, in an economically depressed country. The previous century discourse of pedantic pedagogy laid down by such thinkers as John Stuart Mill and extensive public school programs undergirded this attempt to reengineer youth while in the paternal care of the state. In addition, it abetted the government’s right to provide education, training, and inculcation. Mandated education served as another way to exert control over an individual.

CCC ideology also advanced the notion of physical soil as an idealization of American land. In the 1930s, the aggregate population of the United States was just passing the intersection where urban populace exceeded rural populace.\(^\text{15}\) CCC agendas promoted Theodore Roosevelt’s ‘American Earth’ tradition of conservation. The invocation of Roosevelt’s conservation ethos also evoked the call and idea of the land as
an American ideal that must be instilled into youth. Such an ethos echoed traces of Pearl Buck’s 1931 of the ‘Good Earth’, wherein no matter the time or place of crisis (or famine), “there is always the land”. President Franklin Roosevelt’s words, inscribed on a commemorative plaque in a Michigan CCC camp, refer to this redemption by extolling the hope of saving the Depression ravaged United States through the virtue and use “of our national resources.” For recruits arriving from ecologically ravaged dust bowls and financially failed farms, this ideation of the American soil only reinforced their previous sense of purpose and country. Recruits who arrived from the urban centers, could only struggle to catch up with this ideology, internalize it, and attempt to act it out through their daily labor.

The Civilian Public Service (CPS) camps designated seven years later for COs by the Selective Service Act of 1940 carried the vestiges of this American land and labor ethos. The Ohio Yearly Meeting (OYM) of the 1930s would watch such a CCC Soil Conservation Camp in Coshocton become their arena to both shelter their youth and their own pacifist identity, all through the embracing of this ‘Good Earth’, Theodore Roosevelt-driven government ideology. Of the five religious groups that comprised the soon-to-be formed National Service Board of Religious Objectors (NSBRO), the Friends proved the most adamant in carrying out the CCC land imperative in their CPS camps. Other pacifist including Friends, Catholics, Brethren, Methodists, and Mennonites oversaw the transformation from CCC to CPS camp projects during World War II. Many camps continued Roosevelt’s conservation ethos and adherence to the land. Of these five denominations running CO, the Friends adamantly clung to this tradition as part of meaningful work for COs to pursue and from which to gain identity.
The ideological soil of the CCC camps would both fertilize and poison, the harvest of the Ohio Valley Friends’ nearby CO camp endeavor. The echoes of paternalism and ageism permeated them. The CCC camps of the 1930s were stages for patriotic battles in an imagined war that called American males to stand and metaphorically defend their country.\textsuperscript{18} Two ideations emerged: 1) the ‘Youth’/‘son’ is the strongest defender of a ‘mother’ land, and 2) a condition such as a Great Depression, in the words of the president, is nigh “the emergency of war”.\textsuperscript{19} The feminization of a 1930s U.S. nation resonated in the recent popular culture artifact, Irving Berlin’s plea, “God Bless America” with its prominent lines “…stand beside her, and guide her.”\textsuperscript{20} Fathers were to stay back to continue other patriotic tasks, sustaining ravaged farms, laboring in hard-to-find service or factory jobs, and holding families together. A Youth, without these specific age-defined responsibilities, should step into the breach and defend the ‘mother’ land. The male youth fulfills this need in a gendered role in perfect complement – the male defends the mother by virtue of age.\textsuperscript{21} Roosevelt’s use of war metaphors “…as we would treat the emergency of war” further underscored the need to elevate economic crisis to an imagined siege of a war crisis, the enemy being economic struggle, fascist agitators, and stark starvation.\textsuperscript{22} War imagery was the rallying cry, accompanied by defense as the unspoken solution. Even the Friends would succumb to this, as they lived out these discourses in CCC camps-turned-CPS/CO camps.

These very camps, where the seeds of militaristic action had been sown, would then become the fields for the three-way contest between the state, the Friends, and their youth. The CCC camps legitimized the statist extension of militarism into a civilian peacetime mind-set by a government. The U.S had already rehearsed an extensive
repertoire of militaristic discursive formations during its forays into Spanish American War and World War I. The CCC camp administration was itself an arm of this same military - the War Department. The faux-militarism of the CCC camps - the veritable antithesis of Friends’ pacifism - would be a latent sticking point for the Friends, as these camps would be the arena for their valiant attempt to exert their agency in opposition to a state and its maturing patriotism and nationalism.

CCC faux-militarism was obvious not only in its origins from the War Department, but also in the day-to-day language in each camp. Youth were identified as recruits. U.S. military cadres presided in camps. The very notion of a camp with military numbering and “Camp” titling, divided it from the eponymous quaint sleep-away nature camps formed in the aftermath Teddy Roosevelt’s obsession with nature.23 The venerable “KP” (“kitchen patrol”) was a central part of day-to-day life. Military-like order, including reveille lines and roll calls, regimented the daily pattern of life in the camps and reinforced their proto-militarism. Recruits even wore obsolete military uniforms. Uniforms have always afforded a restricted contesting for identity, as the uniform itself becomes the identity, allowing the individual to control their identity only within the confines of specific configurations of threads and fabric.24

Though the government promoted the camps as a peacetime solution to a national economic and social crisis, the proto-militarist results were stark. By the time last CCC camp closed in 1942, men from multiple social and educational backgrounds had learned what military regimentation entailed, and how to obey a military order. They had learned from the enforced and encoded strictures of the camps what ‘manliness’ and ‘cleanliness’ meant and, more importantly, how it was linked to specific group of people called ‘men’.
They were not down-and-out hobos, or ill kept economic casualties, but patriotic men, who knew their duty and carried it out in a well-kept and committed manner. The irony of the peacetime CCC enterprise was that it had prepared so many recruits for a far larger wartime endeavor, the jumpstarting and formation of the United States military needed to engage a global struggle over multiple continents, not just the dust bowls and back alleys of Depression-torn United States. The Friends hardly missed this irony, as they could see the rudimentary skills for warfare, order and discipline, had been instilled throughout the CCC camps. The very government-sponsored youth camp idea they would try to use for a pacifist camp in Coshocton, Ohio, carried the latent echoes of all they were trying to avoid.

With the onset of the war and the sudden closure of the CCC camps marked the beginning of the Friends’ endeavor. On June 5, 1942, the U.S. House defeated further funding for the CCC and appropriated $8,000,000 to liquidate the CCC facilities and personnel. Resistance was moot as the youth of America and those in the camps had already risen in great numbers to the cause of nationalism and patriotism, slowly crystallizing in battlefields thousands of miles away. The camps had emptied. In the aftermath Camp Coshocton, CPS Camp #23, rose in Fresno, Ohio, nine miles west of Coshocton, from the abandoned CCC Soil Conservation station Camp William Green. Though all the previous tenants had left, the discourses they acted out continued to vividly live in the minds of many, both locally, and in Washington, D. C.

The American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) sought multiple grants to convert abandoned CCC camps into CO camps. Operating out of a still pertinent Hicksite post-millenial discourse, the AFSC was trying to assert moribund pacifism in the
face of overt militarism. Among the multiple grants the AFSC would receive through its membership in the National Service Board Religious Objectors (NSRBO) was given permission to occupy CCC Camp William Green pursuant to the Selective Service Act of 1940, passed September 16, 1940, and the executive order of the President (No. 8675, dated Feb. 6, 1941). CPS “Camp Coshocton” occupied the previous site of the CCC Soil Conservation Service Camp Fresno of Coshocton, Ohio. 27 To fulfill the stated needs of the eager, but wary, the Soil Conservation Service (SCS), made plans for the transfer of a contingent of COs from CPS #14 Camp Meron in Richmond, Indiana. With further staggered arrivals to follow, these five “boys” entered the camp January 16, 1942 with the opening date officially falling on January 21, 1942. 28

The permit of occupancy came with reminders of the previous faux-militarist regime of the camp. As “paragraph 3” stated quite clearly, “This permit may be revoked by the Soil Conservation Service…upon giving 30 days advance notice in writing to the Director of the Selective Service”. 29 The government never truly relinquished its but military control. Lee M. Cleland, Director of the Selective Service, signed the permit. From its start, the physical camp itself, the chosen arena for the Friends’ to stage their pacifist critique of the war, had a very tenuous start with both stark anti-pacifist underpinnings and a military landlord.

The nearby town of Coshocton was a typical 1930s town of central Ohio. Agricultural, it was small, remote, yet well connected for transportation. Local bus service, which camp members could use for furloughs, included Greyhound Bus Lines, and the Zane Transit Co. running between Zanesville and Wooster. These services connected members of Camp #23 to major intersecting interstate Greyhound Bus lines
and to nearby states. Rail lines included the Pennsylvania Railroad running freight and passenger service on wartime schedules along the Wheeling-Lake Erie lines. A White Transportation trucking depot provided interstate transfer for local trucking to the camp. The AFSC, with minimal choice, had effectively chosen a site, which could be seen by either some of the arriving CO youth as remote exile from the cities they may have known, or as intimate as the agricultural home they had left behind. In either view, though, the camp was remote, and separated from the other towns by a nine-mile truck ride. 

Whatever form the camp may have been signified in the minds of the internees, their ‘Incarcerated Exile’ would not be lost on many of the arriving young Friends.

In some ways, the CO camp of 1940 carried imagined vestiges of a 1938 CCC camp or, for that matter, an earlier summer youth camp of the days of Theodore Roosevelt. A picturesque description sent to Washington six months after the opening, detailed the work of the camp as it had been done since 1938, describing it pastorally as “…Set in the foothills of the Appalachian Mountains where the abounding Tuscarawas and Muskingum River wash away tons of rich earth every year, the camp is ideally situated for study and environmental soil conservation.” Recruits were similarly described: “Most of the 150 campers, in addition to 28 regular employees, work on the campsite at the federal government’s three-quarter million dollar experimental station built in 1938”. Their bucolic internment station was deemed, “The finest of three of its kind in the country, the station owns and leases 1200 acres in the immediate vicinity for experimental purposes” including, “numerous instruments [for] testing and recording all possible changes in temperature, precipitation, wind, etc. that might affect the soil.” Internees were glowingly referred to as patriots for a mother America: “Campers are
detailed to read, repair, and manufacture instruments. Others compute the recordings into statistics. From the data, procedures for scientific farming are drawn that will someday show America how to save her soil.”

Glowing descriptions stressed the virtue and health of the camp. Portraying it as almost self-sufficient drawing on the skills of internees, descriptions detailed, “Technically trained CPS men man the carpentry and machine shops, offices and fully equipped laboratories. Two campers are currently rebuilding the telephone system that nets the project”. Hardly a prison, the camp was portrayed almost as a summer resort camp:

Twenty-three buildings of the one-story, green and white CCC variety are landscaped with grass and evergreens. Four barracks (called “dorms”) house the men; the staff house quarters the director, his family and houseguest accommodations for 12. A large recreation building: library-craft-room-coop, and administration building and garages complete the picture.

Into this idyllic pastoral scene, adult Friends felt both impelled and compelled to place their youth, yet on the ground it was a conflicted discursive labyrinth. Meaningful work was accompanied by isolation; freedom was encircled by incarceration; possible urban familiarity with rural discomfort; and any sense of patriotic belonging with nearby alienation. Local hostility soon emerged. Coshocton town officials estimated their own town population at 11,699. A town of 11,699, which was sending their youth away to war, would see, a camp nine miles away housing pacifists, with peak population approaching two per cent of all Coshocton. This camp was completely involved in helping other youth avoid the war that Coshocton sons would not, or could not avoid. If
their drafted sons were 3,000 miles away fighting with a rifle on foreign soil, why were CO sons digging with shovels in American soil?

The glowing report of 1942 had been forwarded to NRSBO, an independent agency set up to oversee conscientious objectors, and then onto the SSA per its request, conveyed a tone of gleaming success and moral superiority. The AFSC camp had a palpable need to demonstrate: 1) youth can be involved in something meaningful besides war, 2) youth can work as diligently as their military peers, and 3) the AFSC can succeed without the help of the state. It can run a station that had previously been a government installation, noted by the repeated references to the continuance of the previous CCC activities. The Friends could replicate the efficiency and stamina of the government to which they were in opposition without any catalyst or crisis of war.

The previous Soil Station supervisors listed the station’s main activities from the previous CCC camp as: 1) construction; 2) development work in water control; 3) watershed development; 4) collecting data from instruments; 5) analysis work; 6) limestone quarry operation, some blasting and machinery operation.\(^{37}\) The youth sent to the camp would be involved in a mix of hard labor and sophisticated agricultural support: “The project is a hydrologic research station of the Soil Conservation Service, the only one of its kind still operating to any significant extent.”\(^{38}\) A further excerpt of the same letter from the SCS stated a need for at least 80 men to run the camp, evidencing the straits of the vanished CCC population. Even with this need, there emerged accompanying concern and dissension in letters among the SCS as to whether “C.O.s should be doing this work.”\(^{39}\) Conscientious Objectors may not be the ‘right’ kind of
successors to the ‘boys’ who had managed these camps so well in the CCC years, and had emerged as clean, disciplined, patriotic, American ‘men’.

The mere naming of the camp haunted its inception, echoing this disparaging view of the COs. The original name of the camp was Camp William Green (named for the head of the American Federation of Labor who was born in Coshocton). There was furtive debate that not only the place and work, but also Green’s name, would be sullied by the occupation of COs – or militarism. Ongoing correspondence debated how to change the name so as to ‘honor’ CCC campers and distance CO internees. “Camp William Green” was changed simply to “Camp Coshocton.” Internees who had not even arrived were being categorized and identified by their conscientious objection to war and similarly being pulled into the contention over what to name their place of incarceration. The venerable work of the CCC was not to be sullied, and yet the cause of the Friends and the AFSC was not to be honored with a congruent name either. A letter sent to a local Friends’ church official by James Mullins, an administrative member of the Civilian Conservation Service shows his complicity to the name change. There was no consideration or recognition of pacifism as valid or worthy. The contest for identity by the Friends was hindered even in the starting gate of nomenclature; pacifism did not deserve credence.

Ageism that occurred establishing Camp Coshocton underscored the curious slippage between “men” and “boys.” These ‘boys’ were chronologically and discursively placed in an ageist signification in opposition to not truly being adult ‘men’ yet. This tension in terms would continue throughout many of the documents of Camp Coshocton, and rather than invalidating the assertion that multiple parties saw these individuals as
‘youth’, it endorsed the flux that only ageism could have brought to the forefront. From the very beginning, the AFSC’s and OYM’s embrace of ageism abetted this paradigm.

The object and source of the Friends’ discontent and objection - the government - was their only reference point for creating identity, setting up an arena for the protection of their youth, while asserting their pacifism. This dissertation posits that such a constructed conflict was the primary arena for the Friends striving to gain identity from an antagonist, the government. Initial permit of occupancy disputes pitted the AFSC against its militarist adversary, the U.S. government. Further negotiations over land usage and other specifics, such as posting some form of bond for damage done to Soil Conservation Service equipment, showed the struggle between the Friends and the government. To oppose the state, they had to negotiate and comply with the state and its regulations. The state became the locus point for their identity.

The camp start-up reflected ongoing obeisance and submission to the government agencies of the SSA and SCS. The day-to-day schedules and activities defined the life of the camp and were emblematic of both the Friend’s desires to create a structured haven, and to create an arena to actualize their religious beliefs in defiance of U.S. belligerent nationalism. By the summer of 1942 the camp reached its highest occupancy of 168. With over 160 acres of buildings and tillable land, the camp was well accommodated and situated to produce its own food; and house the men needed to carry on the ongoing work of the Soil Conservation station. The forty acres for food production granted by negotiation and contesting with the SSA and SCS had previously been tilled farm fields and meadows for grazing livestock. The twenty-six brick, wooden, and sheet metal buildings of the CCC camp served previously designated functions. This was an ideal
start-up situation especially when considering other CPS camps, where internees had to endure living in tents while new facilities were built.\textsuperscript{42}

The daily schedule accommodated the Selective Service’s requirement mandating an eight and half hour workday and fulfilled the demands of the Soil Conservation Service, as well as created an environment to both protect and nurture their ‘youth’. Sample work schedules of the first year of operation, dated July 15, 1942 and October 21, 1942, with a full complement of 168 C.O. internees, list the following:

- 7:25 bell warning
- 7:30 leave camp for work
- 12:00 leave project for camp
- 12:15 lunch
- 12:45 bell warning
- 12:50 leave camp for work
- 4:55 leave for camp \textsuperscript{43}

- 5:00 Work finished
- 5:20 first signal for dinner
- 5:30 last signal for dinner
- 9:25 signal for lights out
- 9:30 lights out in dormitories \textsuperscript{44}

This schedule was followed Monday to Friday, with Saturday a half day, and Sunday a complete day of rest. Trying to accommodate the mandates of the Selective Service and the War Department, the AFSC created a quasi-military environment lest they be accused of creating a camp for ‘slackers,’ and repeat painful stereotypes from World War I pacifist persecutions. An ordained posture by the state became entwined with the concurrent need by the Friends to control and manage ‘youth’. On an aside, a European or Pacific battlefield would hardly offer the possibility and consistency of a regular scheduled Sabbath on a Sunday, so here was a vestige of the Friends’ attempting to insert their identity through the rigors of state-imposed structure. As the camp years progressed,
these schedules would become an arena in which the Friends tried to keep their identity separate from that of the government.

The idea of personal freedom, coupled with the body politic, was crucial in the three-way contest between Friends, the United States, and the youth of the Friends. To accede to the demands of the empowered state, which, by legislation, had control over the body of every eligible male throughout the nation, the Friends had to basically incarcerate the bodies of their young to establish their identity separate from the state. The United States government had already gone through its own dark night of the soul with the treatment of COs in World War I, who were imprisoned under less than constitutional conditions.45 The Friends had witnessed these abuses, and memories were still strong; COs of that time were imprisoned, treated brutally and even died. Their young were privy to those memories only in as much as they were ingrained into them to counter the rising tide of patriotic fervor soon to swell among their non-pacifist peers, including those in the nearby towns of Fresno and Coshocton. The state’s control the ‘body politic’ entails the control of the individual citizen bodies and that tension, a tension that has been a constant political conundrum for states throughout history and civilizations, from Greece and Rome to China and India. The ability to navigate these antipodes of individualism vs. society was a crucial battlefront for the Friends as pacifists.46

Administrative Directive No. 7, signed by Lewis F. Koch, Colonel, Field Artillery, Chief, Camp Operations Divisions (then acting military chief in 1942 – ‘Colonel’ does not prefix the name in signing) states very specifically how this ‘body politic’ relates to the state through its subject-relationship as a religious conscientious objector (and Friend).
2. Absence from camp for the convenience of the assignee is a privilege not a right. He has no *free* time; that is, time for which he does not have to account, from the day he *enters camp until he is discharged*. Hours of work, or rising and retiring, meals, meetings, etc. as well as liberty, leave, and furlough, are all *subject to control* either by regulations or the Camp Director. Furthermore, the assignee’s *conduct and movements* while away from camp on liberty, leave or furlough, can be regulated and restricted.  

There is no ambiguity in the subject relationship of the assignee in this bargain with the SSA and state; the state owned the assignee. By declaring the identity of religious objector in the camp as under the state’s control, a control similarly exercised over all other male citizens, the state’s power was irrevocably confirmed. Those drafted into military training camps, serving in stateside bases, serving in battle situations, had the same rigors imposed upon them equally. In the CPS camp, they were merely replicated in uniformity so as to preclude any accusation of favoritism or ‘slacking’. The assignee had “no free time.” This condition was enforced, without abeyance, from entry into the camp until discharge. How the body spent his time was strictly controlled by the state. His every hour was “subject to control” by regulations, or the state as embodied by the Camp Director. This director was an AFSC non-military person, but he was still bound to implement uniform regulations and acts, serving solely at the behest of the State. The very “conduct and movements” of the assignee were defined as appropriate or inappropriate, by regulations that were in force twenty-four hours a day, fifty-two weeks a year, through the four ensuing years of international turmoil. The body, and the very actions, of the conscientious objector was defined and constrained in the definition of being an military assignee, who did civilian, not battlefield work. This was hardly conscientious objection of any substance. It was merely ‘constructed’ objection within
the constraints and definitions of the State. Adult Friends were complicit incarceration of their youth merely so that they could say, as a sub-group with a pacifist identity, that they object to war on religious grounds, all in a charade put on in a prison camp. These were ‘body of conscientious objectors in Camp Coshocton operating under the same dispensations and regulations as hundreds of thousands of nation-wide drafted recruits.

The Director’s Manual illustrated how the CO internee was defined and controlled by the state. Liberty was constrained by rules that determined “Absences from camp should be strictly controlled”. The control and granting of liberties could not be, “the mere signing of a book, which allows a man to leave camp and roam at free will.

The number of liberties granted to an individual especially during a work week should be limited” 48 Wording in regards to these limitations included “strictly controlled” and “positive control” markedly defining the subject-object position of the assignee. The freedom that might come from being able to “roam at free will” is proscribed and eliminated from the assignee’s role and identity. He was not free. He moved at the behest of the State. He was, for all purposes, possessed and incarcerated by the state with the sanction of the elders.

“Leave” was another category of definition granted to those assignees who wished to travel to their family for holidays, or in its more bizarre form, spend time with their wives who had moved to the Coshocton environs during the CO’s assignment (confinement):

a. Leave is understood to mean absence from camp on non-working days such as holidays and weekends…Leave for holidays such as Lincoln’s birthday could begin after work on the last week day and end at midnight on the holiday…In this connection it should be noted that practically all
holidays have been suspended by administrative order, and few if any can expected in the future…

Restricting holiday observations as if one were in a battlefield was a subtle form of control. To those assignees of the CPS system who had strong religious backgrounds and upbringings, holidays were a crucial identity point. Christmas, Easter, and other assorted Catholic and Protestant seasonal periods were foundational to the identity and practice of both ethnic and religious sub-groups. The Selective Service directive approached this very subtlety, by first suggesting there was validity to these temporal tags. The directive then offers an example, but substituted a national patriotic one (Lincoln’s Birthday), eliding the debate over religious ones. It then rendered the entire debate moot by suggesting that all holidays, (even Lincoln’s and its association with the bloodiest war in U.S. history) have “practically…been suspended”, thereby affirming that the State, supposedly a Christian collective, had the authority and the power to “suspend” holidays, and their significance, all in the face of international trials. Holidays were suspended because of a war across an ocean far away. A fulcrum of identity - seasons and ‘Holy Days’ - were circumscribed by a state because of the very reason the objector was in the camp – religion.

Whether real time (schedules, due times, restricted leaves and furloughs), or imagined time, (holidays, Holy days, seasons, patriotic days) they all served to establish a powerful subject/object relationship between the state and the Friends, one the Friends willfully embraced their attempt to maintain religious identity. By cooperating with their adversary, the state, they assumed the role of surrogate for this same state, and in the bargain, imprisoned their own youth both physically and temporally. The price for this
strong religious discursive identity of pacifism was to take on another identity, that of the ‘Trustee’ for the state. 50 Throughout the full spectrum of types of incarceration camps - stateside POW camps, Federal Prisons for COs who refused to enlist, CO camps for internees who refused to work but were an imprisoned CO in Military Camp, hospital CPS sites, military brigs - this flux of temporal and physical state-sponsored restriction elevated and denigrated the citizen’s body to this essential fulcrum where the State owned the individual. The Friends disingenuously played into this contest.

The implications of these forms of control emerged in ensuing difficulties with people in the local area. The camp, with its leaves and liberties, was not insulated nor holding the assignees completely incommunicado; the assignees did “go into town”. And their identity had already been established by where they lived – they were Camp Coshocton “Conscientious Objectors”, not patriots. They might have been doing the good work of the earth, but in the eyes of the locals also working on the earth, they were not American for doing it. The camp allowed liberties, as stated, using a pass system. Once earned and once validated, an assignee was allowed to go to local population centers. Camp instructions emphasized that, “For the assignee’s protection he should be given a signed pass … which should be carried on his person and produced upon the request of any Selective Service official and all law enforcement officers.” 51 The use of the word “protection” connotes a paternalistic relationship to the State, one that belies an individual who does not know his own jeopardy, and was he to realize it, would still need the state to protect it. The passes were papers that must be “produced” for the proper authorities, ergo surrogates for the State, including appropriate local “law enforcement officers”, or shown to any Selective Service official who might, curiously, be in the area.
This would be appropriate in the many CPS camps administered by the SSA but in the setting of Camp Coshocton, a specifically independent non-military installation, the irony is not lost that identity was given by the state. The identity of CO, granted and affixed by the state, carried with it an encumbrance hardly imposed on local people. A local would not have to produce papers on demand. An affixed identity was also a required one - upon demand.

The same identity could also be reneged and revoked at the behest of the state. “…Continued A.W.O.L. of 10 days or more, or 3 separate periods of A.W.O.L. will be considered sufficient grounds for requesting reclassification or taking other procedures under the Selective Training and Service Act, as amended”. 52 The irony is inescapable, that the self-chosen and self imposed identity of the religious Friend CO was ratified only in the eyes of the state (not the local community) and could be taken away, not because of failure to be conscientious in objection, but in failure to abide by external restrictions that had nothing to do with the religious identity the Friend was seeking. The State was solely responsible for ratifying an identity that was completely at odds with, and outside its own purview and foreign policy.

The reactions of the local populace also offer insight into how identity was shaped by a local people. Within the first twelve months of the camp’s start-up, both a local and national flare-up occurred where local residents brought perceived injustices and grievances, not to the camp, but to an ever-growing list of officials, including local sheriffs, congressmen, senators, and military adjuncts of the Selective Service. Camp assignees, who had apparently exercised their rights to liberties and passes, were seen as aberrant and irresponsible in comparison with other “boys”, in particular local drafted
townspeople, who were off fighting for freedom. The only referent for the “fighting for freedom” (or the ‘not fighting for freedom’) had to come from the foreign policies of a national state involving itself in a war. Such views could only be maintained by refracting the identities of the COs in the camp off the government.

The intricacy and extent of these perceptions appeared in local responses. A letter from a local Coshocton resident signed “A Traveler who listens” to the NSBRO stated:

I was on the streets of Coshocton yesterday and because I love peace I am writing this in hopes that, if you knew the true sentiment of the people (common) who live in and around then local CCC camp which is to be occupied by conscientious objectors that something could be done to prevent an enraged community from doing harm to this particular group of individuals. I heard not one but hundreds of veiled threats yesterday of what was going to happen unless the government sent armed forces to protect the conscientious objectors. The local people feel that some of the locally elected politicians have failed to fulfill their obligations to the people who did elect them in that they did not consult any of the people who elected them before the meeting at which Col Lewis Kosch said and I quote the local paper of that date, ‘We do not want to create friction. If the community wants the objectors camp and will respect the beliefs of its residents, we can establish the project here’ (italics added emphasis).53

This writer was caught in the interconnected web of the religious conscientious objector (a Friend striving to create and sustain identity), an American populace where that religious person interacted, and a State that existed outside the two, bestowing order and various identities, based on its own policies, domestic and foreign. The local people called for restitution and justice from the paternalist government. In the letter, the writer posed that the “common” people were enraged. And to assuage the “veiled” threats, the government was called upon to intercede with the very force the objectors sought to separate themselves from – the military with its “armed” force. The armed form of the
protection – armed – refutes the very point of contest that the objectors had posed – non-violent social interaction.

The writer continues:

Somebody, somewhere has tried to pull a Pearl Harbor attack in bringing this particular group of people into a community which has always resented conscientious objectors because of things that happened among the Amish settlement during the World War no. 1. This community has a great number of boys already drafted and a good many more being called every day and they can not see the idea of putting their own boys (who did not want to kill either) out on the front and then bring boys who can afford to donate their services, back to an isolated camp such as Camp William Green is and has always been known that way. Their opinion is “if your group are interested in helping protect the government” they could find some site nearer the scenes of action where they would be of value in helping clean up possible bomb attacks. (underlining by letter writer, italics for emphasis) 

It is highly indicative to a reader today to realize that this same letter, dated exactly one month (January 7, 1942) after Pearl Harbor, would utilize this image of Pearl Harbor. For the writer’s thoughts to have been coherent to a larger culture spanning the nation, both he or she, and the nation, would have to be knowledgeable about an event thirty days previous, over 6,000 miles away. Such knowledge would then have to be elevated in their collective mind to a culturally commonly held image of duplicity, treachery, of an infamous ‘sneak attack’ without honor or pride. Couple this reference with a writer’s reference to “World War no.1” and the power of verbal signs becomes apparent, as the evolution of consciousness about being in a “World War II” is also emerging at a later time. The writer is emblematic of how persons used verbal signs as shorthand for their own embedded (superimposed) nationalist discourses. These discursive formations were
the very same ones the religious objectors and Friends were using to counter define their own pacifist identity.

The writer also underscores a commonly held ageist belief that the parties involved are “boys” not necessarily men, and by closing them off from the category of ‘men’, sets them up for protection and special dispensation. Boys are categorically easier to generate sympathy for than middle-aged men. Patriotism can use the same ageism as the Friends had been using in their cause. If the objector ‘boys’ were not under the same duress as the patriotic boys, then a severe injustice had been served and the only resort to justice was – the state.

Geography also played into the construction of the writer’s mindset. The camp (referred adamantly to by its CCC name “Camp William Green”) is defined as “isolated.” The isolation is then given a referent to an imagined place of national pride and valor, battlefields far away where other boys are dying valiantly. Patriotism and nationalism have created in the writer’s mind an imagined place where bombs wreak havoc and war is waged for ideals set out by the state. Geography, in terms of either a CO camp in isolation or of far away battlefields, was shaped in terms of state imposed concepts of freedom and democracy through violence, a war for democracy far away.55 The objector boys are even rhetorically categorized as deficient as they won’t protect the government. In the imagination of the writer, where did the government geographically exist? Europe? The Pacific?

The writer also felt compelled to contextualize himself in both personal religious terms and nationalistic religious terms – two coterminous but distinctly separate points for religious identities. “This is written not as a crank or even a locally interested party
but in the spirit of a Christian who does believe in God but also in Country and one who has seen an enraged community beginning to take steps to prevent the conscientious objectors moving in unless protected by armed forces.” 56 The writer carried within him a set of religious categories becoming prevalent in the time period. 57 The idea that the state and a notion of a supernatural God could work in tandem with each other functioned quite effectively in the collective minds of America’s culture of the time. The writer appealed to his standing “of a Christian who does believe in God but also in Country” not posing a juxtaposition of contradiction, but a sufficiency that God could actually entail Country and vice versa. This is a precursor for the eventual U.S Civil Religion that would consume the Ohio Valley Friends and United States, and he felt confident that those in Washington to whom he addressed the letter were of the same mindset. The irony lay in his appeal for the state to send “armed forces” from the state, the same forces which religion would proscribe in the Friends’ pacifist understanding. Identity consistently flowed from the subject position of the government acting in the three-way intersection of individual, society and state.

Any comprehension of the Friends’ religious dynamic of pacifism was lost upon the writer (and most probably the post-Pearl Harbor-incensed local populace). He continues: “The local community have been told that a true conscientious objector will not strike back or ask for military protection in any way so some of the threats I heard yesterday were that if that were true they could soon get all of them when they left the camp site.” 58 The complete breakdown of any negotiation between a personal religious discourse of pacifism and the nationalistic cult for violence is evidence of how the
discourses of this time could pass as ships in the night, both being blown by a religious fervor.

The intensity of the conflict reached far higher pitches as a parade of legislators, AFSC officials, and military officers were named in an October 1942 list of accusations by then Ohio congressmen, J. Harry McGregor (Ohio, Coshocton District). In an interview with Betty Jacob for a memorandum to the NSBRO, McGregor recounts a litany of misgivings and hearsay accusations all reflecting suspicion and pervasive local “othering” refracted through a lens of patriotism and imagined international affairs.

The conduct of the men has the community all aroused. The men go around half naked, in shorts, and in ‘Lion Hunters’ helmets. Two girls are pregnant because of men in the camp.

The boys have made inflammatory speeches in the homes to farmers and in public restaurants, telling how to avoid the draft.

A number of the men go home for weekends with their wives, when the Army men from the same community have great difficulty getting furloughs.

The Boys at the camp are said to drive expensive cars around at a fast clip when the farmers are having trouble obtaining tires etc. The boys have a great deal of leisure time and just hang around. When told the boys were on a same working schedule as the Army, McGregor flatly denied this was the case. He also accused the boys in a general statement of being next to Bolsheviks. When he was asked to put those in writing so that the FBI could investigate he immediately retracted his statement and said he did not mean that but what he meant was that these boys were super intellectuals who wanted to change the whole economic order upside down and after all they were in a conservative farm community, etc.59

Sexual immorality, gendered victimization, inflammatory anti-American speech, ill-deserved conjugal privileges (while patriotic ‘boys’ are without these privileges),
egalitarian envy over automobile privileges, and base accusations of lassitude emerged from impressions the senator was receiving from local townspeople. The need to couch the assertions in international by-words such as “Bolsheviks” and “economic order” while decrying the infliction of such affronts on “conservative farm communities” shows a mindset that construed good and evil in imagined foreign policy realms, utopias that farm communities have neither visited nor possibly read about. In short, the congressman saw fit to envision and posture himself a defender of local American ‘Good Earth’ farmers from the aggression of conscientious objector ‘boys’ who have to be firstly classified in ageist terms, and secondly categorized in enemy foreign policy terminology for their otherwise ‘boy’-like excesses; this all from an elected official miles away in Washington.⁶⁰

The interviewer’s diligent and patient pursuit of this dilemma on her two-day trip to Washington included interviews with the following: Senator Robert Taft, Raymond Richmond of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Abbott of the Soil Conservation program of the Department of Agriculture, Charles Taft of “Social Security in charge of health and recreation in Army camps” (not the Social Security Administration), Senator Henry Burton of Ohio, Mr. Albert S. Goss – National Master of the Grange; and Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the Grange. Both Senator Taft and Raymond Richmond of the Republican National Committee demurred that this was a local problem and their interference with Congressman McGregor was ill-advised. Abbott verified that a county commissioner, the superintendent of schools, a Representative for the Grange, and a representative of the Chamber of Commerce had all filed complaints at the national level. He himself was concerned that the soil conservation camp required close and
intimate cooperation with local farmers and that the venture may be ill fated given the perceptions of the workers who were conscientious objectors. He described a conflict undergirded by farmers who were not able to cooperate in work directly related to their occupation because of their imagined understanding of an imperiled state embroiled in aggressive foreign policy and international war. They could not cooperate in farm work because their impressions of patriotism were stronger than their need to participate in effective soil conservation.

That the interviewer’s diplomacy trip took her to Washington evidenced the imagined connections between the local peoples’ senators, congressmen and federal administrative officials, as these were the authorities petitioned by local counterparts to intercede in the real/imagined confrontations taking place in the farmer’s fields. These farmers’ concerns, visualized in their fields and local establishments, were then realigned into their relationship with the state. Their objections and umbrages were made real in their imagined understanding of what it meant to be a citizen of a nation at war. This was a complete creation of a mind-set among the locals, given that these confrontations were being addressed in October of 1942, eleven months after the U.S. entrance onto the war.

A coda to the entire McGregor report and flare-up emerges in a letter from Sumner Mills, the acting camp director, to Paul Furnas in Philadelphia. His resolutions try to address the religious tensions in the local churches. McGregor made passing references to “boys” spreading pacifist comments in the course of Sunday meetings (and also in local eating/drinking establishments) and had asked that the boys be grounded from attending religious services outside of camp. The irony herein lies with the crossing of religion and politics. A religious-oriented view, pacifism, has crossed over from the
political view held in CPS camp into commercial and alternate religious realms. Pacifism was not only being asserted in a CO camp but also in bars and local churches. Patriotic Christianity was being threatened.

Also brushing aside any consideration of sexual immorality or other social impropriety - (“I have made some inquiry around the camp and can find no one who will believe that we have men who can be accused of misconduct with girls in Coshocton.”61) - Mills attempts to derail the entire witch-hunt by suggesting that a Federal government agency, the FBI, be brought into the situation to investigate McGregor: “You might consider the idea of taking the initiative to have the Federal Bureau of Investigation investigate this whole business, including any possible collusion between McGregor and the research department of the Soil Conservation Service.”62

Mills, the Camp Director, has ironically invoked the very nemesis of their predicament, the federal government, to resolve a conflict with the local society of allegiant citizens at odds with the conscientious objectors. The perpetrator of their predicament, the government, was invoked as both arbitrator and protector. McGregor himself was part of that government group and yet Mills saw the same governing body as the resolution of a local confrontation that was being highlighted by McGregor. As Acting Camp Director, Mills exhibited an ambivalent attitude towards an imagined national government structure to avoid a very real local conflict; he was able to alter one view of an oppressive governing body by offering that it could alleviate problems. The source of pacifist persecution was also the source of justice.

These recurring local/national/personal perceptions do not fade after the 1942 flare-up but return repeatedly and are documented within a year in an 1943 inflammatory
letter drafted by a local sheriff, John McIntosh, sent to the director of the SSA in Washington. Once again, similar positions and identities emerge quickly as “men” - the COs - are seen in refraction of other “men” (drafted servicemen) and the federal government is imagined as the master referent for identity and subsequent arbitration:

This office has had numerous reports concerning the men interned in your Government Camp near Fresno, Ohio. They have caused near riots in Newcomerstown, Ohio. I have personally investigated the Camp and found there are 50 men interned there. They must report each morning (Soil Conservation Center) at 8:00 A.M. for an 8-hour day and at the end of the day the Superintendent will select certain men to clean up the Camp. All others are at liberty until 8 A.M. the following morning. Over the weekend 25 to 30 men have their liberty from Saturday until Monday morning. 63

Within a year of the initial flare up with Representative McGregor, and also with two years since the camp’s inception, there still remained a sense of intruders and unrest. The sheriff alluded to multiple complaints recurring in the county. He also took it upon himself as the public servant to assess the actual schedule (which should be noted has changed from the initial structure outlined at the inception regarding liberties). He evaluated it as a schedule that allowed an excess of liberty for the men that led to unrest. Yet it was also crucial for him to couch the conscientious objectors’ identity as a function of those they reflect- the serving soldiers in a continent 3,000 miles away. He continued:

There are very few families today who do not have someone in the service and many people in both our Tuscarawas and Coshocton counties are wondering why these men, who are interned because of their ‘Objectionable Belief,’ have more liberties than our own soldiers who are fighting to preserve this country for them. 64
It is key to note the dynamic operating between the various actors involved. Without a militaristic foreign policy from a government, the Friends and other COs have no refracted identity as objectors to that government’s policy unless there are those who have an identity supporting it. And it is this refracted identity (which also places them in double-jeopardy, as they are not suffering the same danger and harm as their counterparts), which then brought about significant responses, not only including incarceration, but malice and death threats. McIntosh similarly recounted, “I fear there will be a murder and that is what I am trying to prevent.” 65

A timely response (within two weeks) produced an extended report by a Friend’s official, Arthur Gamble, who had to follow up the general knowledge of the McIntosh’s letter to Colonel Kusch. Gamble and the board of the camp were confronted with the publication of the letter, and general knowledge of the locals’ peril in both Tuscarawas and Coshocton counties. Various local newspapers had carried stories of McIntosh and his sending of the letter. The five page report dated December 3 & 4 1943, offers a reflection of the animosity and apathy that existed in both the minds of the camp members and the local surrounding populaces. Gamble pursued the situation diligently within those two weeks by speaking directly to McIntosh and tracking down various parties such as American Legion members. His observations show what external factors were affecting camp members. His interview with McIntosh was especially telling as McIntosh recounted his fears of violence driven by antipathy to objectors not serving their country. “He stated that practically every family in the county had a near relative in the service, and feeling against anyone who did not support the war was beginning to
develop. Curiously McIntosh constructed a class struggle issue out of simple antipathy. Gamble recounts,

The county, according to the Sheriff McIntosh, was controlled politically by the labor unions. He himself was a union man, having been a mill worker and later organizer before getting a job as deputy sheriff. Prior to his term in office, the county had a long record of violence in its labor relations. Coal miners and workers in the clay products factories had organized strikes and had resorted to violence in compelling adherence to the principles and in punishing those who had failed to go along. There are many foreigners amongst them and many people are ignorant and intolerant. Feeling against the colored population runs high.

Such prevalent perceptions would have been very apparent to camp members from their frequent trips into Newcomerstown and Coshocton. Not only were the camp assignees vilified for their objection to the government, but were also vilified for not being of a worker class; (ironically, if they had any class identity, it was agricultural.) The sheriff had plied a cultural discursive formation that identifies an individual’s identity by one’s occupational association. The camp-workers effectively bridged this other group as not only non-union, but also unpatriotic and in that purist “fail[ing] to go along”. The sheriff’s thinking to avoid violence was not that abstruse, and conceivably well known to camp members; the local populace saw them as “Other” because: 1) they lived outside the towns, 2) they were COs, 3) they were unpatriotic, not like their sons, and 4) they were not of the laboring class. The complexity of the local antipathy is overwhelming when viewed in a local sheriff’s report.
The Sheriff also attempts to deploy a rudimentary set of discursive formations of religious ‘Othering’ when Gamble reports his understanding of other local problems relating to religion.

The sheriff raised another phase of the attitude of the county toward conscientious objectors. This related to the Jehovah’s Witnesses. There were approximately five hundred of them in Tuscarawas County and they were quite active. Twice during recent months their meeting place has been wrecked. The very morning we were with the sheriff, a delegation of the Jehovah’s Witnesses were waiting in his outer office to see him regarding the protection they considered their rights as citizens. Mr. McIntosh was of the opinion that this group and their actions is responsible to a considerable degree for the unfavorable attitude toward anyone who is a conscientious objector. The sheriff deployed what would have been a fairly common religious perception popular at the time. These 1940–1950s perceptions enabled people to see themselves in relation to two major bodies: Mainline Protestantism and the older traditions of Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy. The subsequent divisions along class and social lines were readily notable. Yet Jehovah’s Witnesses lay outside the pale of these main formations (and outside the pale of these religious grouping’s acceding to the U.S. Government’s violent foreign policy drafting their children).

Jehovah’s Witnesses, an indigenous American religious group that emerged in the early twentieth century, had already firmly established itself as an ‘Other’ religion. Americans were well aware of their curious and non-traditional practices, which included door-to-door proselytizing, taking no blood transfusions, observing no holidays, and participating in no patriotic actions, such as not saluting the flag, and not serving in the military. The First World War had already evidenced how mainstream Americans would savagely treat Jehovah’s Witnesses, just as Friends, as conscientious objectors.
Adding to this opprobrium, the Camp Coshocton rosters listed some Jehovah’s Witnesses, so it was not a far-fetched connection for the sheriff and local people to link Jehovah’s Witnesses and other CPS Camp #23 conscientious objectors together and come out with the discursive formation that neither are American mainline, traditional religious groupings; they were but a further ‘Other’. Once this connection was made, it was simple to tie in the religious patriotic discourse, bolstering further antipathy towards the Camp Coshocton members. The perspective was deployed with ease by numbers of peoples from various classes or local religious groups. The camp members had incurred but another discursive formation by association to their growing identity as religious ‘Other’. In their perseverance to gain a social counter-identity in marginalization, the Friends succeeded in unforeseen ways.

Violence stood as the crux for acting out these biases, as noted by the sheriff’s and locals’ repeated concerns over such outbreaks in the formative years of the camp. The local Jehovah’s Witnesses, those not incarcerated at Camp Coshocton, numbered as many as 500 in the surrounding area, according to Gamble’s interview with the sheriff, and had the dubious distinction of actually attempting to keep local draftees from heading off to conscription and war:

Quite recently while a group of men were being sent to the army and had gathered at the station, two of the Jehovah’s Witnesses appeared at the scene and attempted to persuade the men at the last moment that their salvation lay in accepting the viewpoint of the Jehovah’s Witnesses. And that this would give them a means of evading service. The men were incensed and the J.W.s were promptly beaten up.
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The report making reference to actual violence and couched it in a latent patriotic vein, implies that further violence was possible. A local veterans’ hospital, located in Cambridge, Ohio, was already receiving returning wounded soldiers, many moving about the locals’ towns undeterred. The sheriff also noted that not only were there wounded veterans in these facilities, but also “psychiatric cases who are under observation or who were men the army considered unfit for service”. 73 (The irony within these two perceptions is profound when refracted off the formations that kept conscientious objectors in an incarcerated state). The report lists an occurrence where these soldier-patients had “torn up a local roadhouse” in a dispute: “…according to the sheriff, that if a group of these men happened to be in Newcomerstown at the same time as some of the conscientious objectors were, there would be trouble. He felt sure that the service men would not hesitate to take direct action.” 74

Class, religious, and political discourses had been used previously to explain a palpable fear of violence and bodily harm that could grow from the resentment fueled by the rampant discursive ‘Othering’ of the camp members. But a newer dynamic emerges when wounded peers who have served in the war, and their incapacitated counterparts who were “psychiatric” or “considered unfit” took on roles as the protagonists and perpetrators of possible violence. The wounded veterans are depicted as the ones who will take “direct action” on their peers. Yet there is also an allusion that those considered certainly ‘Other’ in their mental illness, or for that matter “unfit”, would somehow be seen as covered by the umbrella of patriotism if they took any violent action against the camp members since they were still “service men”. They are construed to have a legitimate relationship to the government – even though psychiatric or ‘morally unfit’ –
which entitled them to act on behalf of that government against those who had spurned that same government’s foreign policy. Retribution – violent and imagined – becomes acceptable both in a foreign policy across an ocean and also within the bounds of a homeland, as long as it is in service to the United States. Such ongoing dissension and recrimination would directly affect how the CO internees of 1942 and 1943 saw themselves and how they would not only act but to continue to reinforce their own identity as outsider or ‘other’. This would become the more apparent through the programming the internees would develop to assert their pacifism.

An examination of the Camp Coshocton’s early records from the inception shows critical perceptions and identities. Friends had a dire stake in shoring up their marginal identity. Pacifism was crucial to their identity heritage and their obeisance to their God. The sudden looming of a foreign policy at direct loggerheads with their pacifism offered them a greater chance for the further emboldening of this identity. Yet the militarist foreign policy had a strong ageist undertow embedded in it, pulling the Friends’ repository of their future from them - their youth. Incarcerating them in a defunct CCC camp, which had similar ageist underpinnings, placed both the Friends and their youth in an arena where the general populace and the United States government could give them the identity as the outlier, the one they so desired. Camp Coshocton became the stage on which to act out their duel with the U.S. culture. The gamble was successful as far as their influence on outsiders. They were severely maligned as outsider, ‘Other’ and unpatriotic. The government similarly cooperated, pinioning them into their contrived discursive formation of Conscientious Objection. They achieved part of their objectives though they would eventually abandon their central tenet of pacifism. It was the
machinations within the camp that evidence the fracture points for their eventual abandonment of their pacifism.
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CHAPTER V

THE INGRAINING OF FRIENDS’ PACIFISM IN CAMP COSHOCTON, 1942 -1944

In July 1944, two years after the inception of Camp Coshocton, the zeal, heritage, passion and conviction of the Friends’ pacifism collapsed. The camp’s programs had ostensibly been designed to reinforce the internees’ pacifism; they failed. The Acting Director wrote to Civilian Public Service headquarters in Washington outlining a dire assessment of the condition of Camp Coshocton. Two years of extensive meticulous ingraining of the Friends’ heritage of pacifism into the camp’s programming had produced only dissent, disagreement, disenfranchisement, and despair. The internees felt out of step with a nation and out of control. Relinquishing control of the camp to the SSA was a pathetic denouement to the 300-year tradition of defying any government that plied violence as foreign policy. The Friends’ pacifism had collapsed both within the camp and within the Ohio Yearly Meeting. The Acting Director wrote:

The rest of us desiring to transfer haven’t gotten our applications completed yet…There seems to be no new developments in the feelings of the men since you left. There has been some more interchange of thinking but I feel the men are pretty well set in their decisions. It would seem unwise to even consider the Friends continuing Coshocton with the present group of men, and I would not feel they should all be moved either. Government administration will not help some of the problems in camp life that have developed, but it would open the Service Committee to even more charges of paternalism if they continued at the camp. I’m afraid the situation has
developed too far. Too many mistakes and omissions have been made which can’t be corrected within the framework we are forced to work in. I can see no other procedure than to turn the camp over to the government…”

The complex intersection of the Friends’ ageist attitude toward their own youth, their striving to preserve a significant pacifist identity, and their marginalization in the face growing nationalism set the stage for this collapse. A decade of active inculcation of their youth in the 1930s and the subsequent active indoctrination of camp internees at Camp Coshocton had failed. Pacifism as the Friends’ hallmark had become within two years their passing epitaph.

The demise was not due to inertia or lack of commitment. Education through lecture, routine, spiritual formation and doctrinal inculcation had been crucial aspects of both the Friends’ and U.S government’s agenda in Camp Coshocton. Paradoxically the Friends’ pacifist agenda exerted over the camp members was reinforced through the overbearing control of the authorizing government, one that sought to inculcate mass patriotism while pretending deference to the defiance of the CO in the camp. These interconnected agendas set up the arena where the Friends could ingrain their pacifism and their identity in defiance of a militant government. All three participants were complicit. The government’s goal was to foster allegiant men in faux compliance to a militarist foreign policy. The Friends’ goal was to shelter and further inculcate their youth in pacifism while saving their own fading identity. The individual objector’s goal was to control and define his own destiny and identity. All used the others involved, while manipulating the various modes of education towards their own goals. In the end, the U.S. government came out as victor as the Friends completely abandoned pacifism and in turn similarly tried to abandon administration of the camp.
The various educational agendas within the camp defined this arena of contest. Baseline educational curricula at Camp Coshocton centered not so much around agricultural skills, but more along other lines of previous CCC mentalities. Moral, ethical, and spiritual formation drove the curricula. Daily schedules reinforced them. The Friends directly controlled this implementation, as directly and adamantly as they had been in at the turn of the century when they had engaged themselves in previous social battles over the immoralities in mass publishing, alcohol, and modernism. Yet by assuming the administration of a SSA CO camp with its quasi-militarist schedules and designations, the Friends folded into a nationalist ideology of the United States by the early decades of the twentieth century that had developed doctrinal coherence.

The SSA-imposed staff hierarchy of the camp included an assistant director whose job description meshed well with the Friends’ religious agenda. In a letter of October 21, 1942, the acting Camp Director wrote to a potential Assistant Director, listing the duties of the position. These included:

Interpreting the spirit of C.P.S. to the men in camp, by example and by associating with the men at work and outside work hours; Planning and promotion of educational, recreational and religious activity programs of the camp if there is not a separate educational director; Assisting in the interpretation of the way of life, manner of worship and conduct of business meetings as found in areas of Society of Friends where the Pacifist movement flourished.²

Three of six of the outlined duties directly entailed educational duties of moral/spiritual matters. One specifically cited the tradition of the Society of Friends’ pacifism. Friends’ agendas were already embedded in a government-sponsored institution of the SSA,
agendas at direct loggerheads with the stated premise of a pronounced militant foreign policy of national interest.

With no apparent interference from this government oversight, the Friends had been allowed to continue their program of isolating their children through incarceration, and to continue teaching them those precepts that gave the Friends and their youth, a central religious identity. Incarcerated and captive, the internees were subject to agendas chosen for them by the Friends in complicity with the government. To fulfill both SSA’s and Friends’ goals, this Assistant Director would foment this “spirit of the CPS's plan and promote the educational programs”, assist in the “interpretation of the way of life”, imbue the principles “as found in areas of Society of Friends where the Pacifist movement flourished.” The Friends, caretakers and trustees of Camp Coshocton, had managed to exceed their trusteeship granted by the government, and positioned themselves to use the camp firstly, to protect their youth, and secondly to further inculcate their young. In the process, they could also bolster their own adult identity of defiance against the mainstream patriotic nationalist society. The camp served as a logical and well-suited extension of the previous decades of ongoing ageist nurturing, based on their own overriding adherence to the discourse of ageism.

A listing of the educational programs at Camp Coshocton shows how embedded this agenda became, and how zealous the prosecution of them could be in blatant defiance of the government. An early letter from the camp director listed classes in Bible Study, Community Pacifism, Non-Violent Techniques, Consumer’s Cooperation, Bookkeeping for Co-ops, Christian Pacifist Cooperation, Disaster Relief Units, Negro
History, Choral Conducting, German, Sanitation, First Aid, Electricity, Printing, Wood Working, and Chorus.  

Regardless of any ordinal importance, the Friends’ agenda permeated the educational programs being offered alongside such secular instruction as Woodworking, Choral Conducting, and Electricity. Camp Coshocton even their educational programming ideas and structures with other CPS camps. A non-Friends CPS camp in New Hampshire received such a curriculum, offered as a model for their own camp programming. The Friends’ administration saw this simply as status quo. “Bible Study” may have been prevalent in other camps, but “Community Pacifism”, “Non-Violent Techniques”, “Consumer Cooperation”, “Bookkeeping for Co-ops,” and “Christian Pacifist Cooperation” certainly stood against the dominant discourses that thrived in capitalism, racism, militarism, and nationalism. The Friends were extremely intentional in their agenda. A notable proviso concerning participation, “in which participation is limited to a small number of interested persons for each group,” was not a diminution of the agenda, but an exoneration of the zealfulness of the intent, as participation could, and would, at times been limited to those of the Friends’ heritage and lineage. Rather than foreclose on programs of little interest to those of other marooned faiths within the camp, the specific Friends’ educational programs were kept vitally alive.

All these factors, considered alongside their subsequent time commitment, show the strong intent to use the camp for ongoing inculcation and identity bolstering. Significant time blocks were designated to this educational agenda. A sample assessment and schedule sent by request to another CPS camp shows how ritual and routine linked into work, education, and self-edification.
**Daily Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td>Arise, wash, make beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:20</td>
<td>First signal for breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30</td>
<td>Last signal for Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:50</td>
<td>Meditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:25</td>
<td>Work Time signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 noon</td>
<td>Lunch period begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 PM</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:50</td>
<td>On way back to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>Work finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20</td>
<td>First Signal for dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:25</td>
<td>Signal for lights out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Lights out in dormitories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The time period from the end of dinner to lights out was notably long and undefined in the schedule, almost three hours. By the end of 1942, because of ongoing local friction, leaves and furloughs in the evenings had been severely curtailed at Camp Fresno. The camp director noted in a letter, “At Coshocton we permit the maximum of two leaves per month but try to encourage the men to ask for one.” This schedule would have created large time gaps between the end of dinner and “lights out,” time for the internees to be involved in non-work related educational programming. The Friends’ educational and indoctrinating agendas took a prominent place in an internee’s sixteen waking hours. A 1942 memo entitled “Activity Program For AUGUST, SEPTEMBER AND OCTOBER” details a schedule where: “Our Committees will meet between 6:00 and 7:00, informal study will meet between 7:00 and 8:00, and the organized recreational groups will meet between 8:00 and 9:00. There will of course be exceptions.” A CO internee would be looking at two to three hours of this regimen daily, with the only end in sight being the end of the world war, the end of a government foreign policy supporting that war, or a
reprieve as a CO. A government change in foreign policy was not forthcoming. The individual internee faced a long road of educational inculcation ahead of him (which did eventually evolve into a four-year program). Within this programming, tenets of Friends’ pacifism stood as an essential foundation of the education of Camp Coshocton.

As the agricultural work hardly necessitated education in “Community Pacifism” and “Negro History,” the large amount of time committed to these many other educational (and recreational) pursuits is quite significant. Such pursuits in addition to a “Meditation” period of thirty-five minutes six working days a week, evidenced a time commitment by the Camp administration far in excess of the one-hour Sunday school of the average local U.S. citizen of Coshocton, Ohio, or the GI in the Rhine on any furloughed Sunday. Other programming recapitulated the previous structure of the CCC camp agenda where the young received instruction not only in the social graces (bathing), but also in useful skills for later productive adulthood (carpentry, electrical work). Given that SCS Camp Fresno had been an agricultural station involved in soil conservation, it is notable that more classroom time was not devoted to such agricultural curriculum in ensuing SSA Camp Coshocton.

Significant time was also diverted to worship activities. The extent to which the Friends inserted their discourses into the camp schedules for camp members is telling. A 1942 summary of the religious activity of the camp lists, “Worship, morning meditation, Sunday preaching service followed by Friends’ Meeting, Sunday evening vesper service and numerous cell groups meeting at various times of day. Total participation represents a fair percent of men in camp.” Herein lies a stark indication of the actual influence of the Ohio Yearly Meeting of Friends. As a Gurneyite Meeting, one that had particularly
weathered the Hicksite split at the turn of the century, it is noteworthy that the camp’s religious activities involved preaching. Local Ohio Valley Hicksite Friends would have eschewed the practice of open preaching, instead appealing to the value of the silent meeting. For Camp Coshocton to commit to this form of Sunday structure tells of a strong Ohio Yearly Meeting influence, especially given that within the Coshocton area of southern Ohio, local Hicksite-oriented Friends’ silent meetings could have likewise extended their traditions into the camp’s agenda.

The meditation time itself similarly promoted pacifism with guided curriculum. A devotional book issued on January 24, 1943, first camp’s first anniversary details Friends’ doctrines in multiple devotional texts. An internee, during devotional time, would be reading and pondering over the following Friends’ thoughts.

…We affirm that there is a universal purpose, most fully revealed in the progress of man and his endless quest for knowledge. We may give the name God to that which upholds existence. This is what we mean when we say that our search for truth leads to God.

It is our faith that within every man there is the capacity to achieve union with the rest of life, and to a deep desire for a better life for all men. Upon a faith such as this we based out decision that war is wrong, and that we would identify ourselves with the creative rather that the destructive forces of our age. As this faith is built into our lives, they will come more and more to reflect the purpose of God.10

In that these two statements started a ten page devotional booklet, their prominence already shows two crucial discursive formations of the Friends: supernaturalism and pacifism. Contrasted with the opening statement of the Ohio Yearly Meeting’s most recently revised 1940 Ohio Yearly Meeting Book of Faith and Practice, the similarities are striking. “We believe in one wise, omnipotent and everlasting God, the creator and
upholder of all things, visible and invisible, and that the Son and Holy Spirit are, with the Father, one and inseparable in divinity, power, and eternity”. The nearby Gurneyite OYM of Damascus had a far stronger influence than nearby Salem-based Hicksites.

Two separate texts from different sources parallel each other in the assertion and affirmations of a supernatural discourse that there is not only a supreme being, but a being who also was directly involved and continues to be involved with creation of all reality. Recapitulating the early twentieth-century aversion to scientific explanation of creation that had so consumed the early Friends as they struggled with modernity (Darwinism) a single devotional in Camp Coshocton, reiterated the same foundational point. Old debates still permeated the camp’s curriculum.

A second passage, recounting the primacy of pacifism, echoes the section titled “WAR” in the 1940 Book of Faith and Practice. The first line reads, “The crime of war has ever been recognized by Friends, and the Friends have been forward to promote understanding and harmony between classes, races, and political divisions of mankind.”

Even the fountainheads of the AFSC and the distant faith cousin of the Ohio Valley Friends, the Religious Society of Friends of Philadelphia and Vicinity, echoed these initial points of this Camp Fresno devotional in their own 1935 revised Book of Faith and Practice: “War is contrary to the life and the teaching of Jesus. Every human being is a child of the Heavenly Father, and has a divine spark that claims our reverence.” The opening statements of this 1943 Camp Coshocton devotional were rife with Friends’ discourses constituting all the COs in the camp as Friends’ devotees, either by lineage or association. Other statements in the devotional continued this line as classic discursive
formations set in place to designate which practices and which modes of thought are countenanced.

The devotional further outlines specific concepts of identity, wellbeing, and power: “…Our discipline must first result in the attainment of health and spirit. This means we learn how to make the most of our lives through the development of that which is divine in us.” 14 There was no category within this text for any other identity formed by the state, a nation, or a land. Identity came from the supernatural, not a United States of America, one especially devoid of a supernatural god. Compare this concept with a definition in the 1940 OYM Book of Discipline: “…the true doctrine when declared by Fox, Barclay, or by Gurney who says; ‘Our Lord Jesus Christ bestows a measure of the enlightening influence of His Spirit on all.’” 15 It continues: “…First we must allow ourselves to be guided by God or truth, second we shall feel impelled to help others to make their own discovery of truth. Third we shall commit in our lives to this faith whatever the cost.” 16 “Truth” was not an abstract, but the product of supernatural revelation beyond experience or reason. Truth could be found in revelation from a supernatural encounter.

Consider the contemporary reference in OYM Faith and Practice:

It has ever been and still is, the belief of the Friends Church, that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were given by inspiration of God; that therefore the declarations contained in them rest on the authority of God himself and there can be no appeal from them to any other authority whatsoever. 17

Here was a recapitulation of a cornerstone of the Friends from their seventeenth-century past. Scripture, as a supernatural document, could not be held in the thrall of dogma, redaction, church scholars or theologians, or papal bull. This small 1943 devotional
reenacted, in a small camp in Ohio in 1943, the entire scope of the debate that brought the split from the Catholic church of sixteenth-century Europe. Truth was theistic, not humanistic. Beyond this, the booklet invoked an additional imperative to lead others to this form of truth, intentionally leading them away from their own wandering and blindness (implicitly, and subsequently, also the very cause of a current world war).

“Abundant health will be reflected in a feeling of certainty and purpose and in a sense of inward power.”

This concept of ‘abundant health’, intertwined with truth, a supernatural being, and an internal source of power, was a state of being that could be presented and passed on to others. This, of course, fit amply into the model of the Friends’ camp where such a devotional had both molding and modeling power. Likewise such molding would naturally have dovetailed with the Friends’ Youth camps of the 1930s. Camp Coshocton repeated what the OYM Friends had inculcated into their youth at Beulah Beach Youth Camps in the 1930s. Now it was done in a U.S. Government Selective Service / CPS internment camp.

Preaching this attitude though the camps curriculum continued in multiple forms. “Our basis for such a faith in ultimate victory is not just blind wishful thinking. Jesus’ victory, the victories of St. Francis, Galileo, John Huss, Debs, Neimoeller are all examples of a life committed to love”. Linking the ‘ultimate victorie[s]’ of Jesus of Nazareth, the perceived incarnation of God, with those victories of other notable historical human figures merely reaffirms this notion that all people can be brought to the Friends’ state of grace, be they their own incarcerated youth, other hapless assignees in the camps, or Nazis tormenting the world:
...let us consider our approach to God through the avenue of meditation and prayer....Sooner or later the gift of God’s presence is granted, bringing with it the new power to right old weaknesses. Then must follow the stage of action: the light we have received must be translated into some practical resolve, some new decision that lifts our life to a new level of creativeness and service.  

This discursive formation strictly defines how this state of grace will be achieved and constructed. Meditation and prayer were avenues very specific to the Friends and demarcated a strong proscription against other forms of religious pursuit. Ritual sacrifices, masses, or enthusiastic cultural manifestation (including raucous patriotism and its attendant rites) were precluded. This essence is repeated in the 1940 *Book of Discipline*: “Being thus prepared to hear His voice and being instructed by [the Almighty], we are made willing to follow the leadings of His Spirit, whether in vocal offerings of prayer, praise and thanksgiving, or in the exercise of secret communion with Him”.  

Thus the camp devotional acted as a molding force that both described and prescribed the accepted modes of interaction with a supernatural source, while also proscribing what would not be acceptable by excluding other modes. Unsuspecting and unaware assignees caught up in this process would hardly be aware how subject they were to a grand Friends’ project, growing out of discursively based texts and regimens, all reminiscent of the Friends’ efforts directed toward their youth since the turn of the century.

Prescriptions continue: “For those willing to undertake it, such a discipline of achievement will be a means by which one’s life may be advanced toward that greatest of all goals: making the most of one’s potentialities as a son of God.”  

A very specific identity was being constructed here. One had a familial identity tethered to a supernatural
being, not as servant, vassal, or soldier, but as ‘son’. The ageist discursive formations that had brought these youth to a camp in Coshocton, also permeated the supernatural relationship they had - and will always have - with a supernatural father. They will always be ‘sons’, and never peers to the Father.\textsuperscript{23} The adult Friends, acting out both a prevalent ageist discourse of U.S. culture, and the ageist discourses of their own texts, had doubled the dimensions of their ageist actions. Their identity was realized in a relationship to the United States as a whole as much as their youth’s identify was being reaffirmed in relationship to their Quaker elders.

These religious activities and devotionals paralleled the educational activities of the camps agendas. Their implanted structures of education evidenced a continued striving to create a contrary series of discourses that would counter extant cultural nationalism, patriotism and militarism. Local citizens of Tuscarawas and Coshocton counties were planting victory gardens, buying bonds, hanging gold and silver stars in their windows, festooning patriotic buntings about on both national holidays and commons days, supporting the war through their efforts and prayers. The inward culturally bound world of Camp Coshocton strove to realign the thinking of their internees with alternate discourses of vulgar democracy, pacifism and cooperation. Daily meditation and religious activities encoded these discourses to an extent only surpassed by the duration of these educational time periods. Headings of other topics for educational ‘large meetings’ and ‘small groups’ also enhanced the agenda with additional subjects such as, “Informal Bible Study, Nonviolent Techniques, Community, Consumer’s Co-operation, Disaster Relief Units, Negro History, Great Literature, Philosophy of Henry Ocore, French and German, Bookkeeping for Cooperatives,
Christian Pacifist Cooperatives.24 Behind these titles lay a prodigious amount of printed curriculum, amplifying the topics and invariably furthering the discourses of the Friends.

A letter from an emerging internee steering group within the first year of Camp Coshocton’s inception shows a vibrant Friends’ agenda permeating written materials. In writing to Friends in other CPS camps, the Friends in Camp Coshocton presented not only a concerted effort within their own camp that was well organized along Friends doctrines, but a resilience and strength that emboldened them to export the same, and offer themselves as facilitators, in absentia and incarcerated. The steering group strove to become a “Christian Pacifist Cooperative.” It is worth noting that the name “Christian Pacifist Cooperatives” is an amalgam of multiple counter-discourses compressed into a single title. The name itself firstly claims “Christian”, which embeds supernaturalism and counters naturalism. Secondly it claims “Pacifist”, embedding the value of Peace over Militarism. Thirdly, it chooses “Cooperative”, alluding to and challenging the attendant valet of U.S. capitalism. Here lay but a further extension of the Friends’ strategy of identifying the dominant culture of the United States, and then creating a counter set of discourses and discursive formations that granted them a moral high ground.

The literature used in the camp and offered to other camps furthered iconoclastic and subversive attacks on the dominant discourses of the United States culture. A letter sent to other CPS camps offered:

Here is an outline of our proposed procedure.

1. Read the material in this basic study packet

Cooperation as a Way of Peace, Warbasse .50
Fundamentals of Consumer Cooperation Alanaac .25
Masters of their Own Destiny, Coady $1.00
Introducing Kagawa, Topping .10 Willette Clark and Co.
Chicago Illinois (Helen Topping)
A Testament of Devotion, Kelly $1.00 Harpers
Brotherhood Economics, Kagawa $1.00 Harpers
(Those two titles may be ordered from Barnes and Noble, Fifth at 18th. New York City, Attn. Charles R. Stockman.
Ask for the usual discount offered to C.P.S. Camps)
Practice of the Presence of God, Brother Lawrence,
Macalester Park Publishing Co., St. Paul. Minn. .20
Economic Foundations of World Peace, Kagawa .25
(This may be ordered from us)
CPC Steering Committee Alpha 1 ________ Chairman,
Alpha 2 ________, Alpha 3 ________________.
Alpha 4 ___________, Alpha 5 ________________ .25

With assistance from outside sources and their own initiatives, the committee had
collected, and now offered to other camps, a series of works directly countering the
dominant culture of both Coshocton and the United States. Identity came out of ideas
antithetical to the discourses that had caused the Friends to be incarcerated in the first
place. Books and pamphlets accompanied discussions of alternate styles of pacifism, such
as Cooperation as a Way of Peace and Introducing Kagawa (a somewhat renowned
Japanese-American pacifist). Such syncretic religious acceding to Asian philosophy
appeared to be tolerable in that it still carried strong Christian bases barring even the the
U.S declaration of war against pagan Japan. Catholic medieval supernaturalism could be
tolerated in Practice of the Presence of God, an exalted work of a time-distant cleric who
had his work published and spread by both Catholic and mystical Protestant devotees for
centuries. Fundamental of Consumer Cooperation and Economic Foundations of
Worldly Peace inextricably link discourses of Peace and Economic Cooperation in direct
opposition to militarism and capitalism. Of all the works that could have been consulted
and utilized by the educational steering committee, these emerged as their choices. The
Friends in Camp Coshocton were not only geographically set aside from mainstream
United States but also separated by their very thinking and immersion into specific discursive formations.

It is significant that all this was occurring within seven months of the inception of the camp. This was not a flare of discourse revivalism, but rather centuries of constrained Friends’ identity, exploding in the artificial environment of a CO camp - the only possible environment - for lack of cultural space in the mainstream U.S. culture. The triad of the Youth Objector/ OYM/United States Government became locked in a relationship that gave adult Friends and their youth identity, all in opposition to the government and its dominant discourse.

An August 14, 1942, a letter addressed “Dear Friends in Civilian Public Service” showed a vital response to the previous forays by the Coshocton Friends into the matters of other camps. Other camps had apparently responded, while Camp Coshocton progressed into crystallizing these counter discourses into structures of their own education program: “As the Christian Pacifist Cooperative program moves forward at Camp Coshocton, we thought you might be interested in our procedure to make this an important part of our educational programs...” 26 The Camp Coshocton Friends had an emerging identity directly linked to the discourses they had embraced. They identified themselves with markers, not of ‘internee’ or ‘recruit’, but “Christian”, “Pacifist”, and “Cooperative”, identities they felt impelled to project outside the confines of their incarceration. They had an identity, albeit limited, outside of their geographical interred restrictions, an identity that moved within further U.S. culture; and they were “Other”.
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They continue:

Our group has had five discussions to discover significant questions, which we might later investigate. We considered these topics:

1. The Cooperative movement in the Pacific region
Ref: Introducing Kagawa, Topping; Brotherhood Economics, Kagawa; Economic Foundations of World Peace, Kagawa

2. The Cooperative movement in the Atlantic region
Ref: Masters of their Own Destiny, Coady; Fundamentals of Consumer Cooperation, Alanne; U.S. Inquiry on Cooperative Enterprise, Report of Inquiry in Europe 1937; Sweden, the Middle Way, Childs

Ref: Cooperation as a Way of Peace, Warbasse; Economic Foundations of World Peace, Kagawa

Ref: Participation in Rural Life, Young (Pendle Hill pamphlet #19); The Community, Morgan

Ref: Testament of Devotion, Kelly; Practice of the Presence of God, Brother Lawrence; Man the Master, Heard.

The committee at Coshocton had crystallized these ideas into discussion topics as part of the camp’s “educational” programs. Notably these formations are not actions or protests or marches on Washington; rather they are intellectual re-calibrations of thought patterns. They affirm the inherent realization within pacifism that each objector is part of a larger mass consciousness made from larger collective discourses. To both eliminate and counter those discourses, there has to be an intentional realignment of thought through these discussions. The three hour-a-day endowed ‘educational program’, (versus the 8
hour-a-day work soil conservation program) had been effectively taken over by the Friends’ identity agenda. Lacking were any studies in American Democracy, Capitalist Principles of Economic Growth, or treatises of Kipling’s White Man’s Burden, all which would be later revived in larger U.S. culture four years from the date of the letter helping Japan to embrace both its own defeat and imposed Western Democratic Capitalism.

Three of the discussion topic headings are directly informed by Christian supernaturalism, further cementing the tether to a Friends’ foundation. The Bible is directly implicated in this discursive reformation attempted by the Friends. This was all occurring in a Selective Service Camp for COs, with the oblique behest of the same board. The camp’s education program had been subverted to challenge the very entity that had sanctioned and permitted the camp to exist, the aegis of the military itself.

The Committee continued to think beyond their present state into the future. How ironic the committee members had no insight into the length of the war or whether it would be won by the United States. The eventual final victory of the United States, for all purposes, stood as a direct repudiation of all the intents found in the literature of the education programming. The war was won fighting for the victory of democratic capitalism. The committee further writes,

…. The results of our study will comprise our contribution to the proposed inter-camp monograph. The possibilities for areas of study seem limitless. These suggestions have been made:
1. An investigation of the differences between Fascism, Communism and Christian Pacifist Cooperation
2. The changing relationship of Church and State and our part in it.
3. Democracy for “our” side, “our” race, versus human democracy.
4. The Relationships between cooperatives and other social institutions – the home, schools, churches, etc.
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The first topic shows an emerging awareness that the Christian Pacifist Cooperative agenda could easily have been seen as ominously similar to other non-American ideas, fascism and communism, the very foes U.S. troops fought continents away. The Camp members had an awareness they were definitely ‘Other’. This was confirmed in their choice in topic number three where the use of the “our” is encased in the subjunctive use of quotes. Who really was “our” side or race? The Friends did not see themselves necessarily within that questioned grouping. They were acutely aware that within the very category of ‘Church and State’, both were eliding into each other and fusing into a chimera that had little to do with the Friends’ Biblical Jesus and Biblical Rome. They already foresaw the rising of Civil Religion.

As much as education and curriculum were essential parts of creating orthodoxy within the camp that matched the discourses of the Friends, there was also the simple and basic conundrum of how to create daily acceptable activity on a consistent and enforceable level among assignees that were both Friends and non-Friends. It is one matter to mold the mind of a camp internee yet quite another to similarly mold the body and its behavior at the same time. Issues of morality would plague the camp throughout the four years of Friends’ oversight.

A letter sent to a local concerned Friend a year prior to the inception of the camp showed how the NSBRO was trying to breach the gap between the remote religious groups supervising the religious CPS camps and the U.S. government’s agent of oversight, the SSA. The guidance and direction that youth would receive under the aegis of the military in a regular army base camp, and on the field, hardly accorded with the desired behavior of the Friends for their youth. Yet these Friends’ youth and other
assignees technically remained under the rule and oversight of the SSA, a military system
that was not only teaching youth to kill, but allowing youth to “go to town on leave” for
all sorts of perceived vices the Friends and other religious groups could not countenance.

February 24, 1941
Dear Friends,
Your letter showing deep concern of Friends in your
Meeting that the Civilian Public Service camps should be
free from smoking and drinking has been received.
The Directors and members of the governing Committee
are very anxious that the year spent in these camps shall be
full of rich and positive experiences for the young men.
They too are deeply concerned that the influences not be
negative….

This letter makes direct references to the various agents in this dilemma. Addressing a
Friend in a Meeting in Iowa, the addressee is named as “Dear Friend” and follows with
subsequent reference to the Committee on Conscientious Objector, another government
formed guide and muse of the NSBRO overseeing the creation of CPS camps.

The first concern cited in the letter constituted a standard concern of both Friends
and some other religious groups, even more the traditional peace churches - smoking and
drinking. An explicit outline of the strictly proscribing the practice of smoking and
drinking existed in the 1940 Ohio Yearly Meetings’ Book of Discipline. Tobacco was
“closely allied to the evil of intemperance…” 30 and “all our members are required to
abstain from the use of such beverages”. 31 Both tobacco and alcohol use were clearly
excised from the proper behavior of any pacifist Friend, young or old. Yet the youth of
the Friends were being drafted by a U.S. agent, the military, which provided cigarettes in
the field on a daily basis as a means of anxiety control (and oblique parallel assertion of
masculinity). The same military proffered alcohol as a recreation both off and on bases
throughout the home nation and the world.
The NSBRO and Committee on Conscientious Objectors had to mediate this maze of conflicting discourses and feints as the letters continues:

At a conference of camp directors in Baltimore, the following statement of administrative standards was presented. In accord with the ideals of the Civilian Public Service, it is expected that Christian fellowship, mutual helpfulness and good neighborliness shall prevail at the camp. Questionable habits such as smoking, betting, swearing, and rowdyism of any type are discouraged and out of place in a mature well-ordered community. Drinking, gambling, gross immorality, cheating and stealing are major offenses. Failure to measure up to the general requirements of good citizenship in a camp, becoming involved in major or minor offenses including failure to report for duty, or to do a creditable day’s work, may involve action by a Camp Council selected by members of the camp for the purpose of aiding the Director and his assistant in maintaining the standards of the camp. 32

These two CO oversight boards were ancillary advisors to the SSA. Yet it was the SSA superior, the War Department, which, within its own domain, actually encouraged and abetted many of the activities that the Friends proscribed in the interest of military moral and masculine identity. The irony only underscores how colliding sources of identity could be navigated. A Friend in Iowa, or in the Ohio Valley, could have gained some succor from the travesty that the U.S. Government, responsible for pulling their youth from their tutelage and guidance, minimally acceded to some vague notion of “Christian fellowship”. Yet as was becoming increasingly apparent, the mere identity of “Christian”, and who owned it also was being contested. “Christian Fellowship” as summed in a U.S. Civil Religion would also include carrying military issued rifle to protect God and His country.
The closing of the letter further underscores this struggle, as the authority and control of the SSA are specifically reiterated, and more importantly, reasserted. This was not going to be a church camp meeting at Beulah Beach: “Ideals and standards of conduct, of health, and of cleanliness, regulation of classes, holidays, hours of labor, etc. will maintained on a standard equal to or above those required of draftees under the Selective Service and Training Act”. 33 The Friends’ youth were, in the end, draftees and belonged to a new parental figure, the U.S. government. The succor of hoping for “Christian Fellowship” could be wrecked easily on the shoals that the “standard” could be any military base in the world.

The ramifications of bodily control and regulation emerged in later months in the camp’s protocols for the liberty and actions of the assignees. The recollection of the CCC camp achievement of regulating and civilizing a youth through cleanliness and work also reemerged. It was solely up to the NSBRO, and more importantly the local religious groups overseeing and surrounding the camps, to decide how “Christian Fellowship”, and more importantly, proper behavior would be promoted, a point not lost upon the AFSC or the OYM.

The tension within Camp Coshocton was related in further letters between directors and home offices. Non-Friend assignees working side by side with Friends’ assignees complained about the intrusive attempt by the Friends to veer from base camp ‘standards’. A 1943 letter to NSBRO cites,

Dear Friends, It has recently come to my attention that the Friends are proposing to issue a strong ruling against drinking within camp. Because this issue is one that nettles a great many of our men in camp, may I give you some impressions of the reason for this problem and my concern about the proposed way of handling it, although it may be
too late to handle it in any other way? My personal opinion
is that it is not, nor should not be a moral issue…  

The Friends’ agenda to impose their strictures on alcohol came up against a larger societal attitude which could not tolerate the discursive formation restricting a popular cultural standard, prevalent in the military, and larger society. A director of one CPS camp articulated a resistance to the Friends, patterned it more on the mainstream cultural mores of the time. The distinctiveness of the Friends and their practices were not necessarily, appropriate to the CPS system as a whole. The Friends’ agenda was not rooted in the CPS but rather a Friends’ agenda being implemented through the CPS. The Friends were in a process of using a governmental agency – the CPS – to forge and advance their own identity vis-à-vis the government with which they were in opposition. They were underscoring and pushing forth their points of difference with that government so as to gain identity from an adversarial role the government created through its own the legislation of the draft.

Further discussion, and attempted resolution, within this same letter concerning the drinking issue, shows the callow nature of other CPS directors and their attitude towards the U.S. government. The writer continues by suggesting:

…. That it (rules against drinking) should be based upon:
1) Affect of drinking upon the individual physically, and affect upon Forestry foreman of a man with hangover, who is unable to work properly.
(2) Affect upon the community relationship, American Legion, and a constituency (which I am sorry to say does not realize half the problems we have to face in camp).  

The above argument presents a sort of cynicism and pragmatism the Friends were both creating, and yet trying to breach. To cite a pragmatism of competency concerning work
made a failing argument for the Friends, yet to offer the opprobrium of the American Legion, a bastion of past patriotism and militarism, as a reason to avoid such stringent morality restraint, only would embolden the Friends. It set their higher morality apart, far above that of both mainstream America, and the U.S. government’s past spent troops, dissipated in previous foreign policy. If such older veterans, vexed in their American Legion posts, would be dismayed or enthralled (the letter is not specific), then it served only better for the self-distancing Friends.

The director offered insight into the actual mechanics of a camp dealing with the oversight of the AFSC.

There seems to be a wide number of reasons of this condition:
1) A very small, self-assertive group feels that since they have been drunk outside of camp and in normal situation they should be able to continue to be normal and not hide their individual tastes.
2) They consider it “unchristian” and infraction upon their personalities, if they are not allowed to drink.
3) One person expressed it is a means of escape which is used instead of meditation, the Bible, sports, which others might be able to use.
4) There seems to be complete disregard for the results. Most of those who drink do not care much what happens to CPS anyway, don’t want to be here, and therefore will not listen to those who are concerned about it.36

By citing the “unchristian” aspect of the Friends imposing restraints, the director is highlighting how the discourse of the Friends - ‘Christianity’ – has its obverse in the binary ‘unchristian’. Even the discursive formations of “meditation” and “the Bible” are called into question as discursive formations at odds with others rightfully within the camp’s programming. The statement “those who drink do not care much what happens to CPS anyway” questions the whole concept of the CPS, the very instrument the Friends
are using to deploy their discourses of identity. Having been sent as far as the AFSC in Philadelphia, these articulated backlashes evidence the Friends’ project of identify formation was actually working both on the national level - resistance to U.S. forced internment related to an adverse foreign policy - and on the local level - resistance from internees throwing off the attendant ‘Other’ identity the Friends strove to impose. Be it 2000 miles away in Camp Antelope (camp #37), or in Camp Coshocton/Fresno, (camp #23), or in the offices of the Philadelphia AFSC, identity could be forged out of one specific avenue of discursive formations - “Morals”. How various groups – the AFSC, internees, disgruntled Friends outside the camps in home meetings - positioned themselves in relation for, or against, arbitrary sets of practices concerning the consumption of alcohol continued to allow the Friends to gain identity in the face of devastating militaristic nationalism. Long traditional pacifism had failed as a strong enough crux for identity, a further gambit was tried through feigned morality.

The local area around the camps (for what the writer referred to as the “community”) could not be overlooked. Camp Coshocton would sustain a fair share of local perception-based trouble reaching up as far as the national level of U.S. Senators. A letter from another AFSC camp, Camp Antelope, Camp #37, California, carbon copied to the director of Camp Coshocton, Camp #23, contained seemingly similar sentiments: “What concerns me particularly is that some of the men in camp write to their churches and meetings and complain that there are individuals drinking in camp.” The writer has underscored outside Friends were involved. “What writing to one’s group meeting implies is a failure on the part of individual within the camp to concern himself enough with the problem to try and work it out. Instead he falls back on his group home to use
their pressure to stop it…”

This line of concern shows how the contesting of identity, through morality, was similarly spilling out of the camps, negotiated both in the referred local meetings (that is, “churches” or congregations), and also in the secular community. Identity formation within the camp was being contested not only in the camps themselves, but also in outside arenas, such as church and communities, all in the imagined “beliefs” of those concerned. The obverse of this had previously been seen in the Senator McGregor situation with the local granges. The weight of imagined beliefs, be they forged in grange halls, incarceration camps, AFSC offices, or Senatorial offices, proved fertile ground for identity formation as the besieged local meetinghouses of the Friends. In total though, the Friends of the Ohio Valley were starting to weather the withering effects of nationalism with its attendant militarism. Their sought identity as ‘Other’ was starting to turn on them in such spheres as morality. It would amply lay the ground for their later ostracizing as pacifists in the glare of U.S. Civil Religion.

Though adamant in their ingraining of pacifism in Camp Coshocton, there were signs that they were forsaking that same central tenet after only the first two years. Even at the camp itself, the Friends’ determination began to deteriorate. The remaining Friends’ internees eventually lost both the stamina and the vision for their Friends’ identity. The decreasing enrollment and numbers at CPS camps throughout the United States evidenced the steamrolling effect of the new emerging nationalist identity with its handmaiden discursive formation, the “Good War”. The young were marching off to a new war for God, either enlisted or drafted.

CPS camps of dwindling numbers routinely responded to Washington office requests to evaluate prevalent attitudes, feelings and futures in faltering camps.
Camp Coshocton routinely implemented these introspections, offering a clear insight into how the actual internees saw their situation, and identity in the face of two years of war and incarceration. In 1944, an intra-camp, survey summary in a Directors’ Manual, titled “CPS Camp #23” shows a camp far removed from its Friends’ quest.

1. “Is the Coshocton project valuable enough, in your opinion, to warrant maintaining a 50 man camp under the peace churches, rather than 20 men on special service?”
   “Yes” 21, “No” 14, “?” 1.

2. “Do you have application in for another project?”
   Yes 18, No 18

3. “In considering your own project choice, rate the following considerations in order of their importance for you.”
   (Use 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 to indicate the order of importance)
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   | 12 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 1 | a. Better use of your abilities
   | 7 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 6 | b. Personal considerations
   | 1 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 12 | c. Friends’ finances
   | 8 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 1 | d. Value of the project

4. “Assuming the Friends give us this camp, indicate your preference for the following:”
   (Use 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 to indicate order of preference)
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
   | 4 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 2 | a. Camp #23 as Brethren or Mennonite
   | 15 | 9 | 7 | 3 | 19 | b. a special service unit
   | 1 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 6 | c. Other camp
   | 12 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 0 | d. Other special service project.

At this juncture, for the remnant of a camp to voice these attitudes and concerns stands as a stark indictment on the success and perceived future of the Friends’ endeavor. Fifty-five percent (twenty-one) of the camp’s number who answered the survey indicated approval of the Friends’ peace endeavor. Yet fifty percent (eighteen) had already applied for other assignments. Ten of the eighteen had applied for a non-traditional pacifist based assignment. The true tenor of attitudes emerges from the rankings the surveyed group
gave to question “#3”. A majority of the men listed “1” or “2” in importance: “Better use of your abilities.” This is hardly representative of a deep concern for the Friends’ endeavor. On a baser level, one could construe that primacy was given to personal self-worth and abilities not only in deference to the national movement in 1944, but also in service to this same cause. This nationalist identity had evolved into one worth serving rather than resisting.

The wording of question “#4” is likewise revealing - “Assuming the Friends give up this camp, indicate your order of preference for the following,” twenty four internees preferred “Camp Coshocton as a special service unit.” The discourse of pacifism, and at war - a resistance to a state that prosecutes wars, was waning in the face of a “Good War”. Within the same year as this survey, the Ohio Valley Friends would similarly be constructing this “Good War” in their own words in their monthly newsletters.

By May of 1944, one month after the survey, the directors of the camp themselves had given way to the despair of the internees. The interim director of Camp #23 received a letter from CPS administration: “We have been very much concerned about the men at Coshocton, and I have made plans to send out a preference sheet listing all of the Friends camps and units upon which they make a choice as to where they would like to be transferred.”

It is obvious that the acting director of the camp had communicated with the CPS concerning the recent survey and the prevailing attitudes among the internees. Resistance to U.S. foreign policy hardly concerned the internees. The CPS’ offer to furnish a listing of other Friends’ camps seemed useless in the face of the internees’ desire to go to other non-pacifist projects. It would be appear that the Interim Director and the CPS seemed quite aware of the change in the tides around them. Even more
telling is the second paragraph: “Unfortunately, the news that appears in Information concerning vacancies (Friends’ facilities) is about as complete a coverage as is available is our office, except for vacancies in base camps (and practically all have vacancies).”40 It can be construed that the Friends were not the only CO group suffering the ill winds of emerging discourses of U. S. Integrity and Honor. Three years of war had taken a toll on the conviction of those who had been in opposition to this foreign policy. Seventeen, eighteen, nineteen, and twenty year-olds of 1942-1945 no longer flocked to the Friends’ cause nor Camp Coshocton, but rather had come of age in a time where the reigning discourse of U.S. might and honor had been inculcated into them through a variety of new social and cultural discursive formations. Local monthly OYM newsletters would also show this.

By 1944, the malaise and lack of focus at Camp Coshocton became quite evident. The Christian pacifism of the Friends had faded. There is no further reference to any pacifist agenda, or any anti-U.S. sentiment for that matter. The continuation and very survival of the camp appeared to be in question. A memo betrays an oblique ambivalence to the original Friends’ project; the message finishes with, “There is a good possibility that this camp will be turned over to another Peace Church Administration or the government. Men seeking transfer should recognize this possibility before making a request”.41 The memo says that if one has “hydraulic experience” they might be more desirable.42 Plumbers, not zealots, need apply.

The ever-increasing erosion of any Friends’ pacifist-related, supernatural agenda is summarized in a letter dated October 19, 1944. Camp #23’s director writes to the AFSC-CPS:


…Evaluation of Religious Program. Since I have not been a participant in this at all and am not qualified to evaluate it, although I have tried to get things rolling, I have asked for an evaluation from Francis Hole, who is fathering the religious program at present and is the man best qualified for the job of judging its effectiveness. I should not expect too optimistic a report even from Francis…Despite rumors to the contrary, we are not what I should choose to call “a sick camp.”

The imagined place for a showdown of dissent, objection, counter culture, and ardent supra-naturalism that founded and sustained Camp Coshocton from 1942 to 1944 had eroded from its zenith of educational and religious single purposes to a despairing description of “unoptimistic” in subsequent status reports, accompanied by half-hearted attempts to defray rumors of Camp Coshocton as a “sick camp”. The ambitiousness of the Friends’ project was matched by the ennui of the camp’s demise and eventual demobilization in 1946.
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CHAPTER VI

THE OHIO YEARLY MEETINGS’ ABANDONMENT OF PACIFISM

IN WORLD WAR II, 1944 - 1946

Within a day’s travel of Camp Coshocton, over sixty-four meetings of the Ohio Yearly Meeting maintained their small congregations of parents, children, and grandparents. These meetings would have been the sources for local internees, financial support, pastoral care, the consensus for Friends’ pacifism. Remaining in these congregations were any adult men and women not directly involved in World War II. As a devout Friend, each member carried within them the heritage of pacifism reaching back through 200 years of American conflicts. Their most prominent committee of the Yearly Meeting, the Peace Committee, spoke out annually for the Quaker cause of Peace. Beyond that, their heritage reached back to Friends’ founder George Fox in seventeenth-century Leicestershire, England, and even further to Jesus of Nazareth in a first century Roman Judean province. Throughout the first half of the twentieth century, through the Great Depression, and into the 1942 founding of Camp Coshocton, the Ohio Valley Friends adamantly raised their youth in this tradition of pacifism, preparing them for any new onset of war, readying them for in evitable incarceration in a conscientious objector camp as near their homes as Camp Coshocton. Yet by 1945, the Ohio Valley Friends, like
some internees and administrators of Camp Coshocton, completely abandoned their pacifism, giving their allegiance to a new civil religion that now spoke for their God in new ways. War for freedom was God’s war. War against atheistic communism and pagan emperor worship was God’s war. They abandoned their central tenet of pacifism, and their remaining youth in a Coshocton CO camp.

This abandonment can be seen clearly in the ongoing correspondence between each congregation as they circulated a monthly ten to fifteen-page newsletter, *The Evangelical Friend*. Published by the OYM, each monthly issue provides insight into the thinking of the Yearly Meeting as whole, offering editorials, opinion pieces, teachings aids, printed sermons, and updates from each congregation and the publishing headquarters of the OYM. Volumes from the initial start-up in 1929 show that the collapse of the central tenet of pacifism reflected a stark change in how the Friends understood the discourses of ‘Nation’ and ‘Peace’. Their extensive writings show this understanding to have been altered by the nationalist culture of the war years. The 1930s reveal an OYM secure and staunch, affirming who they were, who their God was, who the United States was, and, more importantly, what peace was and would be forever without change. In 1945 the Friends gave into the new U.S. Civil Religion of the Good War solely because they then saw the United States not as the adversary of a peace teaching God, but as the bulwark and guardian for God. The change was quite stark; God was not at odds with the United States, God was the United States. Their incessant ageist manipulation of their youth concurrently brought them to this collapse, as they tried to save their fading Friends’ identity through their youth. This manipulation only sped up the changes in their understanding of Nation and Peace as it in their contest over their
youth the Friends had taken such a drastic stand. The single point of contention, the draft, had brought the Friends to a far greater loss than their youth in CO camps. It had caused the erasure of their identity as pacifists by reneging on their central tenet of pacifism.

Internally negotiating the meaning of the discourse ‘Peace’ amidst their Yearly Meetings, the Friends set themselves up for their eventual falling into both the thrall and paralysis of U.S Civil Religion. Their longstanding embrace of the discourses of ‘Supernatural’, ‘Age’, and ‘Nation’ had powerful mitigating influences on both their doctrine and their practice in the years leading up to World War II. This same embrace lead to their complicit incarceration of their youth in a camp such as CPS Camp #23. Yet it would be the redefinition of ‘Peace’ where war could be waged for God, that would bring their downfall. This redefinition caused the abandoning of a timeless scriptural definition, and their absorbing into a new civil religion.

The discourse of Peace was the lodestone of the Friends’ practice of pacifism. This central discourse received unfailing continual affirmation throughout the 1930s in the Friends’ monthly arena for discussion and collective conscious, *The Evangelical Friend*. ‘Peace’ as discussed within years of multiple articles, pages and lessons, had a solid standing as a teaching of Jesus. Peace, as taught by Jesus, was the complete orthodox antithesis of war or any violent resistance. This irrefutable doctrine mandated an ineluctable practice of pacifism. No external mediation of rhetorical debate, or modulation by event, could alter this absolute, foundational, tandem of doctrine and practice subsumed in the discourse of Peace. It was of, and from, God. Yet it would be a new understanding of who God was and who the United States was that could cause the
silencing of the OYM Peace Committee and their complete turnaround to support the Good War.

Repeated, continual articles and editorials bear witness to the devotion of the Friends’ of the OYM to pacifism throughout the years leading up to the war. An editorial from a 1931 edition of *The Evangelical Friend*, entitled “The Christian’s Anchor in a Storm-Tossed World”, beseechingly asks the question, “For if the Christian churches of the West ever again bless war, how shall their missionaries speak for God among the heathen?”¹ The dual affirmation of both pacifism and pre-millennialism was apparent here; one cannot preach to the salvation of the heathen if one does not also manifest the practice of pacifism.

A February 1932 editorial entitled “Friends and World Problems” continues to define this attitude where War and Peace are each held as their counterpoint.

> We turn to a consideration of the work carried on for the furtherance of Peace. As a Church, we do surely have great reason to thank God for the part we have had in the propagation of peace principles, and for the glorious heritage we have in the long line of predecessors who have faithfully exemplified the truth on this line. From the days of George Fox to the present we have not lacked for those who have with voice and pen and in some case with great sacrifice, stood for peace as practical livable reality.²

As a discourse, origins of these “peace principles” are an essential part of Friends’ identity, traceable back through any divisions, or duress, to the founder George Fox, ultimately to “God”. Yet these “peace principles” are just as important in how they are tethered to another Friends’ understanding, ‘discipline’. Essential to Friends’ practice was this notion of spiritual ‘Discipline’. The same editorial of 1932 recounts, “And while we never will succeed in wholly banishing war, if we have made impossible even one war,
we have not labored in vain!” This is both spiritual and material contest: “In considering our course in this line we are impressed with necessity of maintaining our testimony on spiritual lines and not allowing it to degenerate in to a materialistic conception and presentation of matter.”

Beginning glimmers of the contradiction within the Friends’ discourse of Peace become evident here, as the Friends affirm their not wanting their discourse of Peace to become solely a materialistic one. The editorial expresses doubt as to whether Peace gains its validity from being in an oppositional dyad with very real material series of temporal events – the horrors of war (which remain from a previous Great War’s armistice, thirteen years before). The discourse of Peace starts to merge into its antithesis of politics, marking its start and slide into a looming nationalist civil religion.

The same editorial continues by showing the antithetical markers of Peace entwined in political markers: “There are groups who stand for such a world peace, as has no place nor part in our program, a peace by force, a peace advanced by the overthrowing of government and the substitution therefore of godless communism.” The fusion of these two discursive formations of “godlessness” and “communism” mark the milestone in the decline of the Friends’ Peace discourse, as now Peace shifts in its relationship to other discourses. Is the opposite of Peace the absence of War? Or is it the absence of God – ergo “godlessness?” Peace can now be set odds with another ideology – communism, strictly by virtue of it being ‘godless’; communism, a political and economic material discourse stands as the stark opposite of God. This paradigm works amply if the state - The ‘United States’ – can be set up as godless in its pursuit of foreign policy using war, but what happens if that foreign policy is directed against godless Nazi
fascism and heathen Japanese Shinto? Where has the center of gravity and locus of ‘God’ shifted? It can shift into the United States as defined by its enemies. This is the crucial pivot point in the devolvement of the Friends’ pacifism into the swell of nationalism; the enemy of peace need no longer necessarily be the godless warring United States, marked by its Peace ablating foreign policy, but rather the vanguard against newly re-imagined godless fascism, communism, and emperor allegiance.

Four years later in 1936, an editorial entitled “The Pursuit of Peace” shows how this chimera of a Peace discourse could slowly evolve in the mind of a reader in a local OYM congregation of a small Ohio town. Memories of Wobblies could serve as the material for a new definition. Now the emblematic organized worker could also be the enemy of Peace.

There is, in addition, a peace, which is social, a harmony and understanding between individuals and groups and between classes of men between nations. Such a peace, in world like this does not come unsought...

Viewed on the negative side, the loss of peace is most costly. Remove it from nations and you have war with all its attendant evils. Take it from industry and you have bitterness, and hate, strikes and violence. Banish it from the home and that God-ordained institution becomes breeding ground for suspicion and crime. Take it away from a group of Christian men anywhere on God’s footstool. And what you have left is something un-Christian in essence. 5

This is a foreshadowing of why the Friends eventually succumbed to their soon emerging, conspicuously silent pacifism. The practice of peace can reflect both an inward unseen spiritual peace, where it is oriented to the inner peace of the individual regardless of outside exigencies. Yet there is an outward peace manifested in the absence of internecine struggle and violence in political and battlefield arenas. The stark references to communism or the references to labor conflicts – “strikes” - are well understood in the
turbulent employment travails of the Depression, be they Coeur D’Alene or Cleveland. More important are the repeated comparisons to Peace existing in multiple social relations, as in nations, industries, and homes. Peace is not so much imagined in a tandem of the absence of War but also in other relationships where weapons, being absent, are not so important as God being absent. “Christian men” without peace are “un-Christian” in essence.

Throughout the congregations of the OYM, repeated grasps at this essential defining dyad continued. The OYM youth oriented Christian Endeavor’s “Young Friends Meetings”, published monthly in The Evangelical Friend, offered similar guidelines in November 1934 issue. Weekly discussion topics to be presented to a teenage Friend youth, (coming of age), included “Nov 5 – ‘Awfulness and Futility of War’ - II Sam 12:29-31” and a week later “Nov. 12 – ‘A Program for Peace’ Isaiah 2:1-5” 6. War and Peace are still kept in an essential dyad, but will eventually erode as Peace comes to be seen, not as the opposite of only war, but also godless communism, socialism or fascism.

In following pages of a same November 1935 issue, among the individual quarterly meeting reports, the Damascus Quarterly Meeting (Ohio) re-affirmed this coupling through one of their actions. “By action of the Meeting its clerks were directed to request of Ohio State University to remove military training from its present place as a required subject and make it an optional (elective) at the University.” As early as 1933, previous deliberations of the Friends of Damascus quarterly meeting offers evidence that the Friends still hold to their heritage of pacifism. This quarterly meeting felt convicted to outwardly declare their opposition to the secular inculcation of their youth in the art of military training at a campus 150 miles away. Eschewing giving this form of nationalist
cultural capital to their youth, they persevered to maintain a dyad where war and peace stood as the two poles in opposition to each other. Yet even so, the dyad was moving from a spiritual supernatural context to a political naturalist one.

This supernatural to natural shifting from the dyad of ‘Peace v. War’ to ‘Peace v. Atheism’ continued to morph in the years leading up to the war. Recall the 1932 editorial entitled “Friends and World Peace” as it reiterates this dynamic “…Our stand on peace has developed from a consciousness of experiential peace in the heart, God given, primarily in all relations of life…And while we never will succeed in wholly banishing war, if we have made impossible even one war, we have not labored in vain.” The author’s choice in title situates the Friends in a real natural historical place and time, the “World”. Yet Peace is now abstracted into something both semantic and also experiential. Peace has a paradigmatic relationship in its identity as it is still the absence of war, or as the author writes “even one war.” Yet it has a semantic value as it is written to be the presence of God, “God given”. This subtle shifting of the discourse of Peace shows that the Friends, as they deploy and interact with even their own discourses, are subject to the tides and eddies of the language that encases them. Such tides and eddies would increase in their headwaters of the emerging U.S. nationalism coursing through militaristic foreign policy. The editorial underscores this as it tries to set up the external determinants of Peace: “There is a peace which is God-given …Such peace, in a world like this does not come unsought”; one is supernatural, one is natural. The Friends’ definition of Peace was evolving in a state of flux between real and abstract, doctrine and practice, discourse and a discursive formation, ideal or real, a pre-millenial view or a post-millennial view, humanism and theism. Blurred in pre-war years, this flux would evolve into the stark
dyad to which the Friends would succumb in the intra-war years. Peace would lose its semantic essence, its spiritual practice, its non-humanism, its post-millennialism, and become completely relational— a political peace related to a new, domesticated, God absorbed into a civil religion.

Tenaciously, the aversion to this realist aspect of peace did not wane readily. Reconsider this 1932 editorial’s casting of peace from a different perspective: “Take it from a group of men anywhere on God’s footstool, and what you have left is something un-Christian in essence.” When a “group of men anywhere” - implying the nations caught up in the ensuing conflicts of the 1930s existing “on God’s footstool”, longhand for the real world, comes up lacking this peace, then by argument, they are “un-Christian”. The undertone of including labor strikes in this grouping starkly stands as shorthand for perceived Bolshevik agitators trying to dismantle true American, “God-ordained”, capitalism. The unstated is obvious; God espouses free market commerce. The growing conflation and identity with the coming civil religion becomes more apparent.

This slow evolution in semantics set the groundwork for ensuing ambivalence of conscience that would so starkly silence their Yearly Meeting Peace Committee after 1939. The stark admonitions against war in the decades of the doctrinal codex, The Book of Faith and Practice, now received recitation in The Evangelical Friend in far more blurred terms. The author of a later 1939 editorial, “In Behalf of Peace”, reflects:

…. This does not mean, nor has it ever meant, that Quakers as a people have fanatically refused allegiance to their homeland because it wages war. None can successfully accuse of disloyalty there. But there has been the strong belief that if we love God supremely, we will not want to war and take human life. Further, it is a strong contention with us that we should, on the ground of peace in the heart,
live peaceably with all men. With Friends, heart peace is deeper than, and different from, the peace of the world.  

Inner peace – “heart peace” – is starting to blur into “allegiance” to another abstract, an imagined “homeland”. (The error within the editorial of the assertion that Quakers had never “refused allegiance” to their homeland over war is summarily refuted by both secular recounted histories of repeated Friends’ objections to the foreign policies of French and Indians War, the American Revolution, the Civil War, Spanish American Wars, and World War I. In all these instances, Quakers with minor exception defied and disobeyed the state in peril to their safety). 

Yet an irony in this blurring can be found in the very same November 1939 issue of *The Evangelical Friend* where the usual extensive schedule of the summer Beulah Beach Ohio Yearly Meeting Youth Conference lists three days of sessions including “Living for Christ Where I am”, “Life Problems” (in the sections of “Boys under 16, Boys over 16, Girls under 16, Girls over 16”, further underscoring the Friends’ immersion into extant Age and Gender discourses) and “The Call of India”. But more strikingly, the itinerary also includes “The Christian Soldier on the Field”, “The Christian Soldier in Conflict” and “The Christian Soldier Pays the Supreme Price”. This growing flux of meanings of the discourse of Peace and the practice of pacifism had now permeated into the very arena the Friends chose for their stand against the foreign policy of a dominant state - their youth. 

The renegotiation and relational reconfiguration of the discourse of Peace, as a referent point for the Friends’ pacifism continued in an example from 1938. In the shadow of the Japanese assault on Nanking, and two months before the German incursion into the Sudetenland, an August editorial of *The Evangelical Friend*, just prior to the
August 22-28 convocation of the Ohio Yearly Meeting, another * Evangelical Friend* editorial further shows how the discourse of Peace would change in the collective conscious of the Friends. A Friend in “In The Event War Breaks Out” writes: “It has been suggested that this paper contain a brief discussion of the attitude young men should take in the event of the outbreak of war. It seems to the writer impractical for one person to serve as conscience for another. In the final analysis such questions must be settled between the disciple and his Lord.”  The confusion of violent world events had rendered the human written *Faith and Practice* directives and pacifist pronouncements as optional. The last redoubt for the Friends is to appeal to the young person’s one-to-one relation with God as the final arbitrator of what pacifism is. (This of course had remarkable echoes of the Hicksite heretical split)

Witnesses to the fall of Paris, the invasions of Denmark and Norway, and the domestic rise of the SSA, the Friends continued in their ambivalent course. In an extended editorial in November 1940 entitled “The Christian and War”, a Friend author writes:

> Since enlightenment of conscience varies, and since competing loyalties are involved, we believe that we should be tolerant of Christians who do not see nor accept the position of non-resistance. We believe that Christians should be permitted freedom in matters of conscience while they seek constantly to be illuminated by the Scriptures regarding God’s will for human life. We believe, further, that we should grant freedom of choice to those in our churches who consider it their duty to engage in either combat or non-combatant military service and not subject them to church discipline in the exercise of their conscientious convictions.  

This concession, coming from a religious group who, within the same time period continued to adamantly circumscribe alcohol, tobacco, and dancing (all with minimal
scriptural proscription), becomes all the more ironic, as the writer suggests the young Christian resort only to scripture for guidance, the same scripture containing over twenty direct admonitions on war and violence and zero admonitions on tobacco.

What external factors could be slowly eroding the Friends central tenet of Peace and Pacifism? What social and political new emerging civil religion could have such as strong gravitational pull on the collective conscious of the Friends? The very essence of the discourse of Peace was transforming within them, while the political debacle of Prohibition less than decade earlier made not the slightest change in their doctrinal position on alcohol, only emboldening their zeal for preaching abstinence? What could emerge in cultural force of World War II that would cause this transformation? The answer lay in a newly forming political understanding of which nation God truly favored in a binary capitalist/communist world-view. God was threatened by the war waged by “anti Christian Axis Powers”. Such nations were the enemies of not only United States but, by implication, God. The United States was now seen as actually blessed by, and not in opposition to God. This was a transition based in an imagined United States at war with imagined godless fascism and communism.

In 1940 the Friends diligently continued to carry on their conscientious objector agenda for their youth, yet with faint signs of uncertainty. They had already felt the trauma of the United States’ appropriation of the citizen body, all for a prosecution of a violent foreign policy. They had witnessed 1940 Selective Service Act firsthand. The Evangelical Friend still carried very stark directives for the local meetings as to how to assist draftees who were conscientious objectors.

Our historic testimony has been in favor of peace and against war. This view that carnal warfare is incompatible
with the requirements of Christ for those who bear His Name is clearly stated in our Discipline and so is part of our public confession of faith. This being the case the national crisis brings us Friends face to face with a very serious problem, the problem of course that shall be pursued by our young men of draft age and those who are united to them in our sacred ties of Christian fellowship. On their part our young men may elect to hold true to Quaker conviction, or they may pursue some other course less exacting. As for the rest of us, we may choose either to give our young men our heart sympathy and intelligent aid and cooperation, or we may pass by on the side and ignore their plight (italics for emphasis).  

Three months before Camp Coshocton’s opening, the Ohio Valley Friends still enjoined their constituent meetings to support their drafted young men either financially or in sympathy, whether their choices be either pacifist “conviction” or pursuit of a “course less exacting.” In a desperate time, these choices also stood as a desperate continuation of an attempt to exact identity from a state that abducted the very bodies of their children to perform a foreign policy at complete odds with their heritage of Quaker pacifism. And for those young men who did choose the strength of “conviction”, the incarceration of Camp Coshocton would be welcomed, supported, encouraged, and embraced.

Identity integrity continued to be crucial in such a desperate time. The same editorial continues, as it marshals all the pillars of Friends pacifist identity:

We especially want to be helpful to those who for conscientious reasons cannot engage in military service. In its statement concerning the evil of war our discipline is clear (See p.85). The section treating of the subject closes with the words “A violation of these principles shall be regarded an offense against the good order of our church.” How can we expect our young men to respect our church unless we stand by them in their attempt to carry out its disciplinary provisions?
Their book of Discipline, scripture, and group pressure, were all marshaled to ensure minimal slippage in the integrity of Quaker pacifism. Camp Coshocton would be a symbolic stand against the United States, and its overreaching, continents-removed, foreign policy. Such a stand would also solidify and cement the Friends’ marginalized and fading identity. The pawns in this endeavor would be their youth.

In the greatest irony, further such pacifist stands appear in The Evangelical Friend of October 1941, two months before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. The august OYM Peace Committee, having given yearly reports for over 100 years, had curiously gone silent in 1939, listing no report at the neither the 1939 or 1940 Yearly meeting. Yet in 1941, reborn as the “Peace and Service Committee”, the committee was charged with a task of: “…(building) a mailing list of all our young men who are in Civilian Public Service camps, or in some branch of the military. We want to keep in touch with them and encourage them in every way to be true to the Lord.”18 The glaringly apparent absence and silence of the Peace Committee during the 1939 Yearly Meeting, coupled with their vague reference to youth “in some branch of the Military service” (with spade shovel - or carbine rifle?), once again, evidence the initial traces of the transition of the Friends’ Peace discourse. Ambiguity and uncertainty pervaded the OYM even before the gates of Camp Coshocton were opened.

With The Evangelical Friend as the arena for the contesting this evolving transformation of the Friends’ discourse of Peace, one of the most striking mile-markers in the transition is found in the final month of 1941. Citizens of an attacked nation, sustaining casualties in one of their remote colonial territories Hawaii, the Ohio Valley Friends reacted to the attack on Pearl Harbor with complete silence in their newsletter.
The December issue, actually written and sent to print in the previous month of November, makes no mention or acknowledgement of the December 7th event. The next edition, one that could have railed and expressed shock, January 1942, never was mailed nor published. There was no issue. There was silence. Reflective of a similar shock that permeated the nation, its absence stood only the more striking in light of the next issue, February 1942, the first edition to be published after the entry of the United States into the war.

This February issue was a complete cipher of their religious zeal. The Friends’ drafted or soon-to-be drafted youth were now in grave peril of combat. Their very identity as pacifists was now thrown into glaring light and scrutiny with the nation at war. Yet this February 1942 issue is stunningly silent on all these matters. The standard ten pages recounted the weekly lessons, editorial homilies written from “warm fireplaces in log cabins” and newsy updates on local churches.19 No discussion, or even remote negotiation, occurs as to how peace vanished from the United States, or the world at large. One small poem at the bottom of an inner page recounts:

We pray for those of every nation  
Who, moved about as chessmen on a board  
And drunk with the drugged wine of hate and greed  
To cruel human suffering gives no heed  
But rend all bonds of brotherhood anew; -  
Father forgive them for they know not what they do

- Emma B. Stevenson 20

This minimal poetic opining, following the diligent twelve years of pacifist disputations published since 1928, only seems to address this world wide calamity in the vaguest allusions, hardly the rhetoric of a 300-year-old pacifist religious group. Communal
national shock coupled with submerged pacifist ambivalence amidst the Friends, produced this first response to the attack on Pearl Harbor

In the April 1942 issue, two months after the opening of Camp Coshocton, that *The Evangelical Friend* returns to discussion of world matters. The copy was printed in a one-time-only, lurid blue ink copy (whether intended or resultant of war rationing) taking on a surreal appearance. The format returns to the standard previous years’ format of *The Evangelical Friend*. Yet, the lead editorial merely recounts an abstract exhortation to a closer walk with Jesus in a fallen world. Summer youth conferences are announced. Evangelism meeting notices postpone their dates. Response to the war is never once mentioned in local meeting field reports. Programmed Sunday school lessons dwell on youth’s need to avoid alcohol (not artillery shells). And one secondary editorial, “Our Men and the Draft”, written by a Walter R. Williams, then acting treasurer of the Peace and Service Committee, extensively calls on the churches to support the CPS efforts through the supplying of the $35.00 a month costs of each internee citing CPS Camp #23, Camp Coshocton, now nearby in the Ohio Valley.

Every church in Ohio Yearly Meeting ought to raise some money for the C.P.S. work, regardless of whether any of its own young men are inducted into these camps or not. And surely each and every church which has members assigned to these camps, ought to see that sufficient money is found for their support...We dare not in time of Peace teach our young men and women that war is a crime, and then when war comes turn them out upon their own responsibility for the simple reason that it costs us money to be consistent...These boys are all ours: we shall not fail any of them. God helping us. 21

Notably pragmatic in its financial appeal, this sole reference that month to the conflagration engulfing the United States, Europe, and Asia still has the crucial discursive
components of the Friends’ twelve-year pacifist quest: their youth, doctrine, identity, zeal, and – God. All are focused on the incarcerated youth (and more specifically potential and actual incarcerated Ohio Valley youth within 100 miles of The Evangelical Friend subscriber churches). Without visiting the camp itself, the Ohio Yearly Meeting readers would have an imagined site for their resistance to the state, an imagined site populated, in reality, by their own youth – and, of course, endorsed by God.

Yet whom actually would God endorse? Would it be boys in CO camps standing for the pacifism of Jesus or boys on battlefields standing up for democracy and God? Would God bless and help the Friends’ pacifist struggles if it showed obedience to his precepts? Would God endorse and bless the camp and its imagined identity as pacifist?

An editorial, similarly placed four months after Pearl Harbor in the April 1942 issue of The Evangelical Friend, entitled “God Rules”, shows that these angles of thought continued to vacillate:

We hope in God’s mercy. Unless this is indeed the end-time and the Lord means speedily to bring to an end this age of Gospel preaching, then we may expect that the Axis powers will fail in their purpose to dominate the world. Being definitely anti-Christian in their attitude and policies, it would seem that in a world dominated by them, little opportunity would be given for Christian life and testimony.
Our hope lies in the intervention of Providence. God rules and at any time He can interfere with the plans of the wicked, either by causing “an uproar in the elements” or in ten thousand other ways readily at His disposal.22

This adversarial relationship between The Friends and the new threatening “anti-Christian” Axis powers marks another crucial stepping-stone from the adversarial relationship between the Friends and the United States to a cooperative participant in an emerging U.S. Civil Religion. A ‘Godless’ adversarial United States, one that drafts their
youth and prosecutes foreign policies of war, now stands placed in a relational position to a ‘Godful’ state. It is Godful if indeed it stands in opposition to the Axis powers. The Axis Powers are ‘anti-Christian’, therefore their dyadic foe, the United States must be, by theological logic, ‘pro-Christian’. The process between the changing discourses of Peace semantically grinds so slowly, yet so finely.

This theistic tension is further strained in a May editorial “Should a Christian Go To War”: “To me the whole question revolves itself into this: Would Jesus go to war in obedience to the demands of his government if he were on earth today? Would Jesus stand behind a machine gun and mow down men and send them from hate and blood–lust to appear before the judgment seat of God.” Jesus, who by Friends’ doctrine and scriptural vetting is God, becomes the standard for practice for how God would be involved in any war. Yet, still the Friends cling to the hope that He could intervene “either by causing an uproar in the elements” or “in ten thousand other ways readily at His disposal.” The editorial continues: “For me it would be blasphemy to say that Christ would participate in carnal warfare: for me it would be heresy to say he would require it of his followers. War is not the Christian way.” God, Jesus, and Christianity are now conflated, as is doctrine and practice. Herein would lie the turn in the axis of God’s endorsement.

The reality of an individual Friend’s ambivalence continued through these opening months of the war. While eschewing the purchase of war bonds, and rather suggesting support of CPS camps (which the government had declared a “war effort” action), a June editorial cautiously tenders: “The war emergency is upon us and we desire to face it courageously and in a manner worthy of those called Friends. While our
Discipline on the subject is very clear, it is hardly to be assumed that all see eye to eye on the question, particularly with reference to the purchase of bonds and the support of Civilian Public Service camps.”

Could all Friends not see “eye to eye?” The strident proscriptions of the book of *Faith and Practice*, invoked with the severity of any other injunctions as those on tobacco, or alcohol abstinence, fades as the writers of *The Evangelical Friend* back away from unilateral pacifist practice, rather allowing for individual conscious, swayed perhaps by outside forces, be they nationalism or patriotism.

A July 1942 editorial reiterates this ambivalence seven months past into World War II: “It is probably too much to expect that in a time like this there will be entire unanimity on the question of our attitude toward the war.”

This demurring comes from a Yearly Meeting that had staunchly, as one, stood for prohibition, vehemently bemoaning its fall. This was the same meeting that had trained and inculcated their youth at conferences every summer in both the disciplines of abstinence and ardent pacifism. This was a Meeting that had already incarcerated some of their own youth in a government-provided camp within their own oversight, and had even enjoined member churches in the same pages to support such a camp. From where and what came this variance and ambivalence?

A September 1942 issue of *The Evangelical Friend* further evidences this rotation of the axis of God’s endorsement. An editorial title informs readers “Ohio State Administrator of War Bond Sales approves contributions to C.P.S. in lieu of purchase of War Bonds:” “It is the purpose of your government to fully maintain the principle of freedom at home during these trying days of war just as it is resisting with its arms forces
throughout the world those who would destroy it.” The government was now described as “their[s]” and as advocate of “freedom.” “We of the War Savings Staff of Ohio, in behalf of the United States Treasury Department, assure you of our desire to encourage among your workers complete respect for the contribution your people are making to the nation in your own chosen manner.” An outside group was still granting the Friends an ‘other’ identity, yet at the same time entreating them. “In your support of this you are demonstrating your basic Americanism with a complete recognition of human needs without regard for race, color, or creed of the individual.” 26 “Americanism” was being offered as a overarching identity that transcended “race color or creed.” That such a proposition from the posed adversary of the Friends, the state, could be tendered and printed without an disclaimer, rebuttal or critique stands in stark contrast to the preceding years of shrill and virulent denouncing of the foreign policy and subsequent war bond support. That the Ohio Valley Friends could be taken in by such a financial ploy evidences the slow slide towards identifying with the United States and its militant cause, and a marked shift away from adamant loggerheads with its foreign policy. Key words elide this adversarial role without rebuttal including “your government”, “freedom”, “those who would destroy it” “your Americanism” and of course “creed”. Would the Friends of 1939 consider the state that had incarcerated their youth, “their government”? Would the Friends’ discourse not espouse that “freedom” was only to be found in Jesus Christ? Would the Friends consider that those who set out “to destroy freedom” are really the enemy (Communists? Fascists?) and not the United States? Would the Friends countenance being included in a Biblical Rome with an enjoining term “your
Americanism”? These words slowly erode the discourse of the Friends’ notion of what a Nation is and what Peace for that nation could be, all with minimal challenge.

A further editorial underscored this blurring of state, nation and Friend. On the same page, an editorial sent by an outside source, the Great Commission Prayer League, shows the level of tolerance that the Ohio Valley Friends reading The Evangelical Friend of 1942 were willing to sustain for the nationalism that was growing around them.

Our country is at war, girding itself for a climactic victory over forces of aggression and anti-Christianity, must have God as Ally, if she is to succeed. Taking it for granted that He will be with us, as did the Israelites in the days of spiritual decline under Eli will prove disastrous. We must know that God is with us and certainly not asking Him to be with us as a nation, we shall not have reason to expect his aid. America on her knees in this tremendous conflict, or to change the figure, “Holding up the hands of her leaders by united prayer is the only way we can have the aid of Omnipotence. God is with us while we are with Him…” Let ministers and people set themselves to fill their churches with patriotic praying on the coming Thanksgiving Day. 27

How would the Friends countenance and allow this form of discussion to favorably enter their monthly discussion. “Anti Christian”, “God as an ally”, and “us as a nation” hardly stood as discursive formations the Friends used throughout the pre-war years. Ten months into a expanding world war caused by antithetical United States foreign policy, would the Friends allow these words and discourses to enter their own domain – and their collective thinking? Prayer in support of war and enjoining God as an ally could be “patriotic?” Would the Friends have prayed for licensed bars during prohibition? Would they have prayed seasonal blessings on the tobacco harvests? Would they have had a prayer circle in the middle of a dance hall beseeching God for a fine evening? Why
would one proscription – pacifist renouncing of war – vanish while other – eschewing and denouncing alcohol, tobacco, and dancing, stood without variance?

In the September 1942 issue of *The Evangelical Friend*, there was the customary report and summary of the August Yearly Meeting in Damascus, the first since the start of the war. The original Peace Committee report remained absent and silent, as was a report from its phantom replacement, the Peace and Service Committee. The only two references to the war in four columns of four-page summary were: “Fears had been expressed that the prevailing condition resulting from the war would materially cut down attendance.” 28 A further mention reports: “Joe Alfred a conscientious objector who has been at Buck Creek C.P.S. for about six month portrayed in a very vivid way life at that camp. His clear testimony to fidelity to peace principles called the yearly meeting to a fresh commitment to Friends’ convictions on this subject.” 29 Two pages of four full column text bear no other mention nor renunciation of the United States and its involvement in a World War II.

Ensuing issues in 1942 continued equally in this opaque vein of the growing war-induced ambivalence. The October 1942 *Evangelical Friend* remained completely silent on the war. November included a short note on a hunger fast to feed Europeans in a CPS camp. December deferred to seasonal concerns of Christmas and its meaning. Over the year U.S. forces took Guadalcanal, 400,000 American troops arrived in North Africa, and German divisions reached the threshold of Stalingrad. None of the events elicited editorial concern.

The ambivalence-driven ennui became more apparent as 1943 produced twelve issues of *The Evangelical Friend*, all with increasingly mutating references to the war and
the peace effort. The defining of the discourse of Peace, and discursive formations of pacifism, slowly wound their way through finances, theology and the ever-increasing pull of a U.S. Civil Religion.

The January 1943 *Evangelical Friend* recounted a stark analysis of how nearby Camp Coshocton needed to be sustained financially. *The Evangelical Friend* set aside extended copy to explain the exact relationship the Ohio Valley Friends had to the State, the CPS camps and their CO youth. Its close examination is revealing.

**Facts for Friends**

*Civilian Public Service for 1943*

1) The C.P.S. population as of October 31, 1942 was approximately 5400 men in 60 camps administered by the Brethren Service Committee, the Mennonite Central Committee, the Association of Catholic Conscientious objectors, and the American Friends Service Committee, and it will probably rise to 7500 men during the coming year.

2) It is hoped that enough detached service projects can be developed so that the average number of men in C.P.S. camps can be held at approximately 5000 men. The maintenance of men on detached service is not paid by the religious administrative agencies.

3) By the end of 1942, it is expected that 1500 men will be in C.P.S. camps administered by Friends. Of these approximately 400 will be Friends.

4) The total cost of operating Friends C.P.S. camps in 1943 is estimated at $570,000. Contributions of $320,000 are expected from non-Friends; $250,000 is needed from Friends.

5) It should be noted that considerably more than one-half of the cost of Friends’ C.P.S. is expected to come from others than Friends.

6) Using contributions received in 1942 as a standard it will be necessary for Friends to increase their financial support.
of C.P.S. by approximately two-thirds if the goal of $250,000 is to be reached during the coming year.

7) In order for financial income to keep pace with the rapidly growing C.P.S. program, *Friends as individuals, as Meetings, and as Yearly Meetings should immediately place increased emphasis on C.P.S. promotion and giving in order that a steady and adequate flow of support may continue to be available.*

8) Every effort is being made to keep administrative costs at the lowest figure consistent with efficient administration. During the first eight months of 1942 the administrative costs per man per month decreased 50% from 191 and at present, is 17% of the total cost.

9) As one means of keeping Friends informed on C.P.S. developments, plans are being made to issue a monthly statement of the number of men in Friends’ camps and the income and expenditures in terms of the budget for the year.30

Such a report never again appeared in *The Evangelical Friend*, nor did the Peace and Service Committee report such figures to the Yearly meeting in the three remaining years of the war. From a completely pragmatic perspective, the Friends’ pacifist attitude towards the war, and their defining of Peace, could not even be financially sustained. Concurrent Camp Coshocton administration correspondence echoed this lack, as did the eventual devolution of the camp’s integrity and management.

Mere congregant numbers of the member congregations in the Yearly meeting show this difficulty. A “Stewardship Department Report” in the following month’s *Evangelical Friend* details the constituent breakdown of the sixty-three meetings throughout the OYM. The Committee chose to rank the churches (meetings) by their percentage of “tithers” (monetary contributors paying up a tenth or “tithe”).31 These tithers were categorized as those contributing a $50.00 amount to the Yearly Meeting
itself beyond any local church giving. The listing also gives insight as to how many
Friends were actually available to make any support for Camp Coshocton internees, or, for that matter, any CO throughout the United States.

Based on a 6-30-42 Statistical Report
Larger Meetings:
(Church name) (Members) (Those tithing) (% of church)
1. Alliance 367 178 48.5
2. Salem 303 140 46.5
3. Portsmouth 212 88 46.2
4. Highland Ave. 256 103 40.2
5. 1st Cleveland 274 106 38.6
6. Gilead 176 65 36.9
7. Mt. Pleasant 192 62 32.2
8. East Goshen 177 44 24.8
9. Damascus 294 55 18.7
(totals) 2251 841 37.36

These “Larger Meetings” represent almost half of the total 5140 members in the entire Yearly meeting (counting of course any member incarcerated in a CPS camp).

Though telling of trying war time economic conditions, an aggregate 44.6% for all sixty-seven meetings shows a listless monetary support for either the operating needs of the Yearly Meeting as a whole, and of course any remaining needs for the $35.00 a month for Yearly Meeting incarcerated COs. Funds for such support were considered outside the Yearly Meetings main outlays for administration, missions, and member church assistance. When confronted with yet a monetary challenge to their pacifist convictions in 1943, the Friends exhibited a similarly tepid response, even in lieu of their other Yearly Meeting obligations. In actuality, 5140 constituent members could easily have covered the needs of whatever OYM COs may have emerged in the war years. $420 ($35.00 x 12 months) would take approximately eighteen $25.00 tithers (a proposed amount for other Yearly Meeting needs) for each CO, yet given the scale of needs which The Evangelical
Friend lists, ongoing calls for further support in the early war years went unanswered. A reading of the listing of twenty “Medium Sized Meetings” and the twenty-eight “Smaller Meetings” shows a far higher percentage of tithers, yet a smaller potential dollar percentage coming out of a grouping of far smaller congregations.

Ambivalence in a time of national duress and concern permeated the many other areas of programming in the OYM. Its sacrosanct annual Youth Conference stood questioned as frivolous in a time of national duress. The “Christian Endeavor News Section” addressed such an obvious circumspection as to whether such an expensive Beulah Beach centered conference should even be held, while state sponsored foreign policy immersed youth into mortal carnage across two different oceans. Yet, it tenuously rebuts: “YES, WE ARE DEVELOPING PLANS FOR A 1943 CONFERENCE: JUNE 22 to 24.” That was the vibrant answer to questioning and speculation among OYM Christian Endeavor members. The rebuttal continues: “Just one moment, please; Many of you are rejoicing over this announcement, but some may be inclined to say “Unwise,” or even “Un-American.” The “American/Un-American” axis similarly permeated this debate. “The Conference Committee found itself obligated to make a decision. After a number of weeks of prayer, correspondence and counseling, it seems best to announce the Conference…We earnestly request your prayers for the guidance of the Spirit upon future planning.”

33 This very keystone of the Friends’ concern for youth now was pulled into the larger discourse of nationalism as to whether having a summer camp conference, continuing to nurture their youth, should be conflated with the deprivations of national “American” duress. Activities for their youth were being conflated with victory gardens, collecting tin, and meatless days, all for ‘America’ (God’s America). Nascent nationalist
sacrifice encroached not on one, but two, central tenets of the Friends: Peace, and their Identity ensconced in the cultural capital given their Youth.

This debate continues in the same newsletter announcement: “And now the Committee presents to you the Publicity Directors and Registrars, Mr. and Mrs. David Skipper. We’re not telling them how to do their work, but if they have a mind to – and can – we suggest they stop this war and give us the best Conference yet.” 34 Though non-specific in its lack of capitalization, the writers seem most reticent in their exhortation to “stop this war” - (“We’re not telling them how to do their work…” – allowing that God would not either). If reference to “war” either refers to the conflict of three continents away, or a “war” in the OYM, such reticence tells that some central roots are eroding in the collective discussion. A cover picture of a benign small child on the cover of the April 1943 issue similarly tells of this erosion, as it hardly coincides with a nation caught up in wars travails and devastation.

Ongoing unfocused ambivalence about Peace continued to manifest itself in The Evangelical Friend. The very next month, the youth oriented Christian Endeavor section titled “CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR SERVES –TODAY” makes a stark promulgation. Other youth are enjoined for concern for their fellow youth: “As we pray for them, write, and keep in touch. Whether at home, at camp, or overseas the boys are still serving Christ and Christian Endeavor. One Society planned a meeting in which these absent could take part by sending letters. And how well the boys responded…” 35 Obviously OYM youth of the past Beulah Beach Summer Camps were caught up in the war. Yet the plea further enjoins: “Many of the boys are realizing opportunities for witnessing to the
power of Christ in their lives as never before: in the hospitals, in the hutments, and while on hikes, opportunities come to give the Word of Life.”

The bastion of Friends’ youth nurture, Christian Endeavor, has drifted into the countenancing its youth embroiled in a foreign policy directly serving to obliterate world peace. Phrases such as “Nearly all our boys away in service to ‘our’ country”, engaged in “hikes”, and living in “hutments” (a predominantly period military term for barracks and Quonset huts), paints a bleak picture of what is really left of the Friends’ Youth identity could hardly be construed as pacifist. Yet they are still just “youth”, in need of letters from home. Where has the zeal for the Friends’ Youth carrying the torch for Peace? And how did the United States, with a foreign policy at complete odds with Peace, become “our” country beyond name, deserving of such service by Friends’ progeny? How has the Friends’ pacifist zeal been reduced to “witnessing” carrying a forty-pound pack, M-1 rifle, and bayonet, rather than zealously defying a draft, a state, and a war? And what are they not “serving” – the discourse of The Prince of Peace and Friends’ Youth, the repository of Friends’ identity? As in the previous April issue, the May issue’s cover ageistly depicts a serene but pensive child reading a book, amidst a war torn world. The monthly Sunday school lessons include a reaffirmation as to the evils of wine and its effects on the youth, a harkening to another central discursive tenet, ensuring Quaker sobriety.

The itinerary for the summer youth conference in question of 1943 dutifully recounts a full-page, hour-by-hour schedule in the June issue. Congregants sitting throughout sixty-four member churches of the OYM read over how their undrafted youth continued in the proper paths. Absent in the four-day itinerary, were any camp study
sections concerning the draft, Peace, or the military. Provided sessions covered “Serving my church”, Bible Studies on the Book of Esther, “Knowing my Church” and “Heroes of my Church.” One more ironic session which would have engaged the eighteenth century Friends carried a title of “My Life: Its Capital, Investment, and Profit.” Capitalism - American Capitalism, not communism – stood as a noteworthy teaching topic. The dissipation and ennui in one of the most invested and intense arenas for the Friends – their youth - had succumbed to encroaching sense of the Friends ‘looking over their shoulder’, lest their pacifism pillory the Friends as – “un-American”? The fifteenth annual Friends’ Youth Conference had come a long way from its preceding events where the Friends so diligently strove to store their cultural capital and identity for posterity.

The Christian Endeavor Committee became a further lightening rod for nationalistic fervor in its capacity as overseers of the youth (and draftees) of the nation. In their October 1943 issue report, Christian Endeavor offered: “REMEMBER THE BOYS IN THE SERVICE - As Kate Smith says, ‘If you don’t write you’re wrong’. What are you doing about remembering the boys in the service? Some societies go so far as to hand out stamped addressed envelopes Sunday evening. We commend this plan.” Far from the exhortations and modeled words of Jesus, the words of Kate Smith, the U.S. Mademoiselle Liberte of the world war, permeated the culture of the United States. These same words could be invoked to both encourage the homebound youth of the Christian Endeavor local societies, and similarly dun anyone else in the OYM for unpatriotic impropriety in action or thought. So admonished, an OYM Friend could hardly declare that their youth had been caught up willingly into a warring nation’s foreign policy. Kate Smith was now the paragon of responsible U.S. practice, not Jesus of Nazareth.
Marooned oceans or states far away, the Friends’ youth’s honored status as young soldiers directly reflected the new Friends’ discourse of Peace and how an adult Friend could act within it. Foreign policy, on far off soil, had reshaped centuries old Quaker doctrine on domestic soil.

This degree of accommodation the Friends sustained is the more marked when in the same October 1943 issue, continuing the upbraiding by an invoked Kate Smith (over the proscriptions of Jesus), the same Christian Endeavor committee appeals to the Yearly Meeting at large: “Let’s let our servicemen talk. We invite you fellows in the service to take this section and tell us in as brief a form as possible how the Lord enables you to retain your Christian experience, even amidst trying and difficult situations.”39 The mere use of the phrase “how the Lord enables you to retain your Christian experience” implies the loss of paradigm where the sites of war were exactly the place where such a Christian experience would be in dire jeopardy. This statement was the best reproach the pacifist Friend of a 300 year legacy could muster. Would this not be the same as having a similar “share section” for the whiskey prohibition runners of Detroit, as the groundswell for the repeal of the failing Eighteenth amendment gained ground in the early 1930s? Could the Friends be so resolute on alcohol abstinence, and so malleable on pacifism? The very same issue’s weekly Sunday school lesson’s title intoned, “Beware I pray thee, and drink not wine or string drink - Judges 13:4.” 40 The drinking of wine was still abhorrent, but not the lack of Peace. How far could reconciliation with the larger dominant culture go before the very identity of the sub dominant culture suffers complete effacement? The subtext of ageism reemerges in the curious slippage of the Youth discourse as drafted ‘boys’, in need of support, become service ‘men’ when they themselves are permitted to
speak back, effectively correcting any deviance at home about how one was to view the war. They were not youthful transgressors, but “service men.”

By September 1943, the transformation of the Friends’ understanding of the discourse of Peace became starkly apparent. There was complete conflation of Peace with naturalist, super-naturalist, and political discursive formations. The lead front page, two-column editorial details the emerging confusion, conflation and reconfiguration of the Friends’ discourse of Peace.

THE BRUTALIZING EFFECT OF WAR
We Friends shall do well to be on guard against the error of imagining that this war is somehow a righteous war, a bit different in its nature than other wars. *Our sympathies, of course, are with the allies; we could not be normally human and have it otherwise. The principles for which the United States stands we firmly believe to be immeasurably superior to the tenets of the Fascism and Nazism.* Nevertheless the progress of the events is demonstrating the inherent evil of war, no matter who is waging it. The words of George Fox are as applicable to the present conflict as they were to the wars of the seventeenth century. Said Fox: “We know that wars and fighting proceed from the lusts of men…”41 (italics added)

War as a word was still semantically being set in opposition to Peace. Yet Peace was changing as a discourse relationally as the Friends’ thinking was now starting to conflate political identities with God and righteousness. The United States was posited as the benefactor of the Friends’ ‘sympathies’ because of its enemies. The ideals of the United States were characterized as superior only when relationally juxtaposed with chosen ideals of harsh and exaggerated statism (the very force the Friends tried to elude in the confrontation with the draft). The ideals of the United States mitigated what the Friends still vainly try to hold onto to - the inherent evil in the discourse of war. Even a George
Fox paraphrase of the biblical injunction against war invokes past Quaker conviction. Yet this same injunction, requiring the “lusts of men” to stand trial for causing war, lead the Friends to conflate the natural with the supernatural, as the editorial declares “…we could not be normally human.” The Friends’ ‘humanity’, not spirituality, bid them to side with the United States and its foreign policy (regardless of any of its Jim Crow domestic policies). Could two more contradictory statements be so conjoined as, “We Friends shall do well to be on guard against the error of imagining that this war is somehow a righteous war, a bit different in its nature than other wars” and “Our sympathies, of course, are with the allies; we could not be normally human and have it other wise?” Peace, as a discourse, had fractured along discursive facets.

The relational unmooring of the discourse of ‘Peace’, from its semantic counterpart ‘War’, is thrown into bold relief by the closing front page Christmas editorial of December 1943 entitled “Peace of Earth”:

….. Now to return to the Moscow conference. Is it reasonable to believe that a pact entered into by a man like Joseph Stalin will result in “general security and peace” for the world. Does not history and Holy Scripture and our own judgment combine in telling us that an enduring superstructure of peace cannot be erected on the sandy foundation of impenitence, ungodliness and atheism? 43

An Ohio Valley congregant, reading the Christmas issue, replete with Sunday school lessons of angels announcing “Peace on Earth, Goodwill towards men” would have actually been watching a collective paradigm shift in the discourse of Peace. Peace cannot be conjoined in an effort with a dark angel of “impenitence, ungodliness and atheism.” 44 Peace is relationally not the opposite of War, but Atheism. Peace is God. Therefore War, now paradigmatically disconnected from Peace, can be actually be of
God as long as it is not atheistic, ungodly, communist, or worse – bolshevist. The editorial ends with “Merry Christmas, Ohio Valley Yearly Meeting.”

Ohio Valley Friends in 1944 read in their local newspapers of massive world events unfolding. Allies landed in Anzio. U.S troops took control of the Solomon and Marshall Islands. 800 flying fortresses dropped over 2,000 tons of bombs on Berlin. 700 ships and 4,000 landing crafts landed at Normandy. Guam and the Philippines had U.S. troops on them. All these events were duly noted in local papers and news sources throughout the Ohio Valley while ruminated over in the pages of The Evangelical Friend. Horrifying in their nature, they still were held in a stasis of idealism of a nation fighting for freedom, ‘the American way’, - and God. The actual events, and their extensive details of misery and suffering, faded in the glare of such idealistic discourses, and the both the writers and readers of The Evangelical Friend, in their own collective thought, collaborated. As young readers’ session included encouraging topics as “Measure yourself by this Christian yardstick. (#) 6 Do I love my neighbor as myself? Would I treat a negro or a Japanese as respectfully as a member of my own race?” 45 Adults received instruction to do their financial calculations of tithing prior to deducting “social security, Victory taxes, bond purchases….” 46 Ohio Valley Friends continued to mull over this new nationalist paradigm. Admonitions in a September 1944 issue such as “A Peace which is brought at a price of silence when the time has come to speak, will never be the kind of peace around which any group will ever find unity and solidarity”, belie the ambivalence towards the foregone lost pacifism the Friends knew before. 47
The new ‘Godful Peace’ (as opposed to the godless War), caused them to deliberate and write such editorials as “Healing of the Nation”

There has been on my heart and mind for a long time a subject in which we should all be vitally be interested. I do not remember the subject of the article – nor do I remember consciously anything else in the article, but this was the sentence. “America, beware! We may win the war on the battle front and lose it in the homeland” And as we think of the present conditions, we realize how true this can be. ““Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord” (Psalm 33:12) We consider our own America a Christian nation, and comparing it with any other, I suppose it is as nearly Christian as any other, and perhaps more so. A great many of the best characteristics of America come directly or indirectly as a result of its being a Christian nation…(italics for emphasis) 48

Amidst the travails of a third year of war, the writer reflects the collective foregone assumption of the readers that this entity, “America”, is not only “ours” but “Christian”. Identity attributes of the United States and the Friends have fused in a symbiotic mindset that the United States is God’s United States, by virtue of “being Christian as any other and perhaps more so.” The very state, that had granted the sought after to-be-salvaged identity the Friends so strove against as a counter-culture, has now become the fused identity marker of the Friends. Compliance and acceptance of a rampant war driven U.S. foreign policy returns to the Friends a status as members of a Christian nation, which has other concerns to deal with than pacifist and sobriety precepts.

These musings continue:

...But what of the many evils we find at home?...(E)vils we might name are: Infidelity to our country, as well as husbands, wives, and sweethearts, immorality, Communism, which would say “Down with religion, God,
education, and government!”; gangsterism, sabotage, civil strife; lack of parental interest in and discipline of children; juvenile delinquency. The stark fact that “infidelity to our country” takes precedence over “husbands, wives, and sweethearts” shows how far the Friend have bought into the discourse of Kate Smith’s God’s blessed America. And a close fifth in the evils listing, after “immorality”, is the anathema of “Communism”, generously expanded for the reader as espousing “Down with religion, God, education, and government.” Government, the Government of the United States, is equated within three words in syntax with “God”, separated only by – “education”. The Friends have lost none of their adherence to their ageist discourse of Youth, as the writer decries the multiple failings towards them, finishing with horrific assertion of “juvenile delinquency.” Adherence to the discourse of Age is just as strong as it was in the 1910s, the 1920s, and the 1930s. Adherence to the Peace discourse has been completely ablated.

By 1945, the die was cast, and the Friends stood resolutely re-oriented in their nationalist Peace discourse. There was no zealous denying of the wrong of war. There were no appeals, nor exhortations to Jesus of Nazareth, God on Earth, the Prince of Peace, and his multitude of teachings. These were replaced with coiling suspicion of communists, fear of God’s imagined enemies, be they atheists, communists, and the ungodly. This was how The Evangelical Friend and its subscribing congregation readers saw themselves in relation to a new United States, where the enemies of the United States were the enemies of God.

The state would no longer be the adversary of the Friends. War would no longer be the oppositional antipode of Peace. Fascism and Communism now stood as the
antagonist of the Friends’ Christianity. The absence of God was the opposite of Peace. The Friends had come completely under the spell of this new discursive chimera of Peace; and the catalyst for this conversion and embrace – the war born discursive formation of U.S. Civil Religion. It affirmed if you are not behind the United States, you are against it – and God.

In 1945, war-weary Americans and Ohio Valley Friends would see more stunning events. The death of a four-term president, the firebombing of Tokyo, V-E Day, V-J Day, and the birth of an hideous atomic age. Once again, the Friends would have to sift their newfound discourse of Peace through these dramatic events. F.D.R, their presidential nemesis, a president who oversaw the end of Prohibition to intoxicate their youth, drafted them, sent them to be killed, or incarcerated them in CO camps, had made the world safe for Christianity, the Four Freedoms, and God. The vanquished fascists of Europe could look forward to war trials and deprivations throughout starvation and bombed out landscapes. The firebombing of one night in Tokyo, March 25th, 1945 incinerated 80,000 to 100,000 godless enemies in twenty-four hours. Two more nuclear incendiary devices annihilating another 80,000 and 60,000 souls would ‘bring the boys home’. The Friends had to continually process these and other events through the last years of the war, not through their now defunct pacifism, and but through their new chimera of nationalist born Godly Peace.

At the beginning of 1945, with the war dragging towards its eventual denouement, *The Evangelical Friend* carried this editorial:
The tragedy is that nations of earth have two governments – the visible and the invisible, and the wars will continue so long as the invisible governments dominate. The chief function of these invisible governments is to satisfy the spirit of greed and selfishness. “Happy is that nation whose God is the Lord”. Christianity must awaken, and at the ballot box send Christian men and women to the seat of government for representation and forever ban a system of political puppets.  

Four years of the fine grinding of nationalist and patriotic fervor have brought the Friends to a place where they can imagine that they live in nation “whose God is the Lord”. This God “is the Lord” because he allowed the United States to win in the battle between “the two governments” in the world, one natural, one supernatural. Though bicameral, what process allows for these two to be fused into one? Voting for representation. Happy is the nation of a Good War. It was God’s War against the evils of communism and fascism. The conflations of the political and religious discursive formations here are startling, for if war was wrong, and not of God, ten years previously - or 300 years ago for that matter - and now war was right, a powerful catalyst had altered this time-born discourse of Peace. This catalyst was a new U.S. Civil Religion.

The same editorial valiantly struggles to continue in bewilderment: “For centuries nations have sought peace through every conceivable channel except the Prince of Peace. Peace is like character, it that it cannot be purchased, legislated, nor achieved through force or man-made treaties. Peace is one of the fruits of the Spirit, a by-product of right thinking”. The Friends have completely un-tethered the doctrine of Peace from the practice of pacifism. Standing up to a government (an invisible government?), defying a foreign policy, being a CO, incarcerating youth, these are as vain as trying to gain Peace that “cannot be purchased, legislated, nor achieved through force or man made treaties”.
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The Friends have almost completely slipped the bounds of reason as they still valiantly try to hold peace in rationality.

With much bravado, the February 1945 issue of *The Evangelical Friend* lists seven areas of focus for church health: “1) Church Attendance, 2) Growth in Grace, 3) Loyalty to your Church…(read *The Evangelical Friend*), 4) Pray and labor for the Programs of the Church, 5) Serve in the business of the Church, 6) Be Financially responsible to the Church, 7) Observe your conduct and conversation.”52 Pacifism is conspicuously and completely absent. Peace similarly is vacated. Staunchly advocated, proscribed, defined 1945 Friends’ practice has dropped both Peace and pacifism.

The concerns of Kate Smith’s “This is My Country” for the Friends are now prayer and vigilance, as the work of the Good War comes to an end.53 With death of F.D.R., the May 1945 *Evangelical Friend’s* lead editorial offers the quoted words of then President Truman:

> May we Americans live up to our glorious heritage…At this moment, I have in my heart a prayer. As I assume my heavy duties, I humbly pray to Almighty God, in the words of Solomon ‘Give therefore thy servant an understanding heart to judge thy people, that I may discern between good and bad. For who is able to judge this thy so great a people’ I ask only to be a good and faithful servant of my Lord and people.54

The editorial followed with the closing: “Thus did President Truman close his first address to congress on April 16th. As these words went out over the air, the heart of every true American who heard them must have been thrilled with solemn emotion.”55

U.S. Civil Religion had fused ‘America / God / Friend / Peace’ completely into this single sign of a president. The president signifies America. America signifies God. The Friends are true Americans.
The editorial completes this fusion of the four parts of this Civil Religion.

These are crisis days in the history of our world and our nation. Fundamental and far-reaching issues hang in the balance. Will the leadership of our country be in the hands of godless men, or men of prayer, like Washington and Lincoln, who made our nation great. What will the world order be following the war? Will it be a world where militarism and Communism are dominant, or will the best political traditions of England and America hold sway?56

The concern here is for “our nation” (the United States previously the Friend’s avowed adversary), to be caught in the hands of godless men. And who are the paragons of this godliness? President Washington, who marshaled a godless war against a king in defiance of the biblical injunctions to pay taxes as encoded in Romans 13, a war the Friends of history refused to participate in, and President Lincoln, the recipient of the Mt. Pleasant Meeting's strenuous letter denouncing both his prosecution and participation in a Civil War. Communism and militarism are conspicuously conjoined, wherein the unspoken tandem of capitalism and militarism is left unsaid, these same exact traditions of England that drove the original Quakers to their ardent pacifism in the seventeenth century.

The conversion to this new discourse of Peace was complete down to the single congregational member, youth, - and soldier. Succeeding issues of The Evangelical Friend never mention pacifism throughout 1945 (or 1944 for that matter), never question the war, nor the President, nor the military. Even soldiers writing to The Evangelical Friends conspicuously never question the war: “Are they praying for us at home? …Are they meeting at our Father’s throne, that we may be kept from faltering when we are standing alone…We thank them for all their money, we thank them for all their care …we
need so much more their prayer.”57 Is there ever a call to prayer to stop the fighting of a world war? Is there ever a call to implore the nation to stop all hostilities? Is there ever a prayer petition at the “throne” of God to chastise those involved the sin of war, and have He who sits the throne, bring all hostilities to an end?

Truman’s call to the nation permeated right down to the very pages of The Evangelical Friend, resonating perfectly with the new discourse of Peace the Friends had embraced. Peace now inextricably entwined with the welfare of a nation that had fought the Good War with God on their side. An editorial called Ohio Valley Friends to recall that, “From time to time in the history of our Nation, The call to prayer has been made to resound throughout the land. At the taking of the Presidential Office, Mr. Truman asked the praying people of the nation to pray that he might be “A good servant of his Lord and of the Nation.”” The Friends asked themselves to act on behalf of their president in a manner that they had held as their own for 300 years – supernatural prayer. They reaffirmed this with a final rejoinder calling for, “A ringing call to prayer that will reach every Christian in America is certainly in keeping with general need and with the will of God. LET ALL CHRISTIANS DO THEIR PART FOR THEIR OWN SAKE, THE CHURCH’S SAKE, AND THE NATION’S.” 58 A foundational practice of a religious group – prayer – was enlisted to the service of a single nation. The Ohio Valley Friend, Jesus Christ, the United States were now of one accord. The ultimate supernatural practice of prayer – speaking to the very God of one’s faith – was now enjoined in symmetrical practice, praying for the “sake” of the Friends, Jesus Christ, and – the United States of America – victor of World War II.
The transformation from pacifist to patriot was complete. With the re-centering of God as the giver of Peace to the beneficiary of Peace, the Ohio Valley Friends had moved from pacifist to patriot countering 300 years of tradition. Any identity the OYM had sought defying the previously godless United States which had waged war trying to use their youth had been completely enfolded into that same state. Becoming more fearful of the imagined enemies of freedom and democracy – communism, fascism, and godlessness – the Friends bought into the civil religion that would defend America from those enemies. Defending America became one in the same as defending God. In the transformation the Friends lost both their youth in a CO camp for four years and their heritage of 300 years. Their youth were to have been the repository of the fading identity as pacifist. As they lost their youth, so did they lose their identity of pacifists in World War II. They abandoned pacifism, following their God to a new sacred place of worship – The United States of America – World War II victor over godlessness. The remaining youth in the Camp Coshocton were their epitaph.
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CHAPTER VII

THE COLLAPSE OF PACIFISM IN CAMP COSHOCTON, 1944 -1945

A striking portrait of the collapse of pacifist commitment in CPS Camp #23 can be drawn from internal memos and bulletins. That collapse and loss of commitment was matched by the ongoing deterioration and ambivalence exhibited among the organizations through which the Friends operated. These included the Friends’ national organization, the AFSC, the CPS, the NSBRO, and of course the SSA. The ongoing discussions among these groups at the local, state and national levels evidenced the decline and ambivalent stance the Ohio Yearly Meeting of Friends experienced. The firewalls the Friends had set in place in the camp’s inception year of 1941 eroded in the Friends’ loss of a commitment battered by growing U.S. nationalism and violent foreign policy. Friends in both Camp Coshocton and the Ohio Valley found themselves absorbed into an emerging U.S. Civil Religion. In this new hybrid, God was not the adversary of U.S. foreign policy but the promoter and beneficiary. The God who gave the Ohio Valley Friends their pacifism now blessed and sanctioned youth fighting on two continents, not pacifist youth in a CO camp in Ohio.

In Camp Coshocton, this ambivalence emerged as early as August 1943, one year after the camp’s founding. A camp director’s communication to the CPS in Washington detailed a variety of ills ranging from staff problems to the larger issue of educational programs going adrift. The ingraining process was losing its impetus. More telling was
the debate among the men at Coshocton as to whether they should become involved in more ambitious programs outside Camp Coshocton such as the training in international relief work, a questioning of commitments that could be more important than sitting in a soil conservation camp defying the government. Of the 101 internees at the camp in mid-1943, many were enthusiastic to commence outside training. Dismay and anger followed when the SSA effectively forbade any such ventures. Across the United States, the Selective Service scuttled the training and deployment of any CO outside the borders of the United States. Such virtuously-perceived service as aiding relief workers in Europe or Mexico, were now beyond the bounds of any CO.

During this same time, another CO camp in nearby Carroll County became available because of low numbers. The camp, known as “NYA,” had extensive facilities and equipment which the SSA saw as a possible site for an “Induction Center” for any future COs. The internees at Camp Coshocton were interested in serving as the trainers and inductee managers for new CPS recruits. They also wanted to use the camp as a training center for the Relief Development Service. Theirs was an ambitious plan in which internees would leave Camp Coshocton, and serve in non-militarized and post-militarized countries, to rebuild and ‘develop’. The SSA response completely dismissed this proposal. The response of the internees begins to show the initial misgiving of the Friends’ involvement with Camp Coshocton; they disparaged being put to the side for any service outside the confines of the camp.¹ The director blatantly spoke of pulling out of the CPS.

Speaking of the importance of a training program leads me to another point I wish to take up – at least mention. I have been just a little concerned to see so much in the way of letters from 101 men and others to the effect that the loss of
this program means it is time for the Friends to pull out of C.P.S. I, too, think it is very important for us to think seriously about the question of Friends continuing on the C.P.S.  

Ambiguity and ambivalence on behalf of the Friends were starting to weigh on Camp Coshocton. Failed projects and loss of direction conspired to bring about the beginning of the eventual disconnect from their ambitious project, to use their youth to forge and strengthen their pacifist supernatural identity. Failure to implement the teaching of their scriptures paled in the face of failures of their secular projects denied by the government. Without this government how could identity be forged? Being at loggerheads with this same government stood as the fulcrum of identity, yet in the face of failed proposed programs, mere objection and dissent would not be enough. These initial misgivings would give way to a flood of struggles to disengage themselves from this very forge of their identity – Camp Coshocton.

The evolution of this ambivalence towards the U.S. government was further compounded for those outside and inside the camp. A virulent letter two months later dated July 7, 1943 sent by a group of the internees bore stark witness to the Friends’ project in jeopardy.

Dear Fellow CPS Men,

The abrupt action of Congress in denying COs the opportunity to train for relief and reconstruction work in colleges, or to engage in such work outside of the United States is a setback to the hopes of us all. … A few may see in the Civilian Public Service reasons why they should take a stand against conscription as well as war by leaving CPS and we respect their convictions. The great majority of us will continue to think in terms of overcoming the evils of war and conscription through a testimony of service.
There is ambivalence as to how to defy the government. The CPS system with its public service activities may no longer suffice. A negative act by the government, entering into a foreign war, was now eclipsed by even a greater travesty, the frustration of the internees trying to forge their counter-identity in an expanded direct service that would identify them as opposed to the war. Cleaning up and rebuilding the aftermath of war would be better than whiling away a war in a soil camp. The zeal for pacifism was fading. The letter continues by defining a serious reflection point for each objector’s identity – local society:

How well are we doing this job? One way to find out is to see what people in the local communities in which we are working think of us. Do they look upon us as idlers leading a soft existence while others are giving their lives on battlefields? What do our work supervisors think of us? Government employees are often the ones upon whom we must chiefly rely to convey out testimony for service to the outside world. If our actions lead them to think ill of us, we are rendering the cause of peace a disservice.4

Abandonment of the cause, as evidenced by leaving the CPS in reaction to a detrimental act of the government, now was cast in the refraction of the local populace, and how they might view the internees. The local populace stood as the proxy witness, standing in for the nation. Their perception as to ‘who’ the Friends’ internees were was replaced by society’s view. Note even the government’s opinion served to vouch for identity – “Government employees are often the ones upon whom we must chiefly rely to convey out testimony for service to the outside world.”5 How would adult Friends see such deference?

Outside perceptions of the Friends, both by the government and society as a whole, were crucial in the structuring of their identity. The identity they sought was
realized not only in their own minds, but also in the minds of the surrounding society. A group does not gain counter culture status unless that group identity is refracted off other surrounding groups, thereby granting the status of ‘counter culture’.\(^6\) This ongoing need for evaluation and reaffirmation is evident in the musings and deliberations over the COs’ having been denied the opportunity to serve in over-seas relief work.

The realization has sometimes been brought home to us that our opportunities for service are not as great as we should like. Does the current action of Congress reflect the view of the public that we have not yet earned the right to greater opportunities for service? If the government which has conscripted us does not have as broad a view of how we can be of service as we have, is the reason for refusing to be of maximum usefulness in the ways open to us?...Faithful and continuous service in a situation of conscription is not easy.\(^7\)

The conditions and perceptions, which constituted the oppositional identity formed by the state, constituted the identifiers of the Friends as a counter culture. Conscripted by the military, they were bodily subjects of the state, interned for their conscientious objection. How the state framed them and treated them subsequently defined how they were seen in the “public eye”. Once interned the state was overwhelmingly the source of their identity. Yet, the Friends themselves sought to forge a further identity apart from these imposed formations, by becoming international relief workers. Ironically, and completely explicably, they sought this identity through relief work, which was integrally intertwined with, and in remediation of, the damages and machinations of the dominant group’s highly dubious foreign policy. Through all their maneuverings, the intersection between them and the state was between the Friends’ pacifism and the state’s militarism. The two entities become locked into a dyad where the identity of the sub-group came from resisting the dominant group.
Internees became concerned over how much complicity with the dominant group devalued a subgroup’s identity and its integrity. This comes to light in the further correspondence mulling over these implications.

There are some in C.P.S. who are concerned because pacifists in the historic peace churches have become involved in the application of penalties to enforce conscription regulations. Because the historic peace churches desire to see the fullest potentialities of CPS realized, they have accepted their administrative role even though it involved some unwanted limitations imposed by the Selective Service. Those who feel concerned that the present camps are an unsatisfactory compromise now have an opportunity to attend a camp where they are directly under the government. 8

The signers of this letter were the more ardent internees, as attested by their names affixed to other educational programs, flyers, and memorandums. They provide a valuable insight into the increasing ambivalence over the identity dyad of Friends’ COs and the US government. 9 To maintain the ongoing symbiotic relationship, the letter notes that some CO participants had actually become vassals to the government agendas and were involved in the implementation of punitive aspects in the SSA agenda against COs. Coupled with the SSA’s previous act to truncate the actions and subsequent identity of the COs as relief workers, the pathology of the dyad becomes even more apparent. The state deemed the CO not worthy of performing international relief service, and remanded them to the tasks of the former CCC camp – in this case, digging in the soil under the guise of soil conservancy. Such compulsion itself underscores the vital nature of this dyad relationship. The Friends' COs, striving for increasing identity markers gained through more national and even international service, while still defining themselves in opposition to the war, were effectively denied their quest for these same identity
markers. Their source for counter identity was actually drying up even while the greater agenda of the war reached far deeper in the economy, politics and culture.

Ambivalence is not difficult to discern. The same letter details, “We at CPS #23 welcome communications from the rest of you to bring us closer together in purpose and action. As long as we are drafted, let us be thankful that we can work for peace, not war, and make the most of our opportunities at the same time as we seek greater ones.” Such a plea underscores that the shrinking arena for identity formation could be found only within the purview and will of the state. Incarceration became doubly difficult due to the curtailment and deprivation of the expanded identity markers the COs desperately sought. As from the beginning, all this was executed in tandem with the State.

Ambivalence and deterioration of the Friends’ agenda continued into 1943. Multiple letters from Camp #23, the CPS, and the NSBRO moved among Coshocton, Philadelphia and Washington, all addressing the eventual and desired imminent extraction and detachment by the Friends at large from Camp Coshocton. Despite the zeal of the few, internees were become fewer – and culturally wiser. The Friends’ pacifist zeal of 1930s, so well inculcated into their youth, retained some traction, but as the relentless war dragged on, further disciples become fewer and fewer. A ubiquitous, omnipresent atmosphere of nationalism, with its fervor to support the troops, (the complete antithetical markers of the COs), made the rarified zeal of pacifism difficult to practice even in an isolated CO camp. Nationalist culture reached into remote barracks of the camp, dimming the pacifist zeal of sunny Beulah Beach camp meetings ten years earlier. The ideological debate of War, Peace, and God aside, the discussion of detaching the Friends from the
oversight of the camp had lost most of its ideological footing and devolved, as early as 1943, to such mundane issues as cost and maintenance.

A cover letter attached to a requested denominational report dated 23 November 1943 asked for a summary of the ongoing expenses of the camp in anticipation of a Methodist takeover. The camp census at the time was 19 Methodists, 9 Friends, 7 men with no affiliation, 4 Jehovah’s Witnesses, 4 Presbyterians, 2 Congregational-Christians, and “one each who are members of the Evangelical, Lutheran, Disciples of Christ, and Moslem Churches.” The camp director goes on to ask, “I would appreciate it if thee could let me have detailed information on the cost of operation of the camp for the last six months.” This was accompanied by a request for “information on whether any of the men among the 49 have been contributing toward their own maintenance or whether their churches have contributed to their support.”

Such querying about the local and national support by the various pacifist denominations calls into question the actual commitment to the pacifist agenda, including that of the local Ohio Yearly Meeting. OYM *Evangelical Friend* newsletters paint a similar picture with pleas for funding for COs in the face of anemic financial support. (Chapter VII). The letter goes on to address the proposed dissolution of camp trusteeship:

> It seems to me that this might be a useful way of making a start toward reducing the number of men under Friends direction. I believe it would be possible to point out to the men in the camp that Friends are glad that other groups are assuming a more responsible participation in the program, and then find out how many men desire to remain or be transferred to existing special projects out to Brethren or Mennonite or government camps.

The signatory was Paul French, Executive Director for the NSBRO, evidencing that, as of November 1943, the Friends were actively seeking assistance to be relieved of Camp
#23. Both internees and local Ohio Valley Friends were losing pacifist stamina within almost two years from the camp opening, and stood in ready concert with national Friends’ organizations to let Camp #23 stop being a battleground of opposition to the United State’s foreign policy. The initial zeal that drove them to incarcerate their own youth so as to set themselves in virulent opposition to the U.S. government and its foreign policy agendas had passed through its waxing stage and was now waning.

Correspondence through the year of 1944 shows how earnestly the Friends tried to extricate themselves from their original project and obligations. Multiple religious groups were approached, either directly by AFSC, or through the proxy of NSBRO. An equal number of groups declined. Pacifist kin groups were approached in the early stages. Eventually even farther-removed groups such as the more mainstream Baptists would be approached.

Correspondence in 1944 concerning the Baptist discussion is especially revealing as to what underlying discursive formations permeated the negotiations. The Director of the CPS wrote to the Acting Director, “It is thought that the cooperation of such groups as the Baptists, the Disciples of Christ and other religious groups in the actual administration of CPS will very clearly strengthen the position of pacifists generally.”¹³ Yet further discussion shows a surprisingly ambivalent attitude by other U. S. denominations towards pacifism.

It would be the first time that they actually involved themselves in denominational support of a group of conscientious objectors. It has been quite evident that these churches are not going to be able to shake off the conscientious objector groups in the future and the sooner that they get acquainted with the knowledge that this is so (that the church has a responsibility), the better we feel it will be. To put it very
baldly, if we got the Episcopal church, for instance, to operate a camp it would go a long way toward making the whole process “respectable.”

Such references in a discussion between the actual camp, and the offices of the C.P.S., the custodial oversight group, shows the emerging fault lines in public, denominational, and national perception. The perceptions in this exchange, as to what even constituted a conscientious objector, almost define them as pariahs and outcasts of the society at large, a same society heavily embroiled in a national foreign policy undergirded by two years of growing God-based nationalism. The newsletters of the OYM, delivered to homes of local Friends ‘congregants enjoiners them to “remember the boys” and “pray for the President.” Following such a nationalist trend, the OYM Friends themselves would pen similar sentiments in their own editorials as a dominant Civil Religion slowly elided the Friends’ 300 years of pacifism. Years of well-honed tenets and attitudes, all rooted in pacifism, were fading into the larger context of U.S. nationalism. The ‘correct’ religion now bore marks of a far larger nationalist civil religion that condoned war.

The appeal to the prestige of larger denominations such as the “Episcopal Church” proves telling. In the writer’s mind, small, regional, traditional pacifist groups such as the Friends evidently did not carry the same status as other larger, national denominations in the religious landscape. The so-called “Mainline” Presbyterian, Lutheran, Episcopal, and Methodist churches dotted every corner of the majority of American towns and cities, including the very same town and cities of the small Ohio Valley Friend’s meetings. These were the ‘Norman Rockwell’ churches pictured with fathers and mothers walking white-gloved daughters and short-pants sons to nearby
steeple not strident pacifists heading to ‘meeting houses’ and denouncing the ‘Good War’ with its boy soldier acolytes. Mainline churches were the denominations of the established and respected attendees, the ‘pillars of society’ in each town in the Ohio Valley. These denominations would supply roster after roster of young men, filling out the soon-to-be half million plus U.S. dead of World War II. And these were the denominations providing the scores of chaplains who would pray for blessings from God on the battlefields, not neglecting to also pray for blessings over the Presbyterian, Lutheran, Episcopalian and Methodist fallen youth who had patriotically gone to fight for these very churches and their constitutional right to freedom of religion. At least the involvement of one of these churches, a cited “Episcopal” church might add some respectability to the culturally debilitated pacifist movement. How far the Friends had come as a counter culture sub group. A foreign policy of violent conflict two different oceans away was shaping radical discursive formations, even in the small communities of the Ohio Valley.

Non-ideological ironies of the time evidenced how even the material needs of conscientious objectors caused further encumbrances. They had become pariahs needing financial support. They were effectively wards of the state. Many non-mainline and mainline denominations declined to take Camp Coshocton over. Numerous letters from the pacifist churches of the NSBRO describe either a financial incapacity to undertake the camp, or hesitancy to be involved with the idea of a pacifist camp of COs. Such an undertaking by a larger well-known denomination would hardly appear socially appropriate while other youth of the church might come home wounded or dead. The reality of such after-effects of foreign policy – the homecoming wounded or dead –
created such pointed discursive formations, that any contrary religious views were completely erased. It would be hard to say that one’s national church financially supported another Christian church’s children in a CO camp while holding memorial services for the children of your own congregants. Religious discourses can drown in the swell of foreign policy.

Churches offered many reasons for refusing to take on the sponsorship of the camp. The ever-so-closely related pacifist Mennonites of the Ohio Valley refused to take over the camp, citing the financial constraints of having other camps. Baptist, in another series of letters, exhibit a marked ‘approach-avoidance’ attitude as they suggest they “might be able” to generate the needed funds from their “unused Home Missions budgets,” only to then question the intention of such a project, and subsequently decline. The variety of excuses illustrate how many Christian cousins of the Friends found themselves in the thrall of a new nationalism and its attendant Civil Religion with a God, who anointed foxholes and rifles, not the peacemakers of the Gospels. Cultural institutions such as religious groups are just as susceptible to cultural discourses as non-religious groups.

By April of 1944, in their quest to relieve themselves of the camp, the Friends began to think the unthinkable—fiduciary and administrative complicity with the United States government. They resumed extensive correspondence with the SSA to take over the camp. The very locus creating their identity as internees, and the very agency and prosecutor of the United States’ aberrant foreign policy, the SSA, along with its progenitor, the State, had moved from nemesis to possible partner. Their quest for identity stood as neither the short nor long-term goal for the Friends. The immediate
short-term goal - separation from a CO camp – was all the Friends could work towards.
A letter of that month showed that the idea of having the SSA take over the camp had
been broached and was creating new problems in its wake. The acting director, an
internee (ALPHA-3), expressed concern over the very nature of such a relationship. He
wrote in a letter to the AFSC offices in Philadelphia: “It seems to me that with a change
in administration imminent for this camp it is high time some attention was given
consciously to the matter of alternatives for the men here who will not wish to remain
here under the new administration, especially if it is a government camp.” He further
underscored “I am quite sure that the SSA will not want to keep men who do not want to
be in a govt.”

Obviously the Friends in the camp and the AFSC both conspired to rid themselves
of the camp, deferring the responsibility to their previously identified antagonist. In
appearances prescient, APLHA -3’s assessment of the U.S. government’s attitudes
towards the COs would prove much later to be the opposite. The government would keep
these same men in the camp far into 1946, past military demobilization. Some of the
camps demobilized as late as 1947. In the immediate moment though, this evaluation,
that the remaining fervent COs (himself included) and SSA government overseers hardly
would make good camp mates (as had been recognized when the camp started), shows
the ongoing tension still within the camp. Principles were being abandoned, yet the same
internees were not willing to sacrifice their corporeal status to the State. How could they
face an ideological loss and also a physical loss of themselves into a more contrived
status of the body politic? Military government overseers in the camp would completely
obliterate their remaining separate counter identity.
ALPHA-3 continued this line of thinking: “If the SSA takes over here, there will probably be 20 to 30 men wishing to move” (hand corrected to “15” to “20”). A tension rooted in the initial discursive formation founded in the 1942 inception of the camp, that a ‘political body’, free from the tendrils of the state, both from its military pursuits, and its physical control by a draft and incarceration, was fundamentally being fueled in these considerations of turning the camp over to state control. These developments were only the beginning of the erosion of the staunch pacifist tenets. In less than one year, any support for CO Friends who were following their supernatural consciences, would wash out in a tide of nationalist fervor celebrating a state that was victorious in war.

This intra-fraternal tension between Camp Coshocton internees and the national pacifist organization of the AFSC repeatedly surfaced in an ongoing subtext of abandonment felt by the internees. How could a national Friends’ organization, in tandem with extant Friends’ church congregations in the Ohio Valley, have so readily let go of their pacifist tradition in the gale of nationalist militarism? How could similar Friends’ groups with similar heritages of pacifism absolve themselves of the care of their own conscientious objector youth? In a letter dated June 1944, acting director ALPHA-7 wrote to the CPS in Philadelphia, bluntly explaining, “[a] question that comes to mind is the future of the fellows with the AFSC. Many feel Coshocton has been the neglected child…” Such a rift, emblematic of the shifting fervor for pacifism in both national and local organs, was exacerbated by the cultural winds of militarism. Those in the camps stood at direct variance with those at a distance in Washington, who now were more in accord with those of the Ohio Valley in supporting the war. All three were still tethered
in a relationship with a state advancing its own agenda. CO Friends in a remote camp were acting out their supernatural discourses. Pacifist national organizations in Washington were acting through their nationalist mediated pacifism. Local Ohio Valley congregants in Friends’ meetings were acting out their severely tempered supernatural discourses by lagging in their support for them, while sending their coming-of-age youth to fight in a ‘Good War’. It still was the state that was the central locus for all these identities. All the involved constituents in this dilemma gained their identity from how they were in relation to the state and its foreign policies. One war in many nations defined the identities of those on the soil in the Ohio Valley.

The true nature and depth of this rift and ever growing cultural detachment by the Friends, became very pronounced by mid-April when, in the wake of ongoing polite search for another pacifist group to take over the camp, the Friends continued to ask for SSA oversight. The reciprocating reactions and attitudes of the SSA were equally disjointed. A camp project supervisor wrote, “…that the number of applications for transfer into the Coshocton camp had been submitted to Selective Service in Washington in the past few month, and that almost all the requests had been denied or are being held up for some reason unknown to him…”21 The antagonistic and adversarial relationship between the state and the Friends continued to be a impediment. The SSA was denying any further internees to even run the camp properly as a Soil Conservation facility. The dissenting internees were similarly being positioned as the imagined enemies of the millions of patriotic youth. The SSA, in its response to continue the incarceration of the internees with no explanation, returned repeated explanations of misapprehension over financial and custodial responsibility where neither the national nor local bodies in the
forms of the AFSC or OYM chose to provide the support of their own internees. It was hardly in the SSA’s interest to increase their involvement in a camp that defied the patriotic militarism of which they were custodian. 1944 could hardly be a year to be coddling dissenters, or for that matter, to have the appearance of enabling them. To starve the camp of future workers and imperil the meaningful operation of the camp would be one way for the SSA to feign a high-profile patriotic posture, both for itself and the public.\(^22\)

The final endeavor of the Friends was crystallized in a letter dated April 13, 1944 from the Director of the CPS to the NSB: “Paul Furnas has given me permission to make the next move in connection with the transfer of Coshocton to some other agency. I shall write a letter today to the National Service Board stating that it is our understanding that the Soil Conservation Service has assurance that the camp will be maintained even if the agencies withdraw, and we are therefore, requesting that we be relieved of responsibility for its maintenance at the earliest date.”\(^23\) The die was cast. The Friends through all official channels had openly declared their lagging support for Camp Coshocton. If truly financial, it was only symptomatic of the fiduciary straits of the rank and file meetings caught in a war torn economy. If it was ideological wavering, then it was symptomatic of the hegemony of patriotic fervor, in direct opposition of pacifist dissent. In either, or combined cases, the Friends had been overwhelmed in the pursuit of the identity as a counter culture. They explicitly asked to disassociate from the project they had valiantly started two years prior; their remaining youth in the camp left to their own devices, while any other youth that could have potentially been sequestered and sheltered from the tides
of war and militaristic fervor scattered. The identity of a Friends’ youth was no longer what it had been in the previous decade.

A solitary letter in April 1944 summarized the failure for those who had entered the camps, those who never had entered, and those who never would. The identity the Friends had sought had evaporated into the mist of American Exceptional fervor. The ‘boys’ in the foreign lands (and in state-side cemeteries) were ‘winning’ the war – the ‘Good War’. God was pleased. And those who had opposed it were not to be counted among those ‘boys,’ they could just as easily be lumped with the ‘othered’ categories of ‘Japs’, ‘Krauts’ and, soon to come, ‘Commies’. The identity the Friends had sought for themselves, and their youth, had devolved into a one of ‘pariah’. Abandoning the camp confirmed this in the eyes of the SSA, the rank and file Friends in local congregations, and the remnant of Camp #23 in Coshocton, Ohio. This attempt to dissolve the camp was a stunning anti-climactic denouement and epitaph to the Friends’ previous zeal and commitment to pacifism. The process to transfer the camp administration to the SSA started in April of 1944, dragged on through the end of the war in 1945, and into demobilization in March 1946. During that protracted time, the CPS and AFSC were never relieved of the administration until the camp’s final closing. Negotiations to transfer the camp to another interested religious group continually fell through. The SSA, in their wariness, threw up roadblocks and made demands, and never took over the camp until it was demobilized, emptied, closed and returned to the pre-war vestiges of SCS. Demobilization of the internees dragged on after the war due to the feared objection of the major veterans’ groups. The American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, both having their national conventions in the fall of 1945, precluded any fall release of
internees, leaving once-valiant objectors, drafted in as internees, forgotten as millions of troops returned to the states.

President Truman himself called the problem of CO demobilization a foreign policy issue. Concern with the ongoing diplomatic intrigues of the new emerging world order precluded any elimination of peacetime conscription. Subsequently the internees continued to be seen as drafted conscientious objectors under the Selective Service Act of 1940, even in the absence of war. They still did not warrant release even from peacetime service. An irony emerged here: the very catalyst that caused the internees to enter into this netherworld of incarceration, a period of errant foreign policy in war, remained the same one causing their incarceration in a period of peace.

Proposed and actual oversight of the camp continued to be a bone of contention for the remaining internees. A hand-recorded poll on 6 July 1944, lists “21 men” responding out of the “27 present at meal” (it is worth noting that as the years progressed the internees were referred to as “men” with greater frequency). The coveted Friends’ ‘youth’ of Beulah Beach faded with the passing of time. One of the essential pillars of contrived identity – the discursive formation of ‘youth’ – likewise faded into ennui and dissipation. Out of the eleven of the twenty polled, one voted for “Govt. Adm.” (government administration). Nine voted for “Church Adm.,” one voted “no preference.” A second hand-written poll listing first, second and third preferences followed a Friends’ pattern of seeking consensus in disagreement rather than in majority.\(^\text{25}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Govt. adm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends adm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist adm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While further underscoring the aversion to Baptist oversight, which was assuredly related to a deeper-simmering resentment to the duplicity therein, the first, second, and third preferences still revealed a dissipation even among those who would still cling to the pacifist agenda. A “5” in first place, yet “8” in second for Friends’ oversight, pales in the shadow of a “12” for government take over.

Throughout the entire dissolution of 1944 and 1945 this disconnected relationship between the interned Friends and the Friends of the national boards and the Ohio Valley matched very closely, confirming the dissipation of zeal for their inherent pacifism and pacifist identity. Those in the camp weathering the quest for identity would flag in tandem with those who sough symbiotic identity in their local congregation and national boards. All were surrendering to the very entity they had fought against – the U.S. government. Writings in monthly newsletters and correspondence of the local congregations paralleled this year to year, and confirm the general crisis between the interned and those who had interned them.27

The ambivalence continued for months. OYM Friends were trying to remain true to the cause, yet continually appealing to the national organ the AFSC to effect the transfer. Eventually the AFSC apparently wholeheartedly concurred. A memo titled “Memo # 453” addressed to all camp directors and unit directors under the direction of the AFSC read in part as follows:

…It is the judgment of the American Friends Service Committee – Civilian Public Service executive staff that negotiations should be undertaken to transfer the maintenance and administration of Camp Coshocton to the Selective Service System and that those men who desire to leave the camp under such circumstances be provided
opportunities to transfer to camps to units administered by historic peace churches…

The most prominent national organ of the Friends had reflected the evolving sentiments of both the internees and the local Ohio Yearly Meeting. Ennui had now collapsed in acquiescence and surrender. There were no substantial numbers of youth to be saved from the state’s foreign policy. There were no viable causes to rally and struggle for in the name of pacifism. And the avidly-sought counter cultural identity, so coveted by the Ohio Valley Friends, dissolved into patriotism, militarism, and nationalism, all erasing whatever ‘difference’ the Friends’ thought would afford them through any constructed identity. The internees, the youth of the Ohio Yearly Meeting, and the national organ of the Friends, the AFSC, were all in alignment. Though pronounced, the end did not come quickly.

This palpable and apparent division, along with the erratic posturing of the Friends as a whole, created a dangerous perception within the SSA leadership overseeing the CO camp system. Assuming the SSA takeover of the camp as an accomplished fact, proved to be unwarranted. The SSA response proved equally erratic, and in the long term, the cause of ongoing misery and discord for the internees who no longer even had a pacifist cause célèbre.

When considered, further articulations of the internee’s actual views and attitudes were hardly encouraging to the SSA, and actually dissuaded them. A letter sent within two weeks of the AFSC resolve to turn the camp over to Selective Service bore even more testimony to a highly dysfunctional situation. The acting camp director described but another intra-camp poll where “6 people don’t want the Friends to even approach the SSA on the subject”, “7 people think the Friends should get out of Coshocton even if it
will surely mean closing the camp”, “3 want negotiations so that there will be no risk of Coshocton being closed as a result of them” and “6 did not choose to register their views.”

Trying to further explain the situation, the camp director in reality showed the depth of the dysfunction resulting from all the previous zeal, dilapidated ideology, supernatural enthusiasm, and ennui. Why would a government agency want to enter into a rehabilitative effort and relationship with such an aberrant group of dissenters? These internees hardly looked to be a group of gung-ho CPS fire-jumpers or sacrificing medical facility workers.

The letter continues: “This reinforces in my own mind that the middleman – AFSC – should be removed for this group in the hope that they will again feel the necessity and responsibility for making decision.” He further charged, “Also the future unhappiness will surely be laid at the feet of AFSC if the Service Committee continues at Coshocton.”

This stands as a scathing indictment of depleted ideological integrity and solidarity, yet would be readily explained by the preceding and emerging debilitation of the pacifist cause. Even though all were in agreement about the collapse, dissension remained over the loss of the cause itself. Also, such an explication from the very heart of the camp would have been a critical warning to the SSA, and would explain their eventual range of decisions and actions.

The impact of the shift became stunningly apparent within a month, as the Selective Service acted swiftly and in some regards ruthlessly. A letter dated August 17 revealed a CPS committee struggling to broach and negotiate the transfer. The response of the SSA was at complete odds to the intent of the Friends, the internees, and the CPS. The Executive Director of the NSBRO wrote to the AFSC on August 18:
This will confirm my conversation with thee this morning about the transfer of Coshocton from American Service Committee to Selective Service System. Colonel Kosch expressed a willingness to consider taking over the camp with the following understanding:
1) That no men would be transferred from the unit
2) That there would no assurance how long SSS would continue the Coshocton unit as a government camp
3) A request that we see if other agencies would be interested in assuming administrative responsibility.  

None of the desired resolutions to this ideological Gordian knot were to be realized with the SSA. The SSA was apparently acutely aware of the heritage of the camp, the ideological turmoil it had caused locally and nationally and the intense dysfunction that was waiting for the SSA’s arrival.

A report filed on Oct 11, 1944, by Lieutenant Colonel Franklin A. McLean, Inf. Field Rep. Camp Operations after a inspection of September 24, 1944 lists many minutia, reporting on a small, minimally-staffed and minimally-functioning camp, with its property “O.K.”, its infraction of rules “with appropriate action taken”, its education “already suspended for the summer”, with “movies every other week” and “S.S.S.” equipment “properly warehoused”. The final summary read, “Although small, the camp seems to be functioning quite well”.  

There were no further actions by the SSA. The camp would never fully be relinquished until the pen of Harry S Truman demobilized it a year after the end of the war. The ambition of the Friends ended with silence, in total subjugation, forced to continue what they did not even have the youth or commitment to pursue. The end of their quest at Camp Coshocton was abjection; disoriented pacifism collapsed into nationalism.
The activity of the last year of the camp continued to reflect this abjection. As the nation progressed tiredly through the 1945, hoping for victory in Europe or victory in Japan, those still interred in Camp Coshocton contended with ever-decreasing productivity, capacity, and morale. They were abandoned in principle by the Friends who still had to retain administration in situ per directive of the SSA, and they were abandoned by local Friends whose other youth served God in the U.S. military in far-off places fighting the Good War. Letters from these OYM youth-now-soldiers had started to fill the pages of *The Evangelical Friend*. The internees who continued to endure incarceration were reduced to a small contingent of divided and discouraged dissenters, . The acting camp director wrote to the CPS in January 1945:

…. We certainly get the feeling that we are going just the way we went all last year with nothing but a “forgotten child” attitude from Philadelphia. 
…. Camp is on the worst situation that it has been for a long while. Several of the new men are already anxious to get out, the old ones still stick right where they are. The educational program shows little life, but the personnel program just doesn’t exist. 
…No real decisions have been made for months, just putting them off. This may be a weakness in us, but you should be aware of it and make some moves to change the situation. The lack of such signs is the most discouraging thing to me. 
As you are well aware, I am getting “fed up” with it.\textsuperscript{33}

The ideological and administrative split between the Friends and those running the camp only compounded a situation where the internees saw themselves as “forgotten children” in a year when a nation looked forward with anticipation to an end of a drawn-out sacrifice both at home and abroad. The references to “new men” (those who were not part of the first wave of zeal versus the “old ones”) showed a markedly fragmented camp agenda not in one accord. Educational programs, the crown jewels of the first years when
the Friends showcased and ingrained their supernatural identity were moribund.

Personnel programs lay defunct with minimal leadership sent from the outside to be a guide the program. (The acting director had been in place since 1944, awaiting any new director sent from CPS). And the entire enterprise could readily echo the acting director’s dissent of being “fed up”.

The day-to-day grind of staying in the camp wore on the internees. One day was much like the next as the war wound down through V-E day and then V-J Day. As those days brought hope and exhilaration to those on battlefields, and joy to those living through four years of deprivation and fear in the Ohio Valley, what possible consolation could exist for the remaining internees? The war they had protested and sacrificed their freedom for was now the “won” war and would soon become enshrined forever as the “Good War” – ever so much more as “God’s War”. An atomic weapon ignited over a Japanese city was not a culmination of triumph for a CO internee but rather the total refutation of all that he had stood against. War had been atomized into an even more inhumane and “Un-Godly” travesty in the eyes of objecting Friends. The intense frustration from this macabre denouement intensified the fact that demobilization for the internees would be delayed, causing an even longer period of internment, and for the pettiest of reasons. Ostracized for having protested the now-won war, the internees remained in their eroded ideological prison, abandoned ideologically by the Friends and by the exultant, celebrating nation around them. Minimal attempts at strikes came and went as their fate faded from the state’s memory. Soldiers needing to be brought home consumed the nation’s mind far more.
The internees turned their keen energies towards pressuring the SSA and U.S. government into demobilizing the camps in accordance with the same post-war proceedings that were occurring with militarized draftees. The more inspired internees created a ‘Committee on Demobilization’ within the camp, and kept close contact with the CPS-wide parent organization of the same name hoping to exert pressure on the SSA for release from Coshocton. They also endeavored to engage other CPS camps in the movement with varying degrees of success. Various obstacles, including government bureaucracy, government apathy, veteran scorn, and even presidential anxiety, impeded the eventual demobilization of the Camp #23. A demoralizing memo from Nov 1, 1945 was sent by the Committee on Demobilization to the other camps telling them that any action by the government, through the maze of dealings with NSRBO, CPS and SSS would be postponed from December 3, 1945 of that year into March, 1946.34

External cultural pressures from both society and the state placed impediments for ending the internment of the small remnant at Coshocton. On November 1, the same day that the Committee on Demobilization sent their memo, the CPS Director wrote to the Director of Camp Coshocton:

….We do not see any probability of speeding up the dates on which men in the different years of service groups can apply for discharge until the [American] Legion Convention which commences on the 17th (December of 1945). We will watch the situation very closely and as soon as it is practical, we will reactivate and renew our efforts to get the discharge procedure speeded up.35

These same obstacles impeded the releases of internees from all of the of CPS units into summer 1946. The mere hint of offending a quasi-political social entity such as The
American Legion seemed to weigh on the minds of both the government and the President. Identity formation and investment were equally involved in such a showdown with a cultural bastion as the American Legion. Those who counted themselves as members of groups like the American Legion gained their social identity from a state-sponsored military foreign policy. To have ‘served’ in such a venture, wherever and whenever, granted the individual an identity through a government militaristic foreign policy. Ironically this constituted the sole quest of the Friends in their pursuit to place themselves in opposition to the same government policy. Yet here was a ‘non-government’ social grouping gaining bold identity from past government foreign policies, so intense that their opprobrium became both a real and imagined obstacle to the discharge of a present day CO; these COs had not served their country, they had defied it – and lived. Irony was not lost here. Nationalism, militarism and patriotism, crystallized in a post-war social group, once again trumped the CO’s supernatural dissent. The identity the Friends abhorred – militarism – still operated within the social culture and was holding them in incarceration. He continues:

…. If we do not get a fairly prompt and favorable response from Selective Service, then we will have to further consider the possibility of getting the President or certain Congressmen to interest themselves in the situation, and although I hope it will not be necessary because delay is inevitable in that case, we will consider what has been entirely impractical heretofore, namely a wide-spread public campaign to educate the public with the purpose of bringing an enlightened viewpoint to bear on Congress.37

First it is important to note that the writer had standing as a representative of the CPS and therefore is the defacto representative of the remnant of the Friends’ endeavor.
The irony emerges that as the final throes of the camp are subsumed in complete deference and obeisance to the government, the government emerges as the sole actor in this drama and the sole grantor of both reprieve and identity. And the reprieve came with a tacit granted identity of ‘deserter’, one who failed in serving the nation. Given this presupposition, there would be no need to even consider ‘freeing’ such individuals. The sought identity of pacifist became a negative social identity of ‘shirker’. And the CPS even realized that there stood a real need for promulgating an “enlightened viewpoint”, beyond the din of jingoism and patriotism, if the remnants in all the CPS units were ever to be freed.

The pacifism of the internees suffered one more blow: “…. The possibility of getting President Truman to act is not too bright because of his commitment to peacetime conscription and even more his preoccupation and apparent discouragement with many of the great national and world questions that haunt his office at the present time. Those who have seen him lately say that he is already beginning to show the effects of the burden.”

The final ultimate irony emerges in this assessment. That presidential concerns over national and world questions would prompt him to consider and eventually implement peacetime conscription is stunning to the pacifist stance. All their endeavors to protest, dissent, and fight the discursive formations of conscription that had ensnared the individual, placing him into the role of controlled citizen, were for naught. The original project was predicated on the conflagration of world war, a foreign policy from the “barrel of a gun”, and now with the war over, this very catalyst, this very antagonist evaporated, yet conscription remained. The entire project of the Friends’ pacifism has been subverted. One could become a body in the state apparatus even when there was no
war. And that body, once again, was defined by militarism. Emerging US nationalism and patriotism had transformed conscription into a peacetime discursive formation, without any war-based foreign policy.

As the final refrains of any pacifist fervor or religious zeal faded into post war national exhaustion in the spring of 1946, it was telling that one of the last communications to Camp Coshocton’s director from the CPS valiantly struggled to remind and rekindle that dissipated fervor. The letter offered a eulogy that the entire project, collapsed under the weight nationalism, deserved a proper commendation, one that could at least commemorate the initial endeavor. The CPS Director writes not of frustration with discharge dates but rather of a recollection for the men, of their purpose, their meaning, their identity:

…. Mankind stands on the threshold of a new era, and feelings of insecurity haunt all men of sensitive character. As C.P.S. men, we should feel considerably heartened by the very close association we have had with one another throughout the last few years. C.P.S. is as real as the vast experience of millions who struggle now for freedom. Desirous as we may be to put this experience behind us, let us approach our release with some sense of the stature it has added to our maturity. 40

Seemingly as aware of the surrounding cultural and political milieu as the men of Camp Coshocton would have readily been, this post-war director of the CPS was vainly trying to link the significance of the men’s identity, not to the great pacifist dissents of the past, but to the discourse of the newly nascent notion of “freedom”. Those “struggling now for freedom” were no longer weapon-carrying soldiers in the carnage of war. They were the millions of completely disposed and displaced starving residents of the same far away continents where the new discourse of Freedom had been born.
The nationalistic freedom-saving foreign policy of World War II had morphed into the pursuit of “Freedom” throughout the world for struggling peoples in the aftermath of fascism and tyranny. This was what was being offered to the internees as their wages of identity. Their salary at the end of the day was what they had struggled so vainly to refute: Freedom from the barrel of a gun. And the ammunition for that gun was the pervasive nationalism, patriotism and militarism that had pervaded the nation then, and permeated into the camp of dissent, Camp Coshocton.

The very God the Friends so ardently served was now the God of the United States. He continues: “As you counsel with the men who are released, we hope you will feel the desire of some to meet with other men in worship and in prayer and that you will provide this opportunity so that they will face the future with confidence and faith that comes from reliance on God himself”. 41

This vague last gasp of an exhortation underscored how, in its uncertainty, the very God he referred to, had been co-opted by the ever-pervasive nationalism and would continue to be so for decades to come. The same God who had impelled the internees into Camp Coshocton was now the captured Baal-God of the state who had persecuted them into the camps, accepting the child “sacrifice” to the new Moloch. And the Friends who had so tenaciously clung to the teachings of this God, and had likewise taught them to their youth for decades, now faced this religious discourse wrapped in terms like “Freedom”, “Democracy” and “Justice for All”. Like the Jews depicted in an Old Testament narrative, the Ark of the Covenant had been lost to the Philistines. The identity of ‘Pacifist’ for Jesus and God, now completely eclipsed by ‘Soldier’ for God and Country, was extinguished for the internees and the Friends, dying in a small Soil and
Conservation Camp on a state road in the Ohio Valley, The camp was run over by the weeds of a new world order, a new religious set of discursive formations, and a new now dominant discourse of “The Nation of the United States”, one day eventually to reach complete maturity as also “under God”.

The Friends’ identity was completely gone and negated in a new nation born in Peace, but populated with no pacifists. Trying to move their heritage and identity of pacifists into their own youth, they sacrificed their own youth through incarceration in a CPS camp, while losing their very God to a dominant cultural appropriation. The Ohio Valley Friends had stood silently both as witnesses and conquered.
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CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

The Ohio Valley Friends were an American religious group who inherited a religious heritage reaching back to seventeenth-century England. This heritage was grounded in scripture, doctrinal statements, tradition and spiritual inspiration. Multiple discourses formed this heritage, some tracing back to seventeenth-century England, and others to nineteenth- and twentieth-century United States. Though pivotal to their identity, these central tenets were highly mutable, some more than others. The single doctrinal tenet of pacifism proved to one of their most mutable as their staunchly clung to it through 200 years of conflicts and daily life in both the continent and Americas. Within the short span in World War II years the OYM had completely abandoned pacifism practice in the deliberations of their yearly meetings in deference to an overpowering U.S. Civil Religion that condoned and glorified war.

Two and half centuries of ardent pacifism had taken their toll on the social standing of the Friends, moving these Quaker pillars in colonial Pennsylvania to outliers. Increasingly marginalized for the reticent involvement in ongoing American conflicts, the Friends as they came to be known, fell more and more under the sway of newer emerging religious discourses including twentieth-century fundamentalism and millennialism. By the eve World War II, the stricken group felt besieged in their identity and by a looming war that would take their young militarism.
Similarly the Friends had appropriated an extant ageist discourse that caused them to set their youth apart in many forms. Contrary to ruling views of youth where economics and class determined attitudes towards children, the Friends strove to conversely educate their youth and instill strong spiritual values in them. Such an endeavor lead them to similarly intrain them with pacifism, ultimately incarcerating them into their own SSA sponsored CO camps at the beginning of World War II. Their fading identity would be strengthened. Their youth would be protected.

Within two years of this war-time endeavor, the Ohio Valley Friends had a sudden turn in their pacifist zeal. Asking the SSA to relieve them of all camp oversight, the Friends turned and embraced a new U.S. Civil Religion that condoned war as it confronted fascism and affirmed God as the author of a fight for freedom for all.

Religious groups are far more the product of cultural discourses in their time than of the power of their heritage. The Friends’ traditions of the seventeenth century were demonstrably tied into larger discourses of contemporary individualism, populism, piety, iconoclasm, and evangelicalism. The fall the Friends’ pacifism in World War II was far more explicable as a product of the extant fundamentalist and millennialist underpinnings leading them to embrace a new war-born U.S. Civil Religion. In the end, Peace became a discourse that was vouchsafed by its antithesis - war. Reaching for a fading identity the Friends clasped a new one where their God was served and blessed a militant United States of America.
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The Ohio Valley Friends in 1945 were still ardent pacifists in doctrine. They had
had changed not one word condemning war in their books of Faith and Practice.
They never would, still carrying their proscription against war even into 2011 as the
Evangelical Friends Church. That a keystone of a religious group’s identity – pacifism –
could be abandoned in the face of current events is a startling indictment of the plasticity
of a group’s orthodoxy in the streams of history. Such a deviation is more readily
explained as a function of how individual discourses are experienced, deployed, and
positioned among many other competing discourses. The Friends’ abandonment of
pacifism into embracing God-ordained, nationalist-driven war, conflict is a classic
instance of what poststructuralist theorists would identify as a paradigmatic shift.

Linguistically and semiotically, words can acquire meaning from either a
syntagmatic relation or a paradigmatic relation.

Whereas syntagmatic analysis studies the grammatical
‘surface structure’ of a text, paradigmatic analysis seeks to
identify the various paradigms (pre-existing signifiers)
which underlie the manifest content of texts. This aspect of
structural analysis involves a consideration of the positive or negative connotations of each signifier (revealed through the view of one signifier rather than another) and the existence of ‘underlying’ thematic paradigms (e.g. binary oppositions such as public/private. ‘Paradigmatic relations’ are the oppositions and contrasts between the signifiers that belong to the same set from which those used in the text were drawn.\(^1\)

The Friends’ discourse of Peace had moved from a syntagmatic relation wherein Peace was the absence (negation) of War (a syntagmatic binary) to a paradigmatic relation within their collective consciousness. Peace became the absence (negation) of Atheism (communism). Escaping the structuralist constraint of the oppositional binary of Peace/War, the Friends evolved a mediated discourse of Peace that was not in a syntagmatic binary anymore, but in a paradigmatic substitution where the assertion of Peace could be identified, by not the practice of pacifism, or the negating of war, but the practice of war to negate Atheism.

Peace in the 1940s became not the refutation of war anymore, but the refutation of atheism as ensconced in communism, making the simple conclusion for right practice waging war itself. Post structuralism’s assertion that meanings are continually contested and mutable is completely evidenced here. In the contest for meaning and identity, the sub-dominant Friends lost to the dominant discourse of U.S. nationalism locked into a war to defy fascism and communism. The Ohio Valley Friends now prayed for the Commander in Chief, for warriors, for their own youth soldiers, and consequently turned a blank gaze from the conscientious objector in a CO camp.

Herein lies a telling irony, as the Friends did not abandon any other of their eight foundational discourses. It is worth noting that all their other pivotal discourses, central to the identity of the Friends – Premillenial Time, Piety, the Individual, and Bible
Inspiration - along with the Friends’ latter day operational discourses – Theology, Age, and Nation (the State) - remained completely intact in both doctrine and practice. World affairs, saloons, movies, radio, flags, and modernity did not alter the orthodox meanings the Friends had given these other discourses in their identity. They were immutable both in their bequeathed inheritance from their predecessors and their bequeathed cultural capital to their youth.

Each of these seven unaltered foundational discourses is found well intact throughout the 1930s and 40s issues of The Evangelical Friend as also in the actions and deliberations of the Ohio Yearly Meeting. Embracing the contemporary evangelicalism of Finney and Moody, the Friends never flagged in their zeal to save as many souls as possible and bring them to the feet of a soon arriving Second Coming of Jesus. Youth camps and adult revivals always sought to bring converts to the altar in renewal. Consistent self-introspection and reliance on the Holy Spirit never waned in the Friends’ Piety, as every year after year the “questions” would be put to all church, quarterly meetings, and the Yearly meeting. The discourse of the Individual, always central in both orthodoxy and practice, still retained the primacy it always had. How one acted was what made an individual a true Friend. Gurneyite OYM Friends, in defiance of their Wilburite and Hicksite theological cousins, clung tenaciously to the discourse of Inspired Scripture in all their deliberations and writings save for the blatant ablating of all their Peace passages in submission to U.S. nationalism. The discourse of Theology remained firmly rooted in Scripture in defiance of all that modernity and mainline Protestantism could foment in Darwinian and Heilsgeschichte battles. The notion of a Nation remained one where that nation would be the landlord of a rented land wherein the Christian lived as
tenant farmer owing allegiance and obedience only under the provisos of Romans 13. And, of course, Age was immutably embedded in the collective consciousness of the Friends. Imperious to mediation, it was the sole chosen course of their quest for identity as a sub-dominant group. Peace was the sole foundational discourse altered during the war. The house of Friends had been raided and left with a changeling.²

The changeling left in the house of the Friends was a grotesque mutation of the previous Friends’ pacifism. Pacifism had been mutated through the nationalism of a new U.S. Civil Religion, bolstered by God blessed discourses of war permeating dominant denominational and national religious thought. This new accommodating discourse of Peace turned a blind eye towards the violent foreign policy of the dominant State. It instead condemned the practice of pacifism by any who would not protect God and country, ostracizing them through the discursive formation of CO internee. Now the true believer tacitly prayed for war efforts, soldiers and the Godly nation of the United States, while denying any of the foundational proscriptive verses of this same God’s scriptures condemning war. Verses vaunting Peace and condemning war were completely ignored in the new civil religion, and the practice of Peace – pacifism - was replaced with a foreign policy of war to make the world safe for Peace. This same foreign policy that had pilloried the Friends’ youth in a draft, marginalized the Friends’ identity as subversive, incarcerated Friends’ youth in camps, was now so overwhelming exalted, the identity the Friends had sought as Holders of Peace was gone. They were enfolded into the identity of the new United States, praying for nation, war, president, and soldier alike. These prayers were offered to the new God of civil religion, not the God who walked along the shores of Galilee.
The theorizing of Michel Foucault and other discursive theorists historiographically can explain such an historical event where a religious group self-immolates its identity in 1940s America? When a religious group is placed into a cultural context, a context wherein they are individuals sustaining a collective consciousness, shaped by both internal and external discourses, it is not difficult to see how the Friends were able to jettison their Peace discourse so easily. The shifting cultural currents of naturalism, supernaturalism, individualism, and nationalism all brought about this radical change wherein a central internal discourse – Peace – collided and fused with the external discourse of the Nation. Though different in content, both were the same in how they functioned as discourses. They functioned much in the capacity that Foucault underscored. Discourses, and their attendant discursive formations, serve Subjects with agency that strive to assert themselves through identity formation, and therefore exert their will on others through cooperation, coercion, or oppression. The Friends diffidently sought to control, maintain, and project their identity as a supernatural marginalized group lost in a naturalist culture. The United States more definitively sought to exert an emerging statist identity through a domestic policy of a Selective Service, a cultural agenda of patriotism, and a foreign policy of warring conflict. In this inevitable trajectory, which Foucault often drew through power relationships, the Friends were defeated and oppressed.

Jurgen Habermas and Julia Kristeva have proposed complementary theories of how individuals and groups gain identity from the larger society. Their theories explains the dynamic of identity in this confrontation between the dominant culture of the United States and the sub-culture of the Ohio Valley Friends. Kristeva understood Subjectivity
as acting through agency and identity. Such Subjectivity must play out within a society for it is there others grant the power of identity and Subjectivity.\textsuperscript{5} This was readily demonstrated in how vigorously the Friends tried to shore up their eroding identity in the early twentieth century through their ageist inculcation of their youth in the Friends’ counter-cultural identity. It was all done in contradiction to the dominant society. Their youth would not drink, smoke, dance nor carry a rifle. This is what would make them a Friend. To the contrary, Habermas saw identity as founded solely within the individual, devoid of society. The Friends also sought this, placing their identity with a supernatural Other – God. They derived all direction, guidance and identity from God through an “Inward Light” and inspired Bible. Yet in the perverse twist, this personal God was co-opted by the nationalism and patriotism of the surrounding social order, and placed in a U.S. Civil-Religion discourse out of the reach of the Friends. Such discursive explanations readily explain how a religious group could so readily immolate their own identity in the dense historical storm of competing cultural discourses. The Friends were within the societal culture and yet without.

How did a religious group such as the Friends see itself in relation to the State, especially a state who had adopted an hostile relationship to the same group? The discourse of ‘Civil Religion’ helps to highlight the arena wherein these United States and the OYM engaged each other. This powerful discourse of ‘Civil Religion’, eventually overwhelmed the Friends, contorting their scriptures, drafting their youth, and requiring their prayer. With an ephemeral supernaturalism embedded in it, this naturalist materialist civil religion followed previous well trodden paths where founding agronomist rebels in eighteenth-century American colonies peppered their Declarations of Independence with
phrases like “Creator”, “Supreme Judge”, “divine Providence” and “Nature’s God”, while formally restraining their mention of a “God” until a third inaugural presidential address. The very notion of a civil religion, as first promulgated discursively in Rousseau’s *The Social Contract*, was a diffuse naturalist amalgamation of discursive formations meant to keep social order and morality in check, much in the way Durkheim suggested religions functioned. Civil Religion for all purposes was a curious amalgam of both naturalist and super-naturalist discourses that wove discursive formations of state, nation, fatherland, motherland, brother/sisters in arms, and the citizen, into a garland, which readily can morph into a noose. The Friends of World War II fell into the thrall of such a civil religion.

Less than twenty-five years after the C.P.S Camp #23 debacle of the Ohio Valley Friends, Robert Bellah noted that the God of Washington, Franklin, Lincoln, Roosevelt, Truman, and Kennedy was not the same as that of Judeo/Christian sects. This well domesticated god, a house broken and kenneled ‘pet’, functioned as a lodestar for a list of simple dogmas: “The existence of God, the life to come, the reward of virtue, and the punishment of vice, and (ironically) the exclusion of religious intolerance.” For all practical purposes, this civil religion which disconnected practice from doctrine, while holding some truths to be true, did not necessarily entail any specified or specific action, save some nationalist crypto Deist displays and utterances on currency, forbearance of ambiguous crypto-Christian groups (as in non-Congregational or non-Episcopal groups), and the firm shoring up of private property laws in the *Constitution*. Bellah sums this: “The God of civil religion is not only rather “Unitarian”, he is also on the austere side, much more related to order, law, and right than to salvation and love.” This discursive
effects of this offspring of the Enlightenment, ameliorations that had so emboldened and
succored rebels in snowdrifts of Valley Forge and the rancor ridden Constitutional
Congress halls, would come to haunt the Ohio Valley Friends 180 years later.

This was the nature of the cultural tidal wave of civil religion that overwhelmed
the Friends in the name of ‘God, Country, and Soldier’. Bellah contrasts its nature with
contrived *nom de plumes* of the extant religions of the day: ‘religion in general’, ‘religion
of the ‘American’ Way of Life’ or ‘American Shinto’ (a stunning example of pure fusion
between state and religion where, in Japan, the Emperor became the pure unification of
both). Bellah cites the perfect summation of ‘Civil Religion’, as posed by Henry Bargy,
writing in 1902, forty years before World War II, as *la poesie du Civisme*, where Bargy
aptly christens “civil religion” as “the poetry of good citizenship.” Religious practice is
defined, not in relation necessarily to an ‘Other’ in a God, but to the state.

This U.S. Civil Religion, one that made calls rallying for the cause of war, (or as
in its modern reincarnated Middle East rephrasings for “supporting the troops”), and
similar calls for continuing prayers of “God Bless America”, was not the same stripe of
religion that the Friends were espousing or practicing. One religion is the descendent of
Durkheim and Marx, where religion keeps the social fabric together, and the other
religion is the Dauphin of Freud and Lacan, where the individual strives mightily, from
birth to death, with a supernatural ‘Other’, a God who is beyond the conscious and the
real - and rather in the “Real” (Lacan). Regardless, these two forms of religion – the
civil and the personal - were completely separate, and essentially antithetical to each
other. Yet their fusion was not far beyond fervent World War II U.S. religious
nationalism.
One means by which to categorize and organize the politic-religious activity which also masquerades as civil religion, has been put forth by Slovaj Zizek, the Slovenian philosopher and cultural theorist. Borrowing from another fervent predecessor of religious thought, Hegel, he offers a triad of religions as a way to view civil religion.

1) - The “people’s religion [Volksreligion]” – in Ancient Greece religion was intrinsically bound up with a particular people, its life and customs. It required no special reflexive act of faith: it was simply accepted.

2) - The “positive religion” – important dogmas, rituals, rules to be accepted because they are prescribed by an earthly and/or divine authority (Judaism/Christianity)

3) - The “religion of Reason” – what survives of religion when positive religion is submitted to the rational critique of Enlightenment. There are two modes: Reason or Heart – either the Kantian dutiful moralist, or the religion of pure interior feeling (Jacobi, etc.) Both dismiss the positive religion (rituals, dogmas) as superficial historically conditioned ballast. Crucial here is the inherent reversal of Kant into Jacobi, of universalist moralism into pure irrational contingency of feeling – that so to say, this immediate coincidence of opposites, this direct reversal of reason into irrational belief.  

The overpowering U.S. Civil Religion of World War II, the one that would so overwhelm the Friends, was a fusion of the first and third category. In the Volksreligion mode, civil religion entwined itself with the people in an imagined ‘nation’, not a ‘country’, and only asked of them acceptance and allegiance (an allegiance, for example, encoded in a ‘Pledge of Allegiance’ such as that written by socialist writer Francis Bellamy for the Chicago exhibition of 1893 and later spliced with the atavistic civil-religious codicil,
“under God”, during another foreign policy struggle, the Cold War). The further requirements in this allegiance were the bodies of male youth in the carnage of foreign policy. It then encased its underpinnings in the frozen Enlightenment thought of third form of a naturalist “religion of reason”, one that crystallized religion into timeless virtues of private property with its attendant severely skewed definitions of “life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness” and “equality”. These benefits were all disproportionately ‘reasonably’ curtailed to First Nations, African descendent slaves, women, and non-land holders. The hobbled, supernaturalist, second category, “positive religion” of the Friends was completely overwhelmed in this continental post-enlightenment thinking, their God restrained as a counter factual. Thinking and talking about God for all purposes was deemed ‘irrational thought’.

The Friends quite accurately saw the state as their ‘Other’. The State required from the Friends’ deference and the bodies and lives of their young. Subsequently the Friends saw this same state as something to be critiqued and defied. Yet in their pursuit of a counter culture identity in contest with the state as the ‘Other’, the Friends lost their sole weapon, their God - their sword - only to have their adversary pick it up, turn it on them, and dun them into submission to a civil religion that eviscerated their doctrine of pacifism. The discourse of Civil Religion pointedly explains this mechanic by which the Ohio Valley Friends fell to U.S. nationalism.

How does a religious group, such as the Ohio Valley Friends, see the passing of cultural capital as essential to its own identity? The downfall of the Friends came with their blind ageist pursuit of trying to reinvigorate their identity, saving it from complete blandished social and cultural oblivion by encoding into their youth. Positioning the state
as ‘Other’, and recognizing it as the grantor of this identity, the Friends encoded and endowed their youth with multiple pervasive and contradictory Friends’ discourses, most prominently pacifism. Pacifism was the sterling of the Friends’ cultural capital, as it would not only embolden their youth, but also protect them in the times of the state-imposed tyranny of war-driven foreign policy. It was for all purposes, the Friends’ sole, desperate gamble, as they had failed through so many other contests, facing down prohibition, trying to efface mass marketing, defying modernism, and resisting five major national foreign policy wars.  

Pierre Bourdieu’s theories of how generations pass on cultural capital to succeeding generations, explains this desperate gambit by the Ohio Valley Friends. Bourdieu underscored how parent groups equip their children with cultural capital, which far exceeds mere monetary capital. Faced with the obscurity and obsolescence in the encroaching modernist world of nineteenth- and twentieth-century theology and religion, beholden to a supernatural being who, by default, required of them marginalization from the mainstream - being “of the world and not in it” - the Friends saw their only hope and legacy in their own youth.  

Having failed to forestall inchoate alcohol use, pernicious fallout from the Scopes trial, rampant modernism in the books, theatre, and movies of the dominant culture, or the lock step march to an emerging nationalist civil religion, their youth would be their legacy and their epitaph. No headstone could stand as strong as a living Friend youth whose parents had imbued them with powerful cultural capital - the Biblical doctrines and Truths of the Friends. In the lost world to follow a world war conflagration, the Friends as a religious group could still be a beacon for Jesus Christ through their children, even after they themselves had returned to his promised heavens.
The Friends could not have undertaken such an endeavor without the deep imbued discourse of Age, which allowed them to set their youth apart from themselves as receivers, carriers, and legacy, in their cultural struggle as a counter culture with a dominant culture. Such a discourse also gave the elder Friends the resolve and mind set that would actually enable them to incarcerate their own youth in defiance, while in actuality reducing them to cultural fodder in Bourdieu’s cultural fields, not so distantly reminiscent of the U.S. military penchant to similarly sacrifice the young.

How does any grouping of people achieve ‘Othering’ through the discursive formation of ‘Ageism?’ This had been a massive undertaking, one completely impossible without the discourse of Age. Seeing themselves as already marginalized, the Ohio Valley Friends’ ageist endeavor strove to make a legacy in their children. Ongoing unsuccessful interactions with the U.S. culture, with its consequential deterioration of Friends’ social identity and status, magnified by the 1940 foreign policy initiative that set up the Selective Service, only hardened the Friends to see that there was one hope. Their youth could be their epitaph. Imbuing their own youth with their fading traditions, and doctrines was their attempt at identity restoration and perpetuation. The cultural capital handed down to their youth was not only to benefit the inheritor, but the benefit the benefactor with infamy.

The operation of the discourse of Age, and the Friends’ Ageist obsessing over their youth’s indoctrination and inculcation was not without precedent in U.S. culture. Alice Fahs in her book, *The Imagined Civil War: Popular Literature of the North and South, 1861-1865* offers a quite similar explanation occurring almost 100 years previous
in another cultural convulsion of civil religion. Analyzing the children’s literature before, during, and after the U.S. Civil War, she notes a similar tendency and undertaking.

Boys’ biographies represented clear attempts on the part of authors, publishers, and parents to inculcate children with a set of shared national beliefs - to create an imagined nationhood that included the antebellum values of duty, thrift, and moderation. They sought to mold the individual to conform to the homogenous national culture.  

Here, endowment and encoding were a device to create a national consciousness, yet also during the fracturing of the same nation, preserve a lost Southern identity. Such a mechanic for reification through children was just as active for Southerners in the 1830s and 40s as it was for religious Friends in the 1930s and 40s. Fahs continues: “The very act of imagining a child a “war hero” was potentially subversive act in that it provided a means of envisioning the child as powerful actor outside the embrace of family”. A Friend “war hero” could just as easily be in a conscientious objector camp as well as a Civil War POW camp in far off southern Andersonville (or frozen Lake Erie Johnson’s Island). The victor - or defeated - could live through their victory - or defeat - by how they passed on this cultural capital in imagined and physical memory.

Fahs further explores how this activity can arch over long periods of time. Fahs observes that post Civil War parents dressed up and limned their children as miniature soldiers and home war supporters in such groups as the Sons of the Confederacy, Daughters of the Confederacy, and of course the far more prominent later Grand Army of the Republic convocations (and re-enactments). The U.S. national holiday, Memorial Day, in itself became but another event to not only pay respect backwards, but to pay legacy forwards. Pulsing through all these cultural phenomenon, and epiphenomenon, is the one constant – war. War is the theatre that refined people, and created the
imaginary fields in which they imagined and remembered the trials. This becomes the cement of this ageist activity. The child must be involved in the theatre, as Fahs points out “as a powerful actor outside the family unit”. The child, in time, transcends and surpasses the parent, so that, starting the child out early as an independent actor (‘Subject’), is essentially Bourdieu’s mechanic of passing on cultural capital, capital that can be utilized when the parent is long gone. Yet such cultural capital is also self-serving for the parent. It serves as memorial to the benefactor.

To see Age, as a discourse, is crucial to this process. If there is no capacity to see the child as different, beyond only in their incapacity to eat, and look after themselves, then this dimension of ageism cannot operate. The child is not solely identified by immaturity, neediness, and helplessness, all which pass with nurturing into maturity, but must be seen, in a transcendent sense, as different from the adult (and not a ‘little adult’) because they will indeed become, in time, The Adult.

Contemporary analysis is even more insightful when exploring how this discourse of Age operates in tandem with its attendant discursive formation ageism. “Although the young person has never been old, the old person once was young…” is the prescient observation of a contemporary cultural theorist Mark Grief. Observing how contemporary post-capitalism utilizes ageism, he discerns a very pointed trend to commodify ‘Youth’ in today’s twenty-first-century culture. Without ageism, the hyper driving of consumerism towards youth would not be possible. He observes “Beauty is too much someone else’s good luck; we accept that is unequally distributed. Youth is more effective precisely because it is something all of us are always losing.” An ageist conception of youth is embedded in every consciousness (as the theories of Jacques
Lacan would affirm) and therefore amply triggered by a discursive formation of ageism.\textsuperscript{25} For Greif, “Youth can be re-qualified physically as an aspect of memory, for every single consumer.”\textsuperscript{26} Though writing about a completely different cultural phenomenon, post-capitalist consumerism where a commodity has not Use-value, nor Exchange-value, but Sign-value, Greif’s analysis offers a distinct depiction of the mechanic of ageism working as it did in the Friends.\textsuperscript{27}

Youth as commodity, in Greif’s contemporary analysis, is impossible without the discursive formation of ageism and a discourse of Age.\textsuperscript{28} He divides the question of this one form of ageism very precisely, showing that ageism forces a culture to see one part of chronological time (sixteen, seventeen, eighteen years old) as highly desirable (deserving of exorbitant amounts of resources in time and money) and another chronological part very close in proximity (fifteen, fourteen, thirteen years old), as deserving of abhorrence, loathing, and restriction in desire. Age as a discourse - and its discursive formation, ageism - permits this time bound form of cultural activity and social coding. If such a dynamic can operate so far below the surface within the discourses of sexuality, why could it not operate similarly within the inculcation of the discourses of religion?

In this dynamic of ageism, the young (including those of the Friends) are not fully replete little adults, yet can be seen as different because they do not yet have the doctrines and the parameters of society (or religion) and need to be set aside for teaching (or CPS incarceration). Though ageism is a highly powerful subsurface discursive formation that determines parameters down to a most base biological activity-sex, it can also operate on the most elevated heights of naturalist/civil, and supernaturalist/evangelical religion. Greif observes: “Perhaps then we would see the beauty of the young, which it is
traditional to admire - their unlined features, their unworn flesh – for what it is: merely an incipient form of life and nothing to emulate. One view of the young body is ideal. The other is as an unpressed blank. The young are beautiful, but they are stupid’.  

All this is impossible without a discourse of Age operating within a social group religion or foreign policy. A young body can be dressed in leotards, or the uniform of the SS. Youth can be strewn across blanket bingos on beaches in movies bearing the same name, or across beaches of tank traps and pillboxes in the Atlantic or Pacific. All these identities are possible, deployable and enforceable through the agency of ageism, the same agency through which the Friends unwittingly lost their pacifist identity. The culpability of the Friends in this demise lay in their own intertwining of the discursive authority of their Bible texts with their own internal doctrine and adopted discourses.

How does a religious group use internal texts to create doctrine and internal discursive formations? By what means do groups participate in cultural fields with a net gain of both power and identity? This dissertation has focused on analyzing this cultural phenomenon of religion. Pulsing through history, explanations of religion are so often shuttled to the side, often relegated to the scorn of fanaticism. Seeing religion as the summation of various discourses equivalent to any other cultural phenomenon, both in the present and in history, is a very straightforward and lucid resolution to this gap in inquiry, one that is the central thesis of this dissertation.

The Ohio Valley Friends actively acted out of a set of chosen Biblical discourses that defined for them specific doctrine and practice. Through this chosen course, the Friends came into severe conflict with a dominant culture (as had their fore-bearers). This dominant culture (the same U.S.) had chosen a series of virulent counter discourses.
Friends’ Godly pacifism went head to head with U.S. Godly nationalism. Identity for both was changed, and within the confrontation, the Friends chose to deploy a discursive formation – ageism – that severely weakened their positioned, caused them to sacrifice their youth, and in the end lose their own God to the State and its dominant culture. This sums a straightforward understanding and explanation of the Ohio Valley Friends’ loss of their pacifism. There is no need to accord it to irrational religious fervent zeal, visions, rituals of wine and bread, or fanaticism, explanations that other disciplines so easily invoke to culturally explain religion. In a day when Islamic fanaticism is so quickly dismissed as irrational religiosity, it is important to outline this mechanic. Religion can be seen as the sum of discourses operating in power fields (including foreign policies and nationalism) as they have from time before, and will continue to do so. Bourdieu’s cultural fields have the same fences, merely changing reapers and seasons of harvest. Foucault’s sense of power continues to be durable force, a force that is neither lost nor increased, merely manipulated by ongoing subjects all seeking identity. Kristeva’s sense of identity is grasped only in the dyad of the individual in relationship with an ‘Other’. And Habermas’ inner identity is still found in the religious pursuit of the God within. Religion is as simple, or as complex, as any other cultural phenomenon in history. It is as lucid as any other studied artifact.

The Friends were involved in no different an enterprise than the United States itself. 1940’s United States’ foreign policy was driven by an end to reassert its own identity, producing a significantly more potent one in the aftermath of World War II. The discourses the United States chose served it well. The discourses the Friends chose failed them, consequently causing the very loss of their own specific “peculiar” pacifism.32 If
both the United States and the Friends were involved in this drive for identity, then it is
worth noting that both religion and nationalism are not that far apart in their pursuit. Both
generate, and sustain, the corporate plus individual identity. For the United States,
identity was seated in the dyadic antipode of “Not Communist”. For the Friends the
counter-valent identity was seated in being “Not Worldly”.

Identity always functions in a relationship, predominantly in a dyad, and for all
practical purposes, is based in the function of the ‘Essential Dyad’. This essential dyad
has been, and will be, basic for every human mind in the individual’s realization and
ongoing social relation to ‘an-other’, the recognized and deemed “Other”, primordially
Lacan’s the “child / mother”, cosmologically Hegel’s – “I and the ‘Other’”. This
Essential Dyad function sustained the U.S. foreign policy through World War II and into
the present, allowing it to collectively see itself as nation that was NOT an ‘Other’
(Ungodly Communist). The same essential dyad operated in the Ohio Valley Friends,
allowing them to see themselves as ‘not worldly’, while at the same time causing the loss
of their pacifism, even unto today as they bought into the new civil religion.

The pacifism of the 2011 Ohio Valley Friends of today is markedly ambivalent
while their other same essentials of religious doctrines and practices continue to work for
them today – supernaturalism, evangelism, pre-millenialism. Yet, conversely now, the
‘Other’ is no longer the United States. The Friends have slid farther over into a deeper
redoubt of religious discourse. Within this redoubt is an ‘Other’ beyond the pale of the
United States. This redoubt is a religious discourse that draws its identity from, but
another supernatural form of Hegel’s dyad “I and the ‘Other’” – it is “I and God”.
The United States in its civil religion wandering only covets this dyad relationship. The Friends in their misguided way, and yet ever so more vibrantly today, no longer need the United States and its foreign policy for identity as the antipode for their pacifism. They have returned to the peripatetic roots of seventeenth-century preacher in rural England, and as far back as the similar teachings of a peripatetic Jesus of Nazareth, preached in first-century Galilee. Their religion now, after this long pain-filled journey filled with discord, incarceration, and vilification, is summed up in the simple equation of their founder’s arcane English – “I and THOU”. And this THOU’s identity is singular without any essential dyad or relation. It is God. This THOU, God, exists beyond the essential dyad. Yet such a unique supernatural anomaly, transcendent beyond the essential dyad of human experience, can still be sought, examined, and analyzed within another discursively constructed realm - History. Ergo, the explanation of a small diligent religious group of pacifists’ marked loss of their pacifism during World War II; the loss was not due to their God, but more so because of the abduction of their God. And the changeling left behind? ‘The United States of God.’ The Friends in their “I / THOU” dyad had not themselves moved, merely the “THOU” had. In World War II, God was no longer in Galilee, but was fully residing in America. He had left the house of the Friends.
ENDNOTES

1 John Deelym, Basics of Semiotics (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990)
Daniel Chandler Semiotics for beginners http://ww.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/S4B/semiotic.html.

2 The changeling archetype is a perennial trope wherein fairies, elves, or ghiligries steal a human infant and leave an infant of their own. The essential horror is the replacement of a simulacrum.


McAfee expands on this idea.

The notion of the subject as an open system, a subject in process, is a central aspect of what I’ll call a model of relational subjectivity. …I mean something much deeper: our very subjectivity is constituted relationally, in the relation between conscious and unconscious, semiotic and symbolic, self and other; also on the political identities we hold simultaneously. All these involve tension, yet at the same time they are productive. As relational subjectivities we are always “under construction”, always producing ourselves, and each other. Relational subjects are deeply indebted to each other.

Yet at first glance this debt seems to come as a threat – of a negative of, and from, the other. A tenet of both post structuralism and psychoanalytical theory is that our own self-identity is founded on our difference from others. Simply put, I realize myself only when I differentiate myself from others. Yet though alterity occurs at the interpersonal level, certainly, more fundamentally it occurs intra-personally. From a psychoanalytic point of view, someone’s identity is formed by the repression and rejection of many desires and drives. As these drives are driven underground, so to speak, into the unconscious, a conscious identity is born. This alterity – differentiation of oneself from another – is the very basis of subjectivity. …All this ads up for Habermas, a subject that is an autonomous agent, and for Kristeva a subject that is in an open system, always coming to speak and to be in relation with others, including the other within. (129)

McAfee subsequently asks,

Need we have a Habermasian notion of the self in order to conceive of the self as agent in a political community, that is a citizen? Or might we be able to consider subjects-in-process as candidates for citizenship? Is it possible to be in an open system and an effective political agent?” (134)
The late 20th century post-Feminist historian Julia Kristeva utilizes this difference by her use of capitalization in the words ‘subject’ and ‘object’. The “subject” with a lowercase ‘s’ refers to the more germane meaning as in a ‘subject to a ruler’; it is passive in agency. The capitalized “Subject” refers to the sense of a subject in a sentence and therefore is active in agency. The “Subject” operates on the “Object” and the noun subject acts on the noun object in a sentence through the verb.

Robert Bellah, in his “Civil Religion in America” (Daedalus) 96, notes this peccadillo in a footnote:

In his first inaugural, Washington refers to God as “that Almighty Being who rules the universe,” “Great Author of every public and private good”, “Invisible Hand”, and “benign Parent of the Human Race.” John Adams refers to God as “Providence,” “Being who is supreme over all,” “Patron of Order,” “Fountain of Justice,” and Protector in all ages of the world of virtuous liberty”. Jefferson speaks of that Power which rules destinies to the universe,” and “that being whose hands we are.” Madison speaks of “that Almighty Being whose power regulates the destiny of nations” and “Heaven”. Monroe uses “Providence” and “the Almighty” in his first inaugural and finally “Almighty God” in his second, 13.


Bellah, 6.

Ibid.

Ibid., 10.

The “Real” is Jacques Lacan’s construct of a quasi-linguistic unconscious realm of agency, differing from his predecessor, Freud, who espoused a realm of the id.


Since their inception in 1813, the Ohio Valley Friends had witnessed the British-American War, the Mexican Wars, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and World War I, plus many nineteenth-century domestic confrontations with First Nations people.


I Cor 9:19-23

17 Ibid.


20 Fahs underscores this even further as she documents the perverse post-Civil War habit of photographing dead children in various guises of adult clothing, including soldiers’ uniforms.

21 The ongoing exploration of the fluidity of childhood traverses huge swathes of modern and past culture. Modern examples of child-hero movies abound in the cinema of the latter twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Consider DreamWorks Studio’s *Home Alone* series, where the child is the adult of the family. Consider the fifty years of Ageist travesties of the Disney studios, where children are the heroes and fathers, and more often mothers, are killed off, leaving the hero-children to face the world, to be returned to (Victorian) safety when another adult enters at the denouement. Literary explorations of this fluidity can be seen in the post-war work of William Goldman’s *Lord of the Flies*, but also in the nineteenth-century work of Twain’s *Tom Sawyer, Huckleberry Finn, Prince and the Pauper, Puddn’head Wilson, and The Mysterious Stranger*. Children’s literature reflects this contesting in Stevenson’s *Treasure Island* (1883), *Kidnapped* (1884), *Spyri’s Heidi* (1884), Barrie’s *Peter Pan* (1904), Hodgson–Burnett’s *The Secret Garden* (1911), Bemelmans’ *Madeline* (1939), Lewis’s *Lion, Witch, and the Wardrobe* (1950), where in various times periods the incessant contestation of the ‘child-adult’ is played out before the child mind. All explore this tension of the ‘child-adult’ acting out the tension on the Ageist stage of adults. All exemplify the glacial groove effect of Ageism tracing though ongoing generations in United States.


The work of Martin Heidegger and Edmund Husserl inform this process of how time modulates perception. The child must be seen as the product of development into future time so as to close off the perception of child as static adult. See Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time* (New York: Harper, 1962) and Edmund Husserl *Logical Investigations* (New York: Humanities Press 1970).


Ibid.

The extensive psychoanalytic work of Jacques Lacan sets the cornerstone of this “essential dyad”, in that all human experience can be traced to its original universal experience of the “othering” of the mother in the child/mother relationship (substitute caregiver/infant), when the child realizes that the caregiver “mother” is not the same as the child. This mechanic will enable the child, now a cognizant individual, to deploy this paradigm throughout every encounter of its life, and maintain the integrity of its own identity (through the strategy of Derrida’s “difference”, and C.S. Pierce’s strategy of “abduction”).

Grief, 14.

Ibid.

A further explication of “Sign Value” vs. Use-value or Exchange-value in modern economic/cultural theory is found in Frederic Jameson, *Postmodernism or The Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham, Duke Univ. Press, 2001).

Grief explores this further: “...persons barely eligible to vote furnish our gossip – with their tumultuous flings, bootleg sex videos, and accidental breast exposures on the red carpet. They are broadcast, examined, emulated, desired. These “sex children” are repositories of fresh sexuality, not, say, or intellect or beauty. As their age goes up to seventeen, eighteen, and nineteen, the culture quickly awards them it highest sexual
adulation. Yet as their age goes down form some indefinite point, to sixteen, fifteen, fourteen, and so on, the sexual appeal of childhood quickly reaches our culture’s zone of absolute evil. We examine children sexually with magnifying glasses to make sure they don’t appeal to us, and we hunt down those who can’t make such distinctions. Worse than a murderer, worse than an adult rapist, of adults, and even worse that the person who physically and emotionally abuses children, is the one who sexually tampers with a child in any degree – who can then never be re-integrated into society except as a sex offender. This is the pedophile. Since the two zones - maximum value for sex and maximum value of evil – are right next to each other, shouldn’t we wonder if there’s some relation in society between our supergood and our absolute evil.” Grief, “Afternoon of the Sex Child,” 16.

29 Ibid.

30 The last soldiers Adolf Hitler decorated for valor were his “Werewolves”, thirteen and fourteen year old boys, their medals of honor pinned on overcoats too large for their shoulders.

31 See Chapter 4, note #20.

32 This hearkens back to the starting point of this dissertation, the seventeenth-century term for the Friends - a “peculiar people”.
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