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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In H. Richard Niebuhr's second study of American denominations, he wrote, "Institutions can never conserve without betraying the movements from which they proceed." This insightful observation certainly is true of the first distinctively American religious movement, which was spawned within the first generation of the new United States. Variously called "the Restoration Movement," "the American Reformation," "the Disciples of Christ," and "the Stone-Campbell Movement," it has become institutionalized in the twentieth century in the form of three exclusive groups with a total present membership of about 3,800,000 in the United States. The more liberal heirs of the Movement call themselves "the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)." More conservative believers make up "the Church of Christ," in all its diverse manifestations. In the central position are "the Christian Churches" and "the Churches of Christ." The preferred name for the latter segment varies according to region of the country.

What is ironic in the history of this tripartite group is that it had its origin in a desire to unite all
Christians in all Protestant denominations. The Movement survived the Civil War without experiencing the division that sundered many other denominations; nevertheless, by 1866, at the time of the death of the most prominent leader, Alexander Campbell, dissension among the members was becoming apparent.³

Division became official in 1906, after members had split their churches over questions about the propriety of cultural innovations within the church, including Sunday Schools, religious seminaries, and the use of choirs and musical instruments in the worship services. Over the next forty years, a second division gradually appeared as members disagreed about the question of individual requirements for membership in the churches. From this time on, division has been the rule more than union, particularly among the conservative Church of Christ. In fact, one noted Church of Christ historian believes that his segment alone is recapitulating within itself the same divisions that the Movement suffered originally.⁴

The question, "Why did the Movement divide?" has been asked frequently and various answers have been provided. Leroy Garrett observes that so many theses and dissertations have been written on the subject that one could write another just for the purpose of summary.⁵ A question that has been asked less frequently is, "Why did the Movement not divide sooner?" In some ways, it is
not the division, but the first six decades of unity that are remarkable. In the first place, the members were drawn from as diverse religious and social backgrounds as could be found. This spectrum of membership will be discussed in Chapter Three. In the second place, there were natural tendencies toward division in the Movement from the very beginning. Whenever a movement crystallizes into a sect, and then a denomination, it invites division and heterodoxy, even as it constructs a new orthodoxy. This formulation of a new orthodoxy is what Kenneth Burke calls, "bureaucratizing the imaginative possibilities." 6 This incipient division is not merely theoretical, as is confirmed by a study of the primitive documents of this Movement. As historian David Edwin Harrell, Jr. wrote, "If Alexander Campbell was the uncrowned monarch of the church before 1860, he reigned over a turbulent and unruly kingdom." 7 This study will show that Campbell preserved unity within the Movement and maintained tension between the extremes by shaping the ideology of the Movement rhetorically. The reason for the first sixty years of harmony will be found in the communication process that shaped and spread the ideology of the group, not in socio-economic factors.

Potentially, ideological division was inherent in the twin emphases in the minds of the originators of the Movement. Of primary importance was a desire to unite
all Protestant Christians. Campbell's co-editor, Robert Richardson, wrote in 1848,

In the present efforts at reformation, it is this unity which has been chiefly urged upon the religious community. Christian union and intercommunion were the original and ruling thoughts with those with whom this movement began.8

It was not an organizational union that was sought, nor an invisible, mystic one, but rather sharing a single purpose, recognizing a common Father, and cooperating in carrying out the work of the universal Church, regardless of denominational lines. Barton W. Stone, one of the three originators, said, "Christian unity is my polar star," and the other two founders, Thomas and Alexander Campbell, agreed.9

The other major theme within the early Movement was that the only method of attaining the desired unity was for all Protestants to adopt, as a pattern for all churches, the apostolic teaching and practice as recorded in the New Testament. Alexander Campbell expressed both of these themes in a pair of propositions:

1st. Nothing is essential to the conversion of the world but the union and co-operation of the Christians.
2d. Nothing is essential to the union of Christians but the Apostles' teaching or testimony.10

His program for church unity, then, called for the substitution of a primitive faith in place of more contemporary creeds, which he saw as exclusive and divisive.
To Campbell, the two points were mutually necessary. Reform of doctrine was the only possible means of achieving unity, and a belief in the apostolic authority of the primitive documents entailed a desire for unity. Barton W. Stone, too, pled for unity on the basis of conformity to a pattern he believed was revealed in the New Testament.11

To other minds in the Movement, though, these inseparable emphases—reform as a means of achieving the goal of unity—were seen as two distinct goals to be reached. The ideal, to them, was religious unity along with peript reform of beliefs. When the two emphases are viewed in this way, they can become goals in conflict with each other.12 In fact, Oliver Read Whitley traced the later seeds of division back to these two early emphases, and he claimed that "the emphasis upon unity and the stress of restoration were products of two essentially different tempers and attitudes.13 An exclusive devotion to "restorationism," or the restoring to prominence of a once-lost primitive blueprint for the church, is, by its very nature, a divisive belief. Because some members are always more faithful than others to the original pattern, the chosen few must purify themselves either by separating themselves from an apostate church or else by expelling heretics from their own midst. Real unity can exist only among those who understand the
pattern in the same way; therefore, the twin emphases were often at odds. The members who were more devoted to unity were willing to tolerate those whose beliefs or practices were not yet pure and reformed. On the other hand, those who cherished restoration as the primary goal refused to overlook any deviation from their vision of the primal pattern; instead, they would separate for the sake of purity.

Problem to be Studied

In spite of the tensions caused by these extreme points of view, the unity of the Movement was maintained until about the time of Campbell's death. The purpose of this study is to determine how Campbell, as a change-agent, was able to intervene rhetorically within the Movement which perceived him as its leader. The methodology I will use in pursuit of solutions to this problem is a humanistic one, rather than a scientific one. As a rhetorical critic, I shall examine carefully the artifacts produced by Campbell and by other members of the Movement in order to determine the formal content of Campbell's symbolic interaction with his followers. To this interaction I shall apply William R. Brown's model of intervention into social systems in an effort to derive a "new interpretative structure" of Campbell's rhetoric. (Such is the result, according to Ernest Bormann, that provides justification for a humanistic study
of events that have been examined before by others.)\textsuperscript{14}

A second purpose for this study is to test the utility of Brown's model. Designed to provide a macroscopic explanation of human intervention in a social system, the model is capable of being refined. In addition, it is still fresh enough that its explanatory power should be tested by rigorous application to actual social systems. In his dissertation, Russell Corley studied Brown's model and then called for "greater precision" in its use, particularly when it is applied to groups smaller than those on a national level.\textsuperscript{15}

One of the reasons why this investigation is significant is that it is an application of an innovational theoretical model to see whether the model generates a heuristically significant explanation of the phenomena it is supposed to illuminate. Presumably, the model will either be confirmed or else disconfirmed as a systemic approach to understanding rhetorical intervention, and will be found useful or not as an investigative tool. The model itself is interesting to the rhetorician because, more than most models of social movement theory, it is committed to a symbolic-interactionist point of view. Instead of studying a movement by delineating the stages of its growth from a sociological point of view, or by creating a taxonomy of leadership styles, Brown's model treats a social movement as a
system that is maintained or changed by symbolic interaction. The model is organic—Brown called it "holo-
graphic rather than photographic." A movement is
treated as a living system of elements affected by each
member and interdependent with each other, as well as
with the larger world. It is not a mechanistic model,
for the agents of change do not control the movement,
but only encourage stability or change. It does not
feature leaders but intervenors. All of these factors
make it a model that could be compatible to and useful
in the humanistic study of communication.

This study, then, aims at fulfilling one of the
functions that "normal science," in Thomas Kuhn's view,
fulfills—that of ratifying a theory within a paradigm in
hopes that the results will "add to the scope and preci-
sion with which the paradigm can be applied." This
ratifying, as it is employed in the business of
hypothetico-deductive theory-building, takes the form of
deducing consequences of the theory, and then testing
them. The testing that is carried out in a humanistic
study is unlike the sort of testing that is done in a
chemistry laboratory. "Humanistic generalizations," said
Bormann, ". . . cannot function as do the generalizations
that are laws of nature." Here, testing will be done
by examining the form of processes and the interrelation-
ships of processes that are posited by the theory, and
studying the historical records of the Movement. The theory is confirmed if there are two kinds of consistency found, and disconfirmed if they are lacking. The theory itself must be found to have internal consistency—that is, it is free of self-contradiction--, and the application of the theory must also explain the dynamics of the movement as they are reconstructed historically. This latter consistency is what Stephen Pepper referred to as "corroboration":

The theory is progressively confirmed as it successively draws more evidence in, and the various different items of evidence achieve higher and higher corroboration in proportion as more items enter harmoniously into the structure of the theory.19

One assumption of Brown's theory is that a society may be seen as an open system, all parts of which are interdependent, and which influences and is influenced by the outside world. The nature of an organism, which is the generative metaphor of this worldview, makes it unlikely that mechanistic laws can explain precisely the behavior within a system.20 Based on an organismic view of systems, Brown's theory avoids attending to the "inexhaustible relations between the event and its context," and attends instead to the "teleology entailed in the growth of an organism."21 Brown agreed with Pepper that "... it is the integration appearing in the process that the organicist works from, and not the duration of the process."22 The communication events that are
discovered historically are both product and process serving either to inhibit or else to facilitate the development of ideology and, therefore, of a system.  

Through symbolic interaction, the realm of rhetoric, the ideologies of a system are created and changed, the roles of participants negotiated, internal and external needs generated, and either met or neglected. Hence, a system may be understood only through study of its symbols, categories of symbols, and modes of interaction. As James Andrews observed, "What rhetoric, itself, does is to define and interpret the significance of human activity for those engaged in the activity." One purpose of this study, then, is to assist in either the corroboration or the disconfirmation of the utility of Brown's model of human communication.

A second reason why this research is significant flows from the first. The division within the Stone-Campbell Movement often has been treated as a primarily sociological phenomenon. For example, Tucker and McAllister believed the disunion resulted from divisions that originated during the Civil War. Garrison, the foremost historian of the Movement, blamed division on the confluence of the deaths of Alexander Campbell and Isaac Errett (a later moderate leader) and the existence of an attitude of legalism, changes in the socio-economic environment, and a tendency to adopt the customs of other
denominations. Whitely frankly described his history as a "socio-cultural" one. He attributed the "growing pains" of the Movement to the changing conditions of the world. Harrell attributed the division to sociological pressures—especially slavery questions and the Civil War.

Even communication scholars who have studied the Movement as a rhetorical movement have tended to use sociological models whenever they go beyond Neo-Aristotelian figure studies. For example, Bever used the social movement theory of Dawson and Getty in order to trace various stages of the Movement. Walker's 1969 dissertation noted the significance of Leland Griffin's 1952 rhetorical study, but attributed the rapid growth of the Movement to such cultural causes as religious liberty, the unique nature of the frontier and the moral conditions of the frontier. It is no wonder that, after surveying past rhetorical criticism of the Stone-Campbell Movement, Paul Prill and his co-authors concluded that critics need to "use a broader range of critical methods in our analysis of rhetorical acts in the movement."

The inadequacy of a purely sociological approach to explain an American religious movement was recognized by Niebuhr. He expressed dissatisfaction with the sociological emphasis he had maintained in his earlier study,
The Social Sources of Denominationalism:

Though the sociological approach helped to explain why the religious stream flowed in these particular channels it did not account for the force of the stream itself; . . . while it could deal with the religion which was dependent on culture, it left unexplained the faith which is independent, which is aggressive, rather than passive, and which molds culture instead of being molded by it.33

This theme has been echoed by Ralph Gabriel, a social historian:

But social beliefs are affected by other forces than economic change. If a man on earth must eat, so also must he adjust his life and thought to the mysteries surrounding him. . . . For this reason the reigning cosmic philosophy is as fundamental to a particular climate of opinion as are its economic foundations to a selected social scene.34

There is a clear need, then, for communication studies of ideology formation and change, which compose the realm of rhetoric.

A third reason for the significance of this study is suggested by the words of Rufus Jones, who observed that his own Quaker church had spent much of its history like a ship tacking against the wind, in a "curious zigzag, back and forth from Scripture to inner light and from inner light to Scripture."35 H. Richard Niebuhr decided that this zigzag between extremes is typical of American Protestantism in general.36

This is not surprising, for, as Burke observed, "an ideology is an aggregate of beliefs sufficiently at odds with one another to justify opposite kinds of conduct."37 As long as these beliefs are treated in toto,
there is harmony; but heresy arises whenever one extreme tenet is emphasized at the expense of another, or when a particular is stressed at the expense of the symmetry of the whole. In the case of the Stone-Campbell Movement, the two particulars that have been stressed are (1) the idea of recapturing the perfect primitive pattern of faith and practice preserved in the New Testament, and (2) the idea of uniting all Christians on the basis of a simple creed. Throughout the course of the Movement, one or the other of these goals tended to predominate and, sometimes simultaneously, one segment would emphasize one goal, while another segment was equally dedicated to the other. Whichever goal was perceived as an ideal product, the pursuit of the other goal could be seen as the process for attaining it.

To Brown, the stability of a social system requires periodic switching from one extreme to the other in order to produce a deviance-compensating cycle. Otherwise, the system will run down. This periodic refocusing is mediated by a change-agent. Giambattista Vico was perhaps the first to recognize that rhetoric as the instrument of social progress either impedes or facilitates social cycles.

A Brownian approach to the understanding of the Movement suggests that the present Church of Christ (non-instrumental) churches became part of a separated movement
when they became involved in a deviance-amplifying cycle in their quest for perfect restoration. This caused the quest for unity to be minimized and resulted in an ever-tightening spiral, as stricter legalism and greater literalism caused spin-offs, scapegoats who were not as pure as the others.\textsuperscript{41} Leroy Garrett recognized the fragmenting tendency of an obsession with perfect restoration:

\ldots those who find the movement's first rupture in some kind of social determinism must account not for one division but many. Why has the movement continued to divide again and again? \ldots The answer appears not to lie as much in socio-economic forces as in the nature of restorationism itself. Restorationists or primitivists \ldots have divided into hundreds of warring sects. Our thesis is that when this inclusivity became dominant in the Stone/Campbell Movement, it divided it.\textsuperscript{42}

There are, though, even in the Church of Christ, some voices calling for a reversal of this trend. Garrett's book itself is one example. He also edits a monthly journal, the Restoration Review. In 1976, he called for a revival of the forgotten theme of unity:

\ldots we began as a unity movement, and yet our people have been among the most sectarian, factious, and divisive in the history of Christianity, \ldots It is imperative that we in our generation reverse this betrayal of our original purpose and once again be emissaries of peace and love in a tragically divided religious world.\textsuperscript{43}

Not only within the Churches of Christ, but also in the mid-stream Christian Church, similar voices are occasionally heard. A widely respected missionary and educator, Max Ward Randall, wrote recently about the possibility of healing divisions, "Without sacrificing one
truth or the emphasis on Christian unity, it can be done; and if it is possible to be done, every effort should be made to do it." The third branch of the Stone-Campbell Movement, the Disciples of Christ, has emphasized the idea of unity for several decades.

In the face of such demands for a reversal of trends, it must be instructive to determine the methods used by those who originally were faced with the problem of maintaining a complex system that included the intelligentsia and the uneducated, that appealed both to lower classes and upper, and that urged upon an independent people the value of cooperation. Especially important must be the methods of intervention in the direction of permanence and stability used by Alexander Campbell, the most influential of the leaders, and "the great pacifier who held the Movement together as long as he lived."

The reforming emphasis in the Movement has sanctioned the deliberate neglect the members often show toward any history that is more recent than the first century. Nevertheless, if the Stone-Campbell Movement is to address the fragmented church of today, its members must not forget their more recent history. Karl Barth suggested that such understanding of one's past is a debt that should be paid:

To accept, to understand, or at least to be aware of the particularity of one's historical relations is an act of simple obedience to life which one may forgo for a time but certainly not forever.
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CHAPTER II

CRITICAL APPROACHES TO MOVEMENT STUDIES

In 1947, the best work that the rhetorical historians and critics could produce was preserved (providing examples for future scholars) in the recently-published volume, A History and Criticism of American Public Address. Most of the pieces were in the Wichelns-Baird style; that is, they were effect-centered studies, and traditional in approach. The appearance of Thonssen and Baird's Speech Criticism was still a year away. Its publication would bring to fruition the traditional, Aristotelian type of criticism, as Bormann has remarked. In spite of the peaceful atmosphere enjoyed by the communication scholars during the years that were highlighted by these classic works, there was an unsettling current in the air, as recalled by Leland Griffin. There was felt a desire to study rhetoric with fresh tools and by means other than the "Great Orator" approach.

At that time, rhetoricians were still untouched and untempted by the sociologists who had been researching in the field of "social movements" and "collective behavior" for decades. Also neglected were some quiet
challenges coming from within the rhetoricians' camp, calling for more adventuresome research. In 1943, Bower Aly had mentioned that he thought that movements and historical periods were worthy of some attention. Donald C. Bryant had been stimulated by the work done by literary critics to say that the study of forces and of social movements had been overlooked so far. Dallas Dickey told The National Association of Teachers of Speech (later, the Speech Communication Association) in 1943 that they should be studying movements and issues in the history of public address.\footnote{6}

In 1947, for the first time, the invitation to study movements was coupled with concrete suggestions as to appropriate methodology. S. Judson Crandall borrowed from sociology a classification of collective behavior, and then combined it with an analysis of the stages of growth within a movement.\footnote{7} At about the same time, Herbert Wichelns suggested to one of his advisees that a movement study would be a significant project for his dissertation. That advisee, Leland Griffin, chose at random a case—the Antimasonic Movement. He quickly discarded the methodology that Crandell had suggested as too limited for his uses. Nevertheless, the study of movements intrigued him, and he finished his dissertation in 1950. As a result, shortly afterward, he published "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," which was the
first article to suggest a careful methodology for rhetorical students of movements.  

For the most part, scholars continued to ignore this new type of study. Edwin Black devoted only four pages of his *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method* to movement studies. He found only three movement studies published in the decade of 1955-1965. Two more studies were discovered later by Simons, Mechling, and Schreier, but those early studies were done awkwardly using a traditional model, exemplifying the then-reigning "paradigm." Simons has pointed out that such a traditionalist approach tends to neglect the dynamic quality of a movement. On the other hand, Griffin's more eclectic approach was rejected as useless by Black, so movement studies languished, perhaps for lack of a fresh methodology, until the mid-1960's.  

After 1964, there was a radical change in the attention given to movement studies. From 1965 to 1977, Simons, Mechling, and Schreier found about 175 movement-related studies in the speech journals. There seemed to be at least three reasons for the increase. In the first place, Black's *Rhetorical Criticism* called the attention of theorists to the study of genre criticism, which encourages the search for commonalities among movements.
In the second place, fresh approaches to methodology became available as theorists discovered Kenneth Burke. Marie Hochmuth brought Burke to the attention of rhetoricians in general in her 1952 article, and Griffin specifically adapted Burke's ideas to the study of social movements in a 1969 article. In the interim, rhetoricians had held a Burke conference, Hugh Duncan had adapted Burke to sociology in 1962, and Griffin's article on the "New Left" had illustrated Burke's usefulness.

The strongest incentive to the study of social movements in the 1960's came from the escalating number of groups and movements newly arisen in American society, which demanded attention from rhetorical theorists. Rejecting traditional communication styles, the new groups specialized in fostering division rather than identification, through gesture, street drama, obscenity, and other forms of symbolic withdrawal. As politicians dealt with protestors by appeals to law and order, by accommodation, or by repression, the rhetoricians attempted to reduce the disturbances to some comprehensible theoretical order.

During the last twenty years, then, movement studies have abounded. In retrospect, though, it is difficult to say what has been learned. Some of the most basic questions have yet to be solved. Among these questions are: (1) how should "social movement" be defined? (2) where is there a need for balance in the field?
(3) what theoretical orientation and methodologies are appropriate?

Definition

The first problem that plagues most theorists of social movements is that of definition. A definition should describe what a social movement scholar ought to study, and, at the same time, should exclude other group phenomena. It is difficult, though, to give a definition that would meet with any degree of acceptance, as long as research in the field is in such a relatively early stage. Nevertheless, some attempts at definition have been made. In his first article, Griffin called for a historical definition, although later he decided that a definition was unnecessary, as long as a student can isolate the rhetorical matrix within a movement. More frequently, rhetorical critics have borrowed their definitions from the field of sociology. Dan Hahn and Ruth Gonchar used the definition of Gusfield, who defined social movements as "... socially shared activities and beliefs directed toward the demand for change in some aspect of the social order." In a similar way, Simons combined definitions from Smelser, Turner, and Killian, to define a social movement as "an uninstitutionalized collectivity that mobilizes for action to implement a program for the reconstruction of social norms or values." While some
scholars are satisfied with these definitions, others have searched for a more "rhetorical" definition. Griffin, for example, suggested that there is a distinctive "rhetorical movement" within a historical movement. Smith and Windes later accepted and expanded Griffin's concept. In an attempt to formulate a more specific definition, Cathcart urged that a rhetorical definition of movements must include the creation of a dialectical tension growing out of moral conflict. Expanding Cathcart in turn, Wilkinson called attention to the strategic nature of movements by defining them as:

Languaging strategies by which a significantly vocal part of an established society, experiencing together a sustained dialectical tension growing out of moral (ethical) conflict, agitate to induce cooperation in others, either directly or indirectly, thereby affecting the status quo.

Michael McGee complicated the problem of definition by asserting that such a thing as a "movement" does not exist as a phenomenon, but only as a construct within the mind of an observer. He reprobated the attribution of the label "movement," observing that to bestow that term upon a certain set of selected social behaviors is to perform a political action. One might reply, though, that it is a political action to refuse to label social actions as "movements" when they are already perceived in that way by the participants or by other observers. In addition, even if some members are gratified to be
recognized as a movement, others will be chagrined to find themselves thus cut off from the mainstream. This political action of naming, then, cuts both ways, granting both identity and separation.

McGee's claim that a movement is not a phenomenon but an interpretation was responded to by Simons, who noted that as long as a critic treats a social movement as a subject of study, whether or not it exists in the "real world" is irrelevant. In a similar vein, Riches and Sillars concluded that, until the impact of this phenomenological view is elaborated, the question of whether "interpretation or phenomenon" is a "distinction without a difference." In any case, Lucas observed that scholars can do movement studies even if they cannot prove that movements exist as a distinct genre.

By his reminder that, at least in part, a movement exists in the mind of the person interpreting it, McGee leads the way to the practical and simple definition proposed by Sillars, that a movement is whatever the critic thinks it is.

In the case of this study, the question of whether the Stone-Campbell Movement existed is moot. In an article that argues for a fluid approach, rather than a linear one, sociologist Gusfield shelved the question of definition:
A beginning to the study of social movements in this vein avoids definition entirely and attempts to convey why it is that the observer wishes to study this phenomena and what experiences lead him or her to do so in this way.30

This dissertation is perspectival—the subject of study certainly was perceived by the participants involved to be a movement, and it is clear that ideological distinctions and resulting behavior distinguished the followers of Stone and Campbell as a movement that was separate from, yet related to, the American Protestant mainstream.

Balance

A second problem is that of balance within the field of movement studies. Several theorists, such as Griffin and Zarefsky, have recommended that more attention needs to be given to the writing of preliminary historical research. The reason for such a challenge is that a disproportionate number of studies were done in the heat of the 1960's and early 1970's, and they tended to concentrate on contemporary confrontational movements, such as the Anti-war Movement and the Black Power Movement.31 Both Cathcart and Griffin have been charged with having a 1960's preoccupation, and Lucas said that this imbalance in the field as a whole has resulted in the skewing of our present understanding of movements.32

Compounding the imbalance, most rhetorical movement studies have dealt with movements in the United
States and Great Britain. Of course, these studies reflect the habitual focus of the communication discipline in the English-speaking world on the study of the rhetoric of English speakers. This dissertation will not help correct the imbalance.

Imbalance exists also in that, as Riches' and Sillars' study concluded, most social movement studies do not proceed from a sound, theoretical base. A fair number of them are entirely atheoretical. Such a study is illustrated by Rosenwasser's 1972 article, "Rhetoric and the Progress of the Women's Liberation Movement." There is little theoretical background to this paper, which is more a chronology of the movement than a rhetorical study. As such, it would be historically useful if judged by the standards of Griffin's earliest article, but it has little value for the rhetorical critic.

In avoiding such an atheoretical approach, this study may help to set an example of the integration of theory and application.

Theoretical Approach

A third problem in movement studies is more serious, as well as more interesting. The diversity of theoretical approaches will continue to be endemic to the field as long as we are in what Bormann calls a
pre-paradigmatic state. The only commonalities that are characteristic of rhetorical movement studies are that most of them have been qualitative and that all of them are dependent to some extent on a historical base, since one cannot study a movement before it is formed.

No one theory of social movements has been spectacularly successful in claiming the allegiance of rhetorical critics. Theories that fit one movement have seldom been applied to others, and, as already noted, many studies ignore theory entirely. In several cases, a case study and a theoretical approach are developed simultaneously.

According to the Riches and Sillars survey, Neo-Aristotelian categories have been used most frequently. This is in spite of the fact that other theorists as early as Crandell in 1947 have shown such an approach to be inappropriate for movement studies. Also popular have been the dramatistic approach of Kenneth Burke, and the fantasy theme analysis of Ernest Bormann. Farther afield, sociology has provided a fertile source of borrowing, since, as noted before, sociologists have been studying movements much longer than rhetoricians. Some scholars attempt a synthesis of rhetorical and sociological theory, as did Golden, for example.

In order to make clear the major differences among the more prominent ways of studying social movements,
I shall organize them into categories for the sake of comparison. There have been several attempts to apply typologies to movement studies. For example, Riches and Sillars categorized studies according to whether they are macroscopic, microscopic, or comparative. There have been fewer attempts to categorize the theoretical approaches of theorists. One might follow the system of Stewart, Smith, and Denton, who suggested several dichotomies: ideally, researchers should treat movements as systems rather than as a group of variables; as organic rather than mechanistic; and as more open than closed. In conformity to this model, studies could be placed on a continuum. This is not the only way to categorize, though, Stewart, Smith, and Denton admit.

The following four categories may provide a valid framework for understanding the theoretical orientations that have been used to perform rhetorical studies of movements. Within each category, various special theories and appropriate methodologies are employed.

I. Structure/function approach

II. Situation/response approach

III. Strategy/goal approach

IV. Ideology/expression approach

Each of these categories stipulates a pair of factors, the interplay of which is emphasized by a certain group of scholars. The following discussion will make
clear the meaning of each approach and will specify some of the practitioners. The discussion will also clarify the approach to be used in this study of the Stone-Campbell Movement.

I. The structure/function approach

Those who share this approach have in common a view of rhetoric as "the primary agency through which social movements perform necessary functions. . . ." Simons exemplified this approach when he summarized his functional theory of social movements:

Rooted in sociological theory, it assumes that the rhetoric of a movement must follow, in a general way, from the very nature of social movements. Any movement, it is argued, must fulfill the same functional requirements as more institutionalized collectives. These imperatives constitute rhetorical requirements for the leadership of a movement. Conflicts among requirements create rhetorical problems which in turn affect decisions on rhetorical strategy. The primary rhetorical test of the leader—and, indirectly, of the strategies he employs—is his capacity to fulfill the requirements of his movement by resolving or reducing rhetorical problems.

The scholar using this approach will study leadership, for example, by discovering how leaders in any movement accomplish certain functional requirements. Simons listed the leaders' functions as:

1. They must attract, maintain, and mold workers (i.e., followers) into an efficiently organized unit.
2. They must secure adoption of their product by the larger structure (i.e., the external system, the established order).
3. They must react to resistance generated by the larger structure.
After having derived his theory from sociological thinking, Simons then isolated certain functions that must be performed by a movement in order to be viable, then tried to discover how a group mobilizes in order to fulfill those functions. Simons saw this as a "leader-centered" approach.43

In general, advocates of the structure/function approach determine the functions to be accomplished or stages that must be reached by a movement. These specifics frequently are determined deductively by borrowing generalizations from sociological collective behavior theory and applying them to a specific historical case. Having isolated certain specifics, the theorist then tries to discover how the structure of the movement functions, shaping the rhetoric of the movement as it changes across time.

Another example of this approach is the life-cycle theory discussed by Stewart, Smith, and Denton, which they derived from the theories of Dawson and Gettys, Wilson, and Griffin.44 A typical social movement progresses through five stages. The first stage is genesis, in which early prophets within a society note imperfections and call the attention of others to an exigence that needs to be met. This incipient movement progresses to the next stage (perhaps after a triggering event), which is social unrest. The prophets become agitators
within the movement and opponents begin to speak against the movement from without. An ideology is solidified into a manifesto that defines good and evil. When the established institution rejects the movement's call to repent, the frustrated movement enters the stage of mobilization, in which serious confrontations take place. The fourth stage is a critical one of maintenance, wherein the prophets make way for statesmen and fundraisers. Finally, there is some combination of success, failure, and retrenchment, and the movement terminates as a movement. 45

Examples of studies similar to those of Simons and Stewart could be multiplied. Ronald Bever's 1968 dissertation, "An Analysis of Speaking in the American Restoration Movement, 1820-1849," discussed the Movement's "propaganda efforts during four stages." Those four stages he derived from Dawson and Getty's model. 46

These examples indicate that those who favor this approach usually have a sociological orientation. Furthermore, communication within a movement and between a movement and the larger society is viewed as the means of performing typical functions demanded by the structure and stage of development of the group.
II. The situation/response approach

Those who share this theoretical orientation give prominence to the interplay between the changing social situation that gives rise to a movement (and that shapes its rhetoric), and the response from the movement as it affects and is affected by the situation. (Inasmuch as the situation may be interpreted to include the structure of the group itself, one could view this approach as a broader form of the structure/function approach. Simons, for example, is willing to call himself a situationalist.)\(^4^7\)

This vague description may be made clearer by looking at the prolific team of Smith and Windes. In an early article, they took issue with Griffin and with Cathcart, both of whom desired to limit studies of social movements to those movements involved in radical change and confrontation. Smith and Windes suggested that there are situations in which, because of values and goals shared with the mainstream, a movement may desire innovation rather than confrontation. They discussed the example of the Sunday School movement within the churches. In their article, they described what an innovational movement might be like, especially explaining how it adapts to the situation.\(^4^8\)

In "The Rhetoric of Mobilization," they carried their ideas farther to show how exigencies create appeals
to mobilize, and mobilizational appeals define a movement. "The effort to institutionalize is the distinctive character­istic of rhetorical movements." 49

Finally, in a third article, they pointed out that, while it may be useful to try to classify movements by types and stages, movements are dynamic processes and should not be segmented artificially. 50 With this comment, they captured the emphasis that distinguishes this second approach from the first. The situation/response theorist attends to the interplay of moves between the rhetorical situation and the movement. These theorists often acknowledge a debt to Lloyd Bitzer's concept of the "rhetorical situation." 51

Other examples of theorists in this school include James Andrews, who observed that "the social movement is simultaneously a rhetorical response and a rhetorical situation." Recognizing the importance of rhetorical history, he claimed that the examination of specific cases should proceed together with the construction of movement theory. 52

A third example is that of James Golden, who synthesized Bitzer and Smelser in order to show how society allows a rhetorical situation to arise, thus encouraging the founding of a social movement. This makes a situation ripe for conversions to occur, which gives rise to leaders and to potential participants. Golden is one of the few
theorists who has tried to explain the origin of leaders in a movement. Bowers and Ochs also seem to fit in this category, as they offered a theory of interaction between agitational strategies and control strategies.

While the situation/response theorists are not averse to sociological concepts, they are more indebted to historians, because of their attention to changing situations, countermovements, and attempts at social control. It is history that records the dance whose steps they hope to learn. Thus, Andrews, in a recent report, suggested that preconceived theory should be avoided in favor of a more historical approach that might eventually reveal patterns of movement. J. Justin Gustainis, who wanted to isolate a genre of social movement rhetoric, has also called for a historical search for patterns.

III. The strategy/goal approach

More directed toward the inner workings of a movement than are the other two approaches, strategy/goal theorists are concerned with discovering group goals and the use of rhetoric in attempts to fulfill those goals. Among those who inhabit this camp is Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, who wrote about the Women's Liberation Movement as a genre, rather than as a movement. In her article, she first determined what are the "revolutionary radical demands" of women; then she explained why women were
compelled to reject the traditional style of rhetoric as averse to their chosen goals. Finally, she presented a new paradigm of "consciousness-raising" as the "mode of interaction uniquely adapted to the rhetorical problem of feminist advocacy."^{58}

Hahn and Gonchar also belong in this group. They preferred to use Aristotelian constructs to explain how a group's rhetoric is directed "toward the demand for change in some aspect of the social order."^{59}

A more extended example is that of Stewart, Smith, and Denton, in the fifth chapter of their *Persuasion and Social Movements*. In what they called "a functional approach," the authors first discussed Gronbeck's six functions of rhetoric in a social movement: to define, to legitimize, to in-gather, to pressure, to compromise, and to satisfy. Feeling that they could be even more specific, they suggested a system of five more inclusive functions (each with two or three sub-functions). Through rhetoric, a group must transform perceptions of history, alter perceptions of society, prescribe causes of action, mobilize for action, and sustain the social movement. This system of categories helps provide the scholar with pertinent research questions, and gives the study the perspective of what they called a "functional approach."^{60} "Functional" labeling aside, what the authors have done is to present strategies for attaining necessary goals. Gronbeck's five
"functions" are likely to be means used to attain the five ends that Stewart, Smith, and Denton proposed as inclusive functions. Hence, in spite of their terminology, the authors are from the strategy/goal school. (In the summary at the end of the chapter, they explained that their "functional approach" shows how persuasive channels are used to further goals.)

One final, brief example is Jablonski's paper, "Promoting Radical Change in the Roman Catholic Church." In this study, Jablonski showed how the position of authority affected strategies chosen by Roman Catholic Bishops as they attempted to realize their goal of adapting the laity to changes in the Church after the Second Vatican Council.

Their interest in motives, morale, processes of persuasion, and behaviors suggests that theorists in the strategy/goal school may be more psychologically oriented than the previous two types of theorists.

IV. The ideology/expression approach

The final group of theorists is distinct from the others, though they are diverse within themselves. These are the researchers who are concerned with understanding the formation of ideology and its interrelationship with its expression within a group. More than the first three groups, ideology/expression theorists avoid the faults that Sillars judged previous studies guilty of--being too linear
and being overly concerned with cause-and-effect analysis, neither of which attitudes is appropriate to an organismic view of movements.63

The effect of expression or communication upon the creation of ideology is as significant as the shaping of expression by ideology. Although Cathcart was not using this present typology, he explained that, whereas other theorists see rhetoric as instrumental, he (and others who share this perspective) sees rhetoric as constitutive and regulative.64

Each of the four schools has a place in the study of social movements, but I think it is fair to say that this fourth approach, more than the others, emphasizes the place of rhetoric in the creation, the change, and the promulgation of a movement's ideology.

The most radical examplar of this school is McGee. As noted earlier, McGee does not believe movements are real, yet he continues to write about them. Thoroughly phenomenological, McGee sees social movements as concepts, not as phenomena. To him, the important questions are not the sort that ask, how does a movement behave in the real world? Rather, researchers should ask, what is the hermeneutic of "movement"? What is the function of that construct? What, when, and how do people perceive activity as a movement--and movement from what to what?65 Lucas categorizes McGee as a student of process, which is
an appropriate label for all the theorists in this group.66

Replies to McGee have taken two forms. Simons, in his 1980 reply to McGee and Zarefsky, claimed that whether a movement exists in the real world or only in the observer's mind makes little practical difference in methodology or in results.67 A more thorough reply was that of Cathcart, as expressed in his article, "Defining Social Movements by Their Rhetorical Form."68 He agreed with McGee that movements do not "move" in an objective world. They are created symbolically, and they are interpreted and responded to symbolically when confrontations occur. Nevertheless, they do exist in space and time, and must be seen against the background they confront. This physical world must be taken into account— it is not arbitrary.69

Another independent, Malcolm Sillars, is less radical than McGee. As previously noted, he attacked the traditional approaches to movement studies, as well as that of Griffin, for treating movements as though they are linear: "A linear approach will not reveal what is rhetorically significant."70 He also recognized the hazards of treating movements as though they are mechanisms rather than organisms. Time limits imposed on a movement are symbolic, not real; and quests for strict causality— especially searches for single causes— are inappropriate. Instead, he championed a pluralistic approach. The
criteria for testing a theory should be carefulness and usefulness. Among the important concerns for a researcher is the relationship between environment and message—how does each shape the other?71

One of the newer stances is that taken by the theorists who use fantasy theme analysis. To its originator, Bormann, the framework within which this methodology is used is a "symbolic convergence approach."72 A methodological breakthrough (though not unanimously hailed), fantasy theme analysis is an expansion and application of Bales' work with group fantasies.

Though not originated for the purpose of studying social movements, the analysis of fantasy themes, Bormann feels, is useful on various levels. Especially significant is the fact that Bormann's approach is, at least to his way of thinking, a distinctly rhetorical one. He noted that the rhetorical critic gives proper emphasis to the role of "words" in creating or being the social context.73 In fact, it is not too much to say that the rhetoric of a group is the social reality.74 The rhetoric contains the meaning, the emotions, and the motive appeals of a group. Hence, content analysis of messages in order to uncover rhetorical visions and fantasy themes of a group is a vital part of the study of a movement. Fantasy theme analysis has been applied by Carl Wayne Hensley to the Stone-Campbell Movement, first in his 1972 Ph.D.
dissertation at the University of Minnesota and later in an article published in the Quarterly Journal of Speech.  

Broader than Bormann's approach (though, like it, a dramatistic one) is the application of concepts derived from the works of Kenneth Burke. Originally, Burke was a literary critic, but his fascination with the symbolic nature of language led him to examine the entire "drama of human relations" from a symbolic viewpoint. His writings are wide-ranging and, while he does not present a unified theory of social movements, one may derive from his work a fairly explicit and complete theory.

Hugh Duncan applied Burke's concepts to sociological theory in general, but the first careful Burkean synthesis of a social movement theory came from Leland Griffin. In 1962, he presented a paper to the Speech Communication Association National Convention on the subject of the rhetoric of the "New Left." Considering Burke's earlier political affiliation, Griffin thought it would be appropriate to do a dramatistic analysis of the political left. Later, he wrote a descriptive piece, "The Rhetorical Structure of the 'New Left' Movement: Part One," for the Quarterly Journal of Speech. Finally, after immersing himself in the writings of Burke, he wrote "A Dramatistic Theory of the Rhetoric of Movements." That immersion apparently had an unsettling effect on Griffin's writing style, causing his article to
sound like a parody of Burke. Nevertheless, he did an admirable job of capturing from Burke what is essential for a theory of social movements. Using Burke's vocabulary, Griffin explained the origin, development, and decay of a movement by appealing to the natural progression of a political group as it begins in harmonious order and then passes through guilt, from victimage through catharsis to redemption. In spite of the fact that Griffin analyzed the stages of a movement, as do the structure/function theorists, it seems to me that he belongs in this fourth group because these stages are not discerned sociologically, but are the result of, and the expression of, ideology.80

Simons, Mechling, and Schreier were not satisfied with Griffin's efforts. They charged that he overemphasized the revolutionary nature of movements to the exclusion of reform movements. Further, Griffin's theory was "undersupported and excessively rigid," and did not allow sufficiently for situational factors and constraints. They concluded that his model, if "inapplicable to the minor ripples in the tide of history, . . . is nevertheless useful as a description of its great waves." On the other hand, they praised Wilkinson's application of Burke because it showed how Burke's metaphors may be applied to a single event in more specific ways than Griffin provided for.81

(In "The Need for Clarification in Social Models of
Rhetoric," Duncan presented a "sociodramatic model" of rhetoric, based on Burke, but it had little relation to movement studies.\(^{82}\)

Besides the well-known principles of "identification" and "victimage" which most dramatists have focused on, Burke presented a number of other strategies that are useful in studying movements. For example, among strategies for consolidation are "idealization," which is the use of a symbol as exemplar in order to manipulate ideological assumptions, "shared ritual," and "corporate boasting," by which an individual may participate in the triumphs of the group.\(^{83}\) Among strategies of confrontation are "amplification," which is requiring a person "who would reject a little to reject a great deal," and "stealing back and forth" of symbols.\(^{84}\) These strategies deserve more attention from students of Burke.

The most essential feature of Burkean movement studies is attention to the concept of "language as symbolic action."\(^{85}\) The idea of "rhetoric as motive" is that symbols not only "say," they also do—and what symbols do most surely is to shape ideas, roles, and values of the user and hearer. This is what Cathcart meant by his claim that communication is constitutive as well as regulative.\(^{86}\)

This basic understanding of the nature of communication is held also in another dramatistic approach, that
of William R. Brown. Brown proposed an extensive model of human symbolic interaction. Like that of Burke, it is more than a model of social movements, but it is particularly appropriate for movement studies. A number of common assumptions are shared by Burke and Brown, which makes it possible to borrow from Burke some of the rhetorical strategies (called "maneuvers" in Brown's model) that help make Brown's model more specific. I should note here that I am calling attention to the commonalities of Burke and Brown. Brown himself chooses to feature the differences. In Pepper's terms, Brown sees Burke as a contextualist, and himself as an organicist. 87

Both Brown and Burke share a treatment of language as action. As already noted, it is through symbolic interaction, which is the realm of rhetoric, that the ideologies of a system are created and changed, the roles of participants negotiated, and internal and external needs (other than biological) generated and either met or neglected. Hence, a system must be understood through the study of its symbols, categories of symbols, and modes of interaction. 88

Furthermore, both Burke and Brown see within social systems a perpetual potential for conflict, and, therefore, a need for identification to be achieved through rhetoric. This potential conflict is present because of the incomplete nature of mediated knowledge. 89
In spite of this potential, both men see homeostasis as a social value that is enacted as groups seek to achieve or to maintain balance within their system. As Duncan said, any model of social action needs to deal with disorder and conflict as normal to agreement.90

More broadly, both theorists follow a systems approach, assuming that "everything relates to everything . . . [but] some things relate more than others."91 Burke's pentad, according to Brown, is one indicator of a systemic approach.92 Both men also share a belief that the basic nature of the human includes the "need to name." For example, Burke defined Man as "the symbol making, symbol using, symbol misusing animal."93 Brown observed that "transformation of experience into symbols fulfills the uniquely human propensity for categorizing all experience."94

Given the need to categorize, it follows that another human need is to form worldviews.95 Burke expressed a similar idea in his description of humanity as goaded by the spirit of hierarchy and rotten with perfection. That definition implies that people attempt to carry out the implications of the drives to categorize and to construct worldviews; that is, they live as though their categories make sense of the world.96

Though Brown and Burke share certain epistemological assumptions, their main concern is the process
by which social knowledge about values, roles, and status is negotiated, rather than with what Burke calls the "scientistic" approach of "beginning with problems of knowledge, or perception." Brown calls attention to the need to explain principles of progress, rather than only arguing for its existence.

Brown goes beyond Burke in his concentration on social processes. His model of social intervention explains the nature of the process of intervention within a system for the purpose of preserving or else of changing ideology. He attempts to explain the communication and creation of ideologies in a genuinely systemic way, presenting an "ideology of ideologies." Ultimately, his system explains human social processes of sharing knowledge and of negotiating perceived realities by giving a communication-centered explanation that goes beyond historical description, yet that subsumes sociological and psychological constructs, thus providing a unique tool for scholars concerned with social movements.

His model will be explained in detail in Chapter III. Other sources of information, besides the primary article already cited, include an elaboration of parts of his model in Brown's "Attention and the Rhetoric of Social Intervention," in the Quarterly Journal of Speech 68 (February 1982):17-27, and "Power and the Rhetoric of Social Intervention," in Communication
Monographs 53 (June 1986):180-199. Two of his related, unpublished papers are "Needs and the Rhetoric of Social Intervention" and "Toward a Complementary Version of Rhetorical-Vision Theory." So far, scholars have largely neglected the model, perhaps because of the complexity and density of the article in which it was introduced. It was used extensively in the Ph.D. dissertations of Russell Corley and Randall Anderson. The application of the model to religious movements was the subject of a program sponsored by the Religious Speech Communication Association at the 1984 SCA convention. The only other scholarly references to the model outside Brown's articles are two non-substantive citations in articles by Brummert and Wander, and a reference in a 1980 article by McGee claiming that Brown reified the elements of his model.

Critical Approaches to the Stone-Campbell Movement

While the theoretical model used in this study has been somewhat neglected, that is not true of the case being studied. As an outgrowth of an informal network of "Restoration Movement" scholars, at the 1982 SCA convention, a panel of papers surveyed scholarly communication studies of the Movement. The bibliography, as complete as the network could make it up to November 1982, contains citations of 407 historical and critical studies (theses,
dissertations, articles, papers, and books). Of that num-
ber, only nine were movement studies. Most of the rest
were neo-Aristotelian studies of "great speakers."\textsuperscript{103}

Of the movement studies, Bever's dissertation has
been discussed already. One paper and an article by
Hensley are fantasy theme analyses. A dissertation by
Walker is based on Griffin's early study, but, according to
Prill et al., it is really a traditional study. A masters'
thesis by Yeakley employed Simons' theory of persuasion in
order to study the strategies of leaders that encouraged
the development of factions.\textsuperscript{104}

From the time covered by that bibliography through
1984, there has been no study of the significant question
of how the unity of the Movement was maintained in the face
of internal divisive tendencies. While Yeakley's thesis
discussed rhetorical strategies of division, there does not
seem to be a study of the other great function of rhetoric,
that of identification—particularly as it was used by
Alexander Campbell.

Data Collection

Since the theoretical model determines to a large
extent the data that are needed to solve a problem, the
method and subject of data collection are significant. In
its examination of the story of the Movement, this study
partakes of the nature of a rhetorical history. As such,
the history is subject to the ultimate tests of truthfulness
or falsehood. As the model is applied and evaluations are made, the study becomes rhetorical criticism, and is thus subject to tests of "consistency and insightfulness," as Gronbeck explained. It is hoped that this combination will confirm that "theory and history can interact to the mutual enrichment of both." Reminding their readers that history always involves selection and interpretation of facts, Barzun and Graff wrote, "The facts never speak for themselves." One purpose of this study is to apply Brown's model of social intervention to Campbell's leadership within the Stone-Campbell Movement, in order to determine whether the interpretation of the history that is provided by the model is a coherent and useful one. That is, how well does it provide a possible explanation of the intervention of Campbell? Is the model useful in explaining how he shaped the ideas of his followers and with what effect? Does it suggest how Campbell's rhetoric shaped and was affected by needs and changing circumstances both within and without his Movement?

Before these questions can be answered, it is necessary to establish a historical base by the study of what Barzun and Graff call "records" and "relics"—the intentional and unintentional mediators of facts. The sources most important in this case are the rhetorical records that constituted Campbell's most influential
attempts at intervention. Campbell preached frequently in Bethany, Virginia (now West Virginia), where he lived, as well as made a number of speaking tours through various parts of the United States, but his ideas reached a broader audience through his voluminous writings, most of which he published himself. McAllister and Tucker, recent Disciple historians, singled out Campbell's two monthlies, along with two journals by other writers, as "clearly the most important sources for understanding pre-Civil War Disciples life and thought."110

Primary sources for the study of Campbell's intervention, then, include his Christian Baptist, which was his first monthly journal and ran from 1823-1830, and its successor, the Millennial Harbinger, which was published from 1830-1870, although Campbell's age prevented him from having much to do with it after 1863. His book, The Christian System (1835), "figured decisively in shaping the theology of the Disciples."111 The records of his five oral debates (scattered from 1820-1844) brought his ideas to many listeners and readers in other denominations, as well as to his own sympathizers. One of his more controversial works was an emended version of the New Testament, The Living Oracles, which was an integration of previous translations made by George Campbell, Philip Doddridge, and James Macknight, including introductory notes by Alexander Campbell.112
The John Barclay Family Collection of manuscripts at Bethany College, under the administration of Hiram Lester, has been indispensable to this study. As probably the most nearly complete collection of its kind in existence, it includes either originals or copies (most of which are photographic) of Campbell's letters, diaries, and early school notebooks. Also in the collection are memoirs and letters from others who knew Campbell, such as Robert Richardson, his biographer. Such relics and records are significant because intervenors influence others interpersonally, apart from their public address.

Underscoring the important place of verbal communication among the members of the Stone-Campbell Movement, historian Richard Hughes said,

While the worship services of many churches—Catholic and Episcopal, for example—could best be described as liturgical and aesthetic; and while many other churches are best known for their charismatic dimension; we are a people whose services have always been marked by the rational use of words. We are not particularly emotional or terribly aesthetic; rather, we are overwhelmingly verbal.

To be sure, we have virtually immersed ourselves for over 150 years in a veritable torrent of words, both spoken and written. We have preached, we have debated, we have lectured, and we have written.\textsuperscript{113}

None of the pioneer leaders in the Movement, and perhaps no one ever among the Disciples, was more verbally prolific than Campbell. The purpose of the rest of this study is to discover how his words and other symbolic actions affected and shaped a movement for religious unity, as well as how his communication was shaped by it.
Limitations and Key Assumptions

For the sake of manageability, I have limited this study to the years 1830-1840. It seems better to research these eleven years carefully, rather than to observe fifty years in a cursory way. Although such time limits may appear somewhat arbitrary, the decade that has been chosen is an especially significant one in the history of the Movement for several reasons.

In the first place, until the 1830's, Campbell and his followers still thought of themselves as reformers within the Baptist Church. Around the beginning of that decade, though, after being expelled from various Baptist congregations, they began to see themselves as a separate Movement. This new conception of their identity has been dated by different historians from 1828 to 1832. For example, Tucker and McAllister's timeline of the Disciples of Christ begins at 1830. By 1832, Campbell was able to write, "The Rubicon is passed." By the end of the 1830's, those who were part of the Movement clearly were thinking of themselves as a separate church. In this connection, the change that Harold Lunger detected in the mind of Campbell was characteristic of the entire Movement:

From about 1831 to the middle of the following decade Campbell's conception of the church underwent a gradual transformation from that of the radical sect form to that of the characteristic American church form--the denomination.
During the 1830's, the Movement experienced rapid growth. In 1832, there were about 22,000 members; by the end of the decade, the membership had quadrupled.\footnote{117}

Besides the rapid growth of the Movement, and their development of an image of themselves as a distinct group apart from the Baptists, there were other changes that made the 1830's a crucial decade. It was a time of consolidation, as the Stone branch and the Campbell branch united in 1832-1833, as well as of tension. Much of the controversy between Campbell and John Thomas (who later broke away from the Movement to found the Christadelphians), and Campbell and Sidney Rigdon (who became a pioneer leader of the Mormons) occurred then. In 1837, Campbell wrote the famous reply to the Lunenburg letter (see Chapter V), in an attempt to counterbalance a trend toward legalism within the Movement.

A significant step toward institutionalization was taken when Bacon College was founded in 1836 and Bethany College founded in 1840. For all of these reasons, then, the 1830's were a formative decade for the Stone-Campbell Movement.

In addition to the carefully circumscribed time period chosen for this study, a second limitation is suggested by one of Campbell's frequent pronouncements, that "God works through means." It seems to me that God's work in history is usually carried out through natural means.
In studying the history of this Movement of which I am one heir, I shall attempt to describe the events and interpret the facts as fairly and accurately as possible. It is not my purpose here either to affirm or deny the influence of the Prime Mover, the first Intervenor. The right of private judgment is reserved in this area of faith, which is beyond scholarship, though not, I think, contrary to it.

A final limitation is that this study will not be able to prove causation within the Movement, nor can it claim to verify fully the model that is used, although it will confirm or disconfirm this particular application of it. To describe an event is a more nearly objective task than to explain it. The explanation and interpretation of historical facts provided by Brown's model seems valid and useful to me, but it is, at best, only a probable explanation. There are several reasons for this lack of certainty. All models have natural limitations. The reconstruction of historical events is an elusive enterprise. Furthermore, there is the nature of the organic system, in which multiple causation is the rule.

In spite of these cautions, there is reason to hope that the results of this study will be useful. As far as I know, this is the first study of the rhetorical influence of Campbell as an agent for maintaining stability within his Movement. In addition, the explanation this study provides of the interrelationships between the
anti-authoritarian Disciples and their leaders is of interest.

To the extent that the model fits the events in such a way as to account for most of the relationships and to clarify the strategies, tactics, and maneuvers used in the interventions, so far is the model ratified and the dynamics of the Movement explained.

It may even be possible to extrapolate from this study possible strategies that one might use in order to intervene in a similar way within a comparable system. For example, some of Campbell's approaches to sustaining unity within a complex system might prove to be useful in preventing further fragmentation within the Churches of Christ.

In the next chapter, Brown's model will be described in detail.

In the following pages, quotations from the original sources are, to the best of my ability, faithful in punctuation, spelling, and capitalization to the primary sources. Few of the writers cited, including Campbell, made consistency their most prominent virtue. Too, idioms have changed in the last century and a half. Where necessary for clarity, I have inserted an explanatory word or phrase in brackets. In most cases, though, the reader may enjoy the flavor of the nineteenth century without being distracted by [sic]'s.
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CHAPTER III

BROWN'S MODEL OF SOCIAL INTERVENTION

If the study of collective human behavior is the province of the sociologist, the study of how that behavior both expresses and creates meaning is the province of the rhetorician. The rhetorical study of a social movement attempts to discover and explain what are the shared images, myths, and values of the participants, and how the common worldview motivates human action. Like Archimedes with his lever, such a study needs a place to stand. The need for that fulcrum is what Robert Berkhofer referred to in his Behavioral Approach to Historical Analysis: "... man can only be studied as an analytical entity through some conceptual framework."¹

It is a theoretical model that provides this framework by giving the student a pair of glasses, a perspective, through which human behavior is seen to make sense. In contrast to "great figure" studies, process studies usually encompass a complex of interactions rather than a single piece of rhetoric, and usually cover a period of time rather than a single occasion; therefore, the student generally does not attempt to construct a fresh model. As
Brown suggested, those who attempt such studies are "likely to come to their data with a model ready-made, with the dual intentions of understanding those data better and simultaneously of testing the application of the model."^2

For the reasons explained in the previous chapter, I have chosen to use William R. Brown's model of rhetorical intervention within a system. This model is particularly well-suited to historical analysis, meeting, as it does, the relevant requirements that Berkhofer stipulated for such a model: it neglects neither psychological nor social variables, but takes account "of the interpersonal as well as the intrapersonal"; it provides a dynamic interpretation of social activity, allowing for change over time; and it allows for the exercise of free will by subjects who, as humans, inhabit a universe of options.^3

This chapter will explain Brown's model in detail sufficient for the reader's understanding of its later application to the Stone-Campbell Movement. To avoid misunderstanding, it should be explained how the term, "model," is used in this study. On the most basic level, a "model" is a pictorial, graphic, or material representation in concrete form of elements that are less concrete, and of relationships that are hypothesized as an explanation of a human or technical process. Examples of this kind of model include the "linear communication models" in graphic form that have been proposed by Berlo, by Shannon and
The reader will find the term used in this familiar and limited sense in the early part of Bormann's book, Communication Theory. However, this is not how the word is used in this study.

On a more metaphorical level, Bormann later uses "model" to refer to mental constructs that operate on the level of general or special theories, or even of paradigms. These models abstract from the infinitely complex world of human behavior certain features that seem especially important to the theorist and which are related in various ways. It is in this sense that "model" is used in this study.

Although there are a number of graphic representations in these pages, they are not "Brown's model," but models (in the first sense) of his model (in the second sense). The diagrams are useful, but one may discuss Brown's model without using them. In fact, in Brown's papers and articles may be found other types of diagrams besides those used here, including some derived from René Thom's catastrophe theory.

All of the elements and relationships that make up Brown's model are reified in society through human communication. Communication is "the true engine of history," he wrote, placing symbolic interaction as the source of human society. In a similar vein, Talcott Parsons wrote, "Communication is the action process which is the source and the bearer of cultural creation and maintenance."
Such a starting point suggests that a search for human needs ought not attempt to reduce them to attitudinal, molecular, or electromagnetic forces or drives. (In contrast, biochemist Jacques Monod expressed his opinion that all coherent and constructive activity is rooted in the "essential molecular agents" of proteins. Using this terministic screen, Monod labeled every organism, including the human one, as a "chemical machine.")

To Brown, the source of human needs is not ultimately chemical; rather, needs arise as people interact--as the individual is told, or tells the self, that needs exist. Duncan affirmed this symbolic origin of need when he wrote, "The self originates and continues to exist, therefore, in a drama of address." Human needs not only arise, but also are met through symbolic means. Communication is the means of interrelationship within society. Kenneth Boulding once described organizations as roles tied together by lines of communication. These roles, though, also originate through communication.

One significant characteristic, then, of Brown's model is that it attributes to communication the central creative role in society. A second characteristic is that the model treats a network of communication as organic. To use Stephen Pepper's phrase, the root metaphor of this communication model is that of "process." A model that emphasizes process rather than content is an attempt to explain
change, including growth, birth, and death in whatever system it deals with—in this case, a system of worldviews or ideologies. Brown's model provides such explanation by considering the "principles by which world views wax and wane." A process model is an appropriate one with which to study the Stone-Campbell Movement, even though change was not immediately apparent during the whole of the chosen decade. As Berkhofer remarked, "process is continual even in stable systems."

A third characteristic of Brown's model is that it provides a systemic approach to analysis of a communication event. This implies that the sorts of relationships made visible by this model are non-linear, not reducible to simple cause-and-effect. Rather than finding chains of precise control, the researcher who uses a systemic approach expects indications of mutual influence. "Explanation" of influences is a more appropriate goal than discovery of "causation." Such an approach is consistent with a humanistic worldview, which does not reduce human behavior to stimulus-response patterns. Duncan expressed such a view when he urged humanistic researchers to use caution in choosing terms: "We cannot say that roles 'gear' or 'mesh' without reducing emotion to motion."

Before describing the model, I shall present three cautions. First, it should be noted that Brown's model was developed gradually over several years of thought, study,
and teaching. What Brown said of ideologies in general is, of course, true of his, as well: "The communication and creation of ideologies proceed together." My purpose in this chapter, though, is to treat as a whole a model that has been described in several articles and papers; hence, my description may give an impression of completeness and harmony that was not present at the start. Nor will this description reflect the variance in emphases within the earlier and the later papers. On the other hand, I will try to harmonize the use of various technical synonyms that is sometimes confusing.

A second caution is that I do not attempt to give a full survey of Brown's theory of communication. A more complete summary which includes the history of the development of relevant ideas was undertaken by Russell Corley in his dissertation. My concern is to provide a more detailed explanation of, and a rationale for, Brown's model of social intervention, which may then be applied to a thoroughly documented account of an intervention.

In fact, the dissertations of both Corley and Randall Anderson covered material that will not be discussed here. Anderson established Brown's approach firmly in the philosophical camp of phenomenology, and sociologically in the arena of symbolic interactionists. His primary theoretical interest was the explication of Brown's notion of the attention-shift. On the other hand, Corley gave a
more comprehensive view of Brown's theory of communication. In addition, he wrestled with possible charges that the model leads to a sceptical relativism, particularly toward value-laden choices.\(^{23}\)

One final caution is that, in spite of the limited focus of this case study, the model is not limited in its usefulnesss only to movement studies. As a systemic model, it could be applied as well to other communication events. Brown expressed his view of its versatility: "This model aspires to be general enough to fit global communication, social movements, even dyads."\(^{24}\) Nevertheless, its scope, its organic nature, and its emphasis on the influence of an intervenor make the model especially useful for the study of social movements. I think that this is recognized by Brown, for he referred to movement studies in his papers, and also illustrated aspects of the model by applying it to movements such as the civil rights movement.\(^{25}\)

A Systems Approach

The goal of any systems analysis, according to Berkhofer, is "to apply a theoretical system . . . to the abstracted relationships of an empirical system."\(^{26}\) By "system," he referred to a set of elements that are related in such a way that each depends on the other and all form a coherent whole. A "theoretical system" is an analytical construction of ideas and principles. Finally, an "empirical system" is a complex of entities that exist in
reality. In the rest of this chapter, the theoretical system will be developed and explained. In Chapter IV, the "empirical system," which is the Stone-Campbell Movement, will be presented in its historical context. The succeeding chapters will test whether the model is adequate to explain intervention within the Movement.

As already mentioned briefly, Brown considers his model to be a systemic approach to the problem of constructing a suggestive model of how ideology develops within a society or a segment of society. Because it is a systemic approach, the model treats society as an interrelated collection of distinguishable elements that together make up a recognizable unit that is discrete from the world outside the system. The human elements affect each other through symbolic interaction, thereby changing the internal stability of the system. The model attempts to trace "mutual influences among significant-appearing factors." The members in the system operate to maintain homeostasis either by adjusting of the various elements (in the case of a closed system), or else by interacting with the environment (in the case of an open system).

The elements in the model include all who are affected by an ideology, and all those who share in effecting it. Brown defined "ideology" as "any symbolic construction of the world in whose superordinate 'name' human beings can comprehensively order their experience and
subsume their specific activities." Among the elements that make up a worldview or ideology are theories about the nature and essence of the members and the system (ontologies), views of values and hierarchies of values (axiologies), and beliefs about the origins and the grounds of knowledge (epistemologies). These ideological elements are formed by individuals or groups who feature (or draw attention to) some concepts and simultaneously mask other concepts that do not fit. Other elements that are part of an ideology include human needs as they are perceived and interpersonal relationships that affect the meeting of those needs through power or influence, which is attributed to others through communication.

Communication is the most basic element of human behavior. Brown describes the world in which we live as an "arbitrated" one—that is, a world that we do not experience directly, but only through abstraction or symbolizing. In more detail, Gregg explained visual perception as based on the basic principle of "edging" or "bordering":

If the principle of bordering is so fundamental, it deserves further attention. The processes of bordering provide the contents of experiencing by stabilizing the ecological flux around us, and this is achieved through detection and creation of structure and form. Of special importance to our inquiry is the fact that bordering activity is an activity that is instantly symbolic. It is not copying experience. There is no experiencing but formed experiencing.

Beginning with such an understanding of human experience, the communication scholar who studies an event
goes beyond the purely historical approach. Berkhofer's final procedural step for doing historical analysis is to "attribute connections, according to various theories, now that the different behavioral levels and categories are differentiated." Such attribution could take the form either of mechanistic or organismic explanations. The communication scholar, indebted to the historian for providing such structure, aims at explaining the connections with their consequences by means of shared meanings or interpretations of the world that are rooted in human symbolizing activity.

In a systemic view, changes among such interconnections are inevitable as ideologies prevail or fade. Suggestive and important questions about how continuity of a system is maintained during experienced change have been raised by Duncan—and these are among the questions that Brown's model addresses:

How can we bring change about in orderly fashion, and yet preserve order? Change always seems to threaten a given order, and yet without change, social order would be impossible. How can we incorporate methods of change into the social order itself?

An Organic System

In Berkhofer's discussion of systems theory, he presented two contrasting models of society, claiming that all systems may be seen either as mechanistic or as organismic. For the mechanist, the root metaphor is the
lever; he or she believes that the whole is the sum of its parts—as, for example, a model of the solar system. The root metaphor for the organicist is growth. The organicist views the whole system as more than the sum of the functioning of its parts; in fact, the system regulates the relations among its parts. As Pepper said, to the organicist, the whole transcends the parts at the same time that it preserves them. That is, in the image of a complex organism there is a drive toward pattern maintenance, as well as an inherent tendency toward pattern disintegration. Though Brown did not use those expressions, he presented the same idea when he said that an organic model is "grounded in the terms equilibrium/disequilibrium." 

To Brown, this persistence of pattern in a stable system is a result of the deviance-compensating nature of three sub-cycles that comprise the processes that he attempts to model. The notion of deviance compensation is taken metaphorically from the practice of putting a twist in a drive belt so that it does not work itself off its rollers. A "deviance-compensating" cycle, then, is one in which trends that threaten the continuity of a system are periodically reversed.

That any trend may eventually threaten the growth of ideology within a system, and thus become deviance amplifying, is due to the imperfect nature of human
attention and the consequent inevitable gaps in any worldview. In order for the cycle to become deviance compensating, there must be a "refocusing of attention," in order to reverse trends. In fact, what Brown said of one of the three cycles (the attention-shift sub-cycle) is true of all three. In order for a shift to occur, there must be at least two alternate patterns (or "templates"); they must be mutually exclusive, and each must make sense of the world. For example, two alternative patterns existed in Xenia, Ohio, during and after the tornado of 1974. When interviewed after the storm, survivors who had been agnostics or atheists before found in the disaster a confirmation of their beliefs; those who had been religious found evidence of God's providence in their own survival. Hence, both views seem to make sense of the event, and both are incompatible with each other. It is Brown's claim, one also exemplified by Thomas Kuhn's discussion of scientific paradigms, that progress or growth in a system requires switching of patterns as gaps or anomalies threaten to disrupt an ideology.

Such switching does not occur by accident, but by conscious, goal-directed human intervention. In a system, there may be agents devoted to encouraging change. Such intervenors serve the vital function of stimulating the reversal of trends that threaten to destroy the integrity of a system. They are able to affect the system's
worldview (or a part of it) by presenting an alternative perceived pattern to the one that prevails in the system. At the same time, other intervenors may perceive imminent change and, consequently, act to prevent it.

Periodic changes between alternative paradigms serve to maintain homeostasis within the system, and so also does the interrelationship among three sub-cycles that create the ideology. As modeled by Brown, there is a power cycle that affects a needs cycle, and this needs cycle affects an attention-switch cycle which affects the power cycle. More generally, each cycle eventually shapes and is shaped by both the others.

If a system is seen as organismic, an intervenor may not be said to control any part of the system, but only to shape it. Intervention into the system may have far-reaching effects, some of which are unexpected and even undesired. Such being the nature of an organism, the observor studying the system must be prepared to discover unintegrated social and cultural wholes composed either of some autonomous unrelated parts or of conflicting parts as well as integrated wholes of various degrees of integration.

In summary, the aim of the model is to explain human ideology by accounting for its formation and change within an organismic system, as the system is influenced (or as it fails to be influenced) by strategic intervention.
carried out in symbolic interaction. The model, then, proposes an "ideology of ideologies." As already mentioned, Brown subsumes the processes involved in ideology-making with three sub-cycles that make up the model: (1) the interpretative or "attention-shift" cycle; (2) the interpersonal or "power" cycle; and (3) the intrapersonal or "needs" cycle.

The Interpretative Cycle

On the most basic level, ideology formation is rooted in the uniquely human bent to denominate all experience, like Adam naming the animals, so that it may be organized and interpreted. (This need to name is situated by the biochemist Jacques Monod "somewhere in the genetic code" of humans, along with "the fear of solitude.")

The symbolic nature of the naming process is evident first in human abstraction of sensory experiences. That symbolism is an essential part even of neurophysiological processes is claimed by Monod:

the information the central nervous system furnishes to consciousness is only, and probably only can be, in codified form, transposed, framed within preexisting norms: in other words, assimilated and not just restored.

Symbolic activity continues in higher-order abstracting of form from experiences, or the creation of categories; and then in the still higher-ordered construction of rules for forming categories of experiences and
interrelationships. When these rules and categories deal with ultimate ideas, they are part of ideology construction. Through intrapersonal symbolizing, then, the human "construes a world." Of course, this world-construal process is not an individual project alone, but also is carried out socially.

In order to make the first cycle especially clear, as well as to introduce the diagrams that may be used to illustrate Brown's model, and to show the effect of intervention within a system, let us take the simplest possible system—a single person. The following example is illustrative; it is not meant to be a documentary account, although I have acquaintances who could claim various parts of the story essentially as their own.

John is a conservative member of a mainstream evangelical church. Although he might not use these terms, his worldview includes an ontology, or a view of who he is (and, therefore, of who others are); an epistemology, or a way of arriving at knowledge; and an axiology, or a hierarchy of values.

Considering each of these elements, an observer learns that John's view of himself has been formed through symbolic interaction with other members of his church, as people he respects have communicated to him, both implicitly and explicitly, that he is part of a loyal few who, almost alone in the religious world, embrace proper and true
beliefs, rather than false teaching. John's church, then, is an object of divine favor, since few other Protestants share its creed. As for the Catholics, as a whole, they are so far separated from the truth that they are disciples of the antichrist.

John's view of who he is affects his way of knowing. His church's creed and the Bible (as explained by his church) are the primary sources of his knowledge. Any religious teaching that is not consistent with these sources is false doctrine. In fact, his allegiance to those documents encourages him to be legalistic. John's source of knowledge about how he ought to behave is inspired; hence, he also knows something about how God behaves.

His epistemological outlook affects his value system. As custodian of the faith, his church upholds the final standard of orthodoxy. Heterodoxy is not a positive value, nor is emotional display, nor open-mindedness or doctrinal liberality. John's values, in turn, affect and shape his self-concept. When he behaves as his values prescribe, he feels satisfaction; when his behavior fails to fulfill his values, he is guilty.

These interrelationships may be diagrammed in this way:
Ontology, including self as a loyal member of the true church

Axiology, including high value for orthodoxy and rational behavior

Epistemology, including religious knowledge derived from creed, tradition, and Bible as mediated by church

Figure 1: Elements of a System of Religion

Such a circular diagram serves as an apt metaphor for a system. The arrows show process, with each element of the worldview shaping and influencing another—not necessarily in order, but perhaps all at the same time. (A circular diagram is appropriate also for other reasons, for this cyclical metaphor will be extended later to describe deviance-amplifying cycles and vicious cycles.)

The order of the three elements in the diagram may be troubling until one remembers that this is not a model of linear order, but of process and relationships. Depending on the case being studied, the researcher may sometimes be confident as to which of these elements should be given primacy; at other times, there may not be enough evidence to tell. In any case, all of them proceed together.
A coherent ideology is self-replicating. To John, his worldview is true and authentic because he is able to live as though it makes sense of the whole world—and vice versa. Upon encountering a fresh experience or new people, John must fit them into pre-existing categories. When he meets a person who cannot fit into the category of "brother" or "sister," his ideology tells him how to respond by treating the new individual either as a religious alien or as a non-person, in which case John may ignore him or her. In all these encounters, as his worldview continues to fit, John learns to respect his own judgment highly. Each successful "fitting" into existing categories confirms that there are, in fact, not more things in heaven and earth than his ideology allows. When a person lives in this way, as though one's worldview is completely reliable and comprehensive, so that any salient anomaly would utterly shatter it, then that ideology approaches a vicious circle, unable to change through growth, and ripe for intervention from outside.

That is exactly what happened to John. Unable to refuse a friend's invitation, John one day attended a meeting of religious businessmen who were known for their "charismatic" behavior. That is, they engaged in mystical behavior, such as glossolalia, and attributed their experiences to divine visitations. After attending their meeting and witnessing their experiences—and after the members
insisted on praying for him--, John found himself "speaking in tongues." John's ideology had no room for such unstructured behavior, but his experience was so immediate and powerful that he could not ignore it, in part because his companions told him that such an experience was a sign of the grace of the same God he already worshiped. Furthermore, he found that he could repeat the experience at will, which made it self-authenticating.

John now underwent a change in his religious views that was as broad and comprehensive as a conversion. His experience was a sign to him that he was divinely favored, entrusted with a living spirit instead of dry words. Now, he saw the charismatics (and himself) as a peace-loving family, rather than as the divisive guerilla agents he once thought them to be. Because they were true initiates into divine secrets, they were the objects of persecution from the mainstream churches. His former friends were either misinformed or his outright enemies. The charismatics were now his new family. This change in his ontology affected his epistemology. Now, he treasured emotional and mystical experiences that would have disgusted him before. Even his dreams became charged with potentiality, because they could be messages from God. He still revered the Bible, but it seemed to be a new book as his charismatic teachers explained it to him.

John's values changed, too, as everything became new to him. In the place of his former dedication to a system
of legalism, John now valued what he called a "spirit-filled life." Emotional and social support became more important to him than before. The people who now were most significant to him were those who had also shared a form of his mystical experience. This bond of fellowship suggests that his value system also affected his ontology. Among his new religious family members are all charismatics, including even Catholics. John began to live according to new myths that include an anticipated unity among all churches, based on the commonality of the charismatic experience. We may summarize his new ideology with this diagram:

```
Ontology: John, as a new person, a spirit-filled initiate, a charismatic

Axiology: experience and emotional fulfillment are valued; the supernatural supersedes the natural

Epistemology: Unrestrained interpretation of Bible; experience is also valid source of knowledge
```

Figure 2: A Religious System after Attention-Switch

Apparently, everything changed when the attention-switch occurred, but there is one similarity between his new pattern of religious beliefs and his old one. The new
pattern approaches a vicious circle just as the old one did. John believed that his new religious system is comprehensive and true, not just for himself, but for everyone. Since it is of divine origin, there cannot be any apparent anomalies—the structure cannot stand the strain.

Such anomalies or gaps may occur at various places in an ideology, threatening to invalidate the whole system. Let us imagine that a gap arises at that "place" in John's religious beliefs that seems especially susceptible to possible intervention—his belief that, inasmuch as a charismatic experience is a sign of divine approval, no one can be spiritually acceptable to God who has not had such an experience. In other words, John can place only charismatics within his category of "Christians."

Suppose, now, that John begins to encounter anomalies—such as failures to fit daily life into his ideology. For example, he may observe behavior that he can label only as pious and virtuous, even though the person he observes is not a charismatic. Perhaps he reads the books of C. S. Lewis or hears about Mother Theresa on television. His value system demands that he respect their goodness. He cannot deny that such people surpass him in many virtues, in spite of the fact that neither is charismatic and both have high regard for the orthodox creeds of their respective churches. If he cannot dispose of such contradictions, he may conclude that a charismatic
experience is not always necessary and sufficient to mark a person as "Christian." John's perception of a basic anomaly causes him to question his whole system, and he may undergo a pattern switch, or an "un-conversion."

If such a change occurs, may it be said that John reverted to his previous system of beliefs? Perhaps, but he did not go back as the same person he was before; he returned with a new perspective. Thus, in discussing such alternations, Brown spoke of "'returns with differences."

He also suggested that a spiral provides a better metaphor than a cycle, because progress is implied in the spiral. Regardless of the progress, the differences between the two systems are so basic that they are irreconcilable, and John cannot hold to both ideologies at the same time.

Both of them, though, may be "plotted" in a similar way.

Here is John's earlier ideology:

```
more
legalism over grace
less

more
orthodoxy over innovation
less

less
authority over experience
more
```

Figure 3: One Pattern of Emphasis in Religious System
John originally saw himself as a Protestant, and as a stickler for rules. The more he emphasized legalism, the more he saw true knowledge as having its origin in an authoritarian law and, therefore, the more he valued orthodoxy, which he saw as obedience to that law. After his charismatic experience, though, he saw himself less as a legalist than as a mystic, one who was especially favored by divine grace. The less that he emphasized legalism (or the more he emphasized grace), the more validity he saw in experiential religion rather than in a one-and-for-all revealed law. Because different people have different religious experiences, John came to value orthodoxy as less important than having an authenticating experience:
John's two ways of understanding religion essentially are irreconcilable. He cannot hold both views at the same time, although he may oscillate between the two at different times in his life. His earlier conversion, or attention-switch, was encouraged through the means of testimonies, physical evidence, and prayers that were addressed to him through God. The intervention and its effect may be seen in this way:

![Diagram of attention-switch cycle]

Figure 5: First Intervention into Attention-Switch Cycle

When John experienced the second attention-switch, again it had been encouraged by an intervention, this time through means of personal examples and written address. This second change may be seen as in the following
Figure 6: Second Intervention into Attention-Switch Cycle

Both of the latter two figures illustrate the intervention as it caused change in the area of ontology. If the observer viewed an intervention as occurring in a different element, he or she could simply arrange the figure in the appropriate order. At this point, having described both attention-switches, it is convenient to illustrate them in one figure:
The dashed lines indicate the two vicious circles, either of which would threaten the system if there were no attention-switches encouraged by appropriate intervention. This final figure illustrates that, in this simple system, alternations between mutually exclusive patterns of religious beliefs prevent the system from approaching a vicious circle. It is these unsettling and sometimes painful changes that provide continuity through growth for John's religious system.

Before leaving this extended example, one might ask, in the face of the discomfort that attends such change, could John not develop a fresh worldview that includes
a third religious pattern broad enough to accommodate the anomalies that invalidate his previous views? No doubt he could, by stepping up to a higher level of abstraction to create a metatheory of religion. Unless there is provision for growth, though, the new, more inclusive pattern would still result in vicious circles, or else would contain new gaps that would again make John ripe for conversion. The human experience seems to require constant growth toward the ideal, though without ever being able to attain it completely. As Burke put it, we are "rotten with perfection."58

The cycle that we have just illustrated Brown has called the "attention-shift cycle," "attention-switch cycle," "interpretative cycle" (since it is here that sense is made of our experience of the world), and the "input-switching cycle."

There are two other cycles that affect and are affected by this cycle. They are the needs cycle (or intrapersonal cycle) and the power cycle (or interpersonal cycle). The needs cycle explains how needs are internalized by an individual or a collectivity and assume greater importance when they are not met by those who can meet them, and lesser importance or relevance when they are satisfied. The power cycle explains the relationship among the various roles in a system (generally a system larger than one person). These three cycles, each feeding
off the other and all mutually adjusting to each other, may be examined either individually or as a whole. Hence, in Brown's writings, sometimes they are called "cycles" and sometimes "sub-cycles."

At this point, a summary of the interpretative cycle is in order, before I proceed to a much briefer description of the other two.

Any attempt to order human experience into a worldview, or an ideology, inevitably omits some details that do not fit. These gaps are "endemic to the abstraction of concepts." Such gaps either are dealt with or else avoided in various ways, but when members of a system act as though a gap would destroy an ideology, they approach involvement in a vicious circle. In order to avoid such vicious circles, there must be a "periodic refocusing of attention" to compensate for "symbolic gaps and vicious circles." Thus, the sub-cycle will take the form of a deviance-compensating cycle, as in the alternation of legalism with charismatism previously examined.

On the broad level of the interpretation and categorizing of experience into an ideology, deviance compensation requires that there be at least two alternative paradigms ("templates" or patterns that provide comprehensive organization of knowledge). These patterns, as seen in the example of John, are mutually exclusive;
neither one is derived or evolves from the other, so that a mental leap, a refocusing of attention, is necessary in order to leave one paradigm and to adopt another. This cycle, then, is called the attention-switch cycle.

The elements that make up the attention-switching cycle are, in the broadest sense, the basic ideological categories of concepts of being, of valuing, and of ways of knowing, all of which are interrelated. Each of these categories is developed through symbolic negotiation between the self and others. Since a fully integrated ideology is not always explicit, each element may be studied as symbolic process in itself. For example, in science, the input-switching sub-cycle may focus on the epistemic reification of paradigms. On the other hand, within a minority movement, the operant category may be that of being; hence, switches may be seen to occur between alternative, exclusive versions of the self-concept.

The Intrapersonal Cycle

As already discussed, an individual creates his or her own world through intrapersonal symbolizing. This symbolizing, though, does not take place in isolation. To prevent vicious circles, the intrapersonal world must be interrelated with those of other humans individually and in groups. Through interpersonal interaction, one tests
one's categories, creates one's self-concept, and negotiates a role in the hierarchy of society. "We 'internalize' social roles," said Duncan, "through arousing in ourselves the response we arouse in others."67

The negotiated role demands "consensual validation" from others in the form of critical responses, attribution of status, and even attribution of beliefs and motives.68 Because these needed responses are felt on the intrapersonal level, this sub-cycle is called the "needs sub-cycle."69

As is the case with the other two sub-cycles, the needs sub-cycle may operate as a vicious circle. The growth and survival needs belonging to a role within a system prescribe attitudes and behaviors (enactments of ideology which Brown calls "action corollaries").70 When one perceives certain role expectations, one attempts to satisfy such expectations by appropriately-motivated behavior. Engaging in this behavior "constitutes advocacy of acceptance by self and others."71 This advocacy which seeks approval or recognition from others leads to open-channel behavior--that is, one is receptive to feedback from both the judgmental self and significant others. Should such response be withheld, the growth/survival needs would intensify, leading to increased advocacy and more open-channel behavior. Open-channel behavior, then, as a plea for attention, involves risk. As Duncan
observed,

every request involves risk. Most terrible of all are the moments when we get no response, as in the nightmare when we seek to communicate with those who can save us, but who will not, or cannot, respond.\textsuperscript{72}

Such a vicious cycle leads eventually to the abandonment of the ideology or the world inhabited by the individual. Presumably, the person may drop out of the system or else experience mental dissociation from the attributed role.

On the other hand, an advocate who, as a consequence of felt needs, engages in appropriate behavior and open-channel activity, may receive needs-meeting response from the environment—that is, from the approving self and also from those who have the perceived power to authenticate the advocate's behavior. This authentication may not take the form of agreement. The testing and rejecting of a scientist's results constitutes needs-meeting behavior if the scientist feels a need to be taken seriously as a researcher who is engaged in normal science.\textsuperscript{73} Response from the environment reduces the intensity of the felt needs, leading to less intense advocacy and less open-channel behavior. Eventually, engagement in less open-channel behavior leads to increased felt needs again. In this way, the needs sub-cycle remains stable because of the symbolic reification of roles from those in the environment who have the power to do so—that is, from the
power, or interpersonal, cycle.

The Interpersonal Cycle

On the interpersonal level, as people interrelate "as though the world makes sense," the difference between "self" and "other" is born. As the self and others negotiate roles and status, giving labels that complement each other (as "teacher" and "student"), a hierarchy is established. Motives and beliefs are attributed to individuals as they behave according to their roles. Interpersonal roles result, finally, as Sarbin and Allen suggested, from responses to the questions, "Who am I? Who are you? Who is that?"

Within a system, not only do interpersonal relationships affect the formation, growth, and death of an ideology, but ideology also defines the roles within the system. The complex of interrelated roles is the "power sub-cycle." Power is defined by Brown as "the collection of 'shares' which individuals or groups have in picking a version of any future."

A power share is rooted in "symbol use." That is, one has a power share when one is able to execute a part in future-choosing through symbolic interaction. Furthermore, power depends on a mutually perceived need for others to mediate one's goals, so power, then, is made real by reification.
The power sub-cycle differs from the needs sub-cycle in this respect: the elements that make up the needs cycle are invariant, having their basis in the human drive to make sense of the world and one's place in it. As Brown explained, "... the self- and other attribution of need is the driving force for behavior." This means that any needs cycle contains the elements of a felt need, advocacy for meeting that need, and open-channel behavior directed toward those who can meet that need. In the power cycle, on the other hand, the elements that make it up consist of roles, role behaviors, and role relationships. Roles are derived from a specific ideology, including culturally shared myths, and this means that the elements of the power cycle vary in number and nature. What is invariant is the need for the cycle to maintain equanimity by interrelationships based on roles, and by periodic refocusing of power shares as a result of interaction with the other cycles.

An example of what the elements might be in a particular system is given in Brown's "Ideology as Communication Process," when he discusses science as an ideology. Adopting Kuhn's taxonomy, Brown finds necessary the roles of revolutionaries (or innovators), ratifiers, and cumulators. Each of these parties has a power share within the system. In a similar way, Wayne Brockriede observed the system of communication research and found the roles...
of researchers, editors and critics, and readers who pass final judgment. A third example is the proposal of Joachim Wach, that a religious system includes the roles of "the Founder of Religion, the Reformer, the Prophet, the Seer, the Magician, the Diviner, the Saint, the Priest, the Religiosus, and the Audience."82

A researcher who uses this model must discern, from a study of the system and its ideology, what are the distinct power shares based on roles taken or attributed within the system. Then these roles must be related in "deviance-compensating ways."83

After the researcher discovers the power shares in a system, the next step is to explain the type of power that is ascribed to each share, whether that of a judge, a priest, a teacher, etc. Finally, the researcher must show how such power is ascribed by the interpretations of roles.84 In short, the creation of power through communication is logically prior to communicating through power.85

That communication may be examined next by a study of interdependency. The interpretations of others' roles lead to three kinds of interdependency: a complementary one (in which a hierarchy is accepted and affirmed); a competitive one (in which a hierarchy is challenged); and a mixed one (in which "a hierarchy is both affirmed and challenged").86
The deviance-compensating nature of the cycle is maintained within the system by alternation between complementary and competitive interpretations. This alternation may also be described as "shifting coalitions among power-holds." This alternation provides "social maintenance by the means of combining social stability and change." 87

The Interrelationships of the Sub-Cycles

As already mentioned, Brown's favorite metaphor for his model is that of a hologram. This is because a hologram is a three-dimensional image, not a flat photograph. When the hologram is broken, each fragment contains the entire image. 88 Brown explained, quoting himself, "As system, the rhetoric of social intervention is holographically conceived, i.e., 'every part of the whole contains or implies the whole.'" 89 In the same way, each of the sub-cycles is needed in order to picture an entire system, yet each may be seen in turn as a system of systems. Each of the sub-cycles is derived from intrapersonal and interpersonal categorizing, and from interpretations that partake of both; still, as discussed here, each sub-cycle is particularly a manifestation of one of the three communication processes. ("Each sub-system is part of all.") 90
It is easiest to see the nature of a cycle as a system of sub-cycles in the case of the attention-shift cycle. One may see the epistemic element of that cycle as, on a more basic level, the result of another attention-shift cycle, the output of which is a coherent approach to ways of knowing. The ontological element of the attention-shift cycle results from a more basic interpersonal sub-cycle which deals with roles. The axiological element may be identified with an intrapersonal sub-cycle focusing on needs and, therefore, on things valued. This is an illustration of how "cycle" and "sub-cycle" are used as relative terms.91

Furthermore, when a system is viewed as a whole, one may change viewpoints and see it as only a sub-system within a larger system. This means, for instance, that another researcher could choose to see the Stone-Campbell Movement as only a sub-system within the larger system of American religion, or else as only one reform movement within the history of Protestant reformation. The choice of what level a system is studied on is left to the scholar.

Finally, since the whole ideological system is made up of three sub-cycles, one might conjecture that vicious cycles may occur in the model as a whole, as well as within each sub-cycle. In fact, as modeled by Brown, the input from the power cycle is vital to maintaining the
deviance-compensating nature of the needs cycle and also entails attention-switches; the needs cycle leads to attention-switches in the attention-shift cycle and to redefined interdependency in the power cycle; and the attention-shift cycle feeds into the power cycle and needs cycle. Brown points out that an attention-switch entails perception of new needs and in new ways of advocating them, as well as fresh perceptions of power relationships. Normally, these interrelated influences maintain the continuous change that provides a system's stability and that causes Berkhofer to say, of an organismic model, that it is "a product of the functioning of its parts" and "also . . . a regulator of the relations among those parts."

Furthermore, when only one of the sub-cycle processes is emphasized within a system, a vicious circle is imminent. Anderson's dissertation seems to support this idea, for he described Carl Henry as an agent of continuity through change, who thus avoided a vicious circle. Henry attempted to maintain stability within the system of evangelical Christianity by emphasizing ideology (in the attention-shift cycle) at one time, and at another time creating a need for behaviors that enact the ideology through action corollaries.

This chapter has portrayed Brown's systemic model as a whole composed of interrelated parts. Much of the
discussion has been abstract. In part, this is due to the nature of the model, which deliberately sacrifices verisimilitude for the sake of scope. Nevertheless, in the few remaining pages, I shall discuss more specific details (and for the researcher, more findable ones) in order to explain how one may intervene into a system, either for the purpose of preserving an old ideology, or in order to help bring into being a new one. It is here, in the area of change influenced by symbolic intervention, that the study of rhetoric traditionally has been situated.

Social Intervention

In the simplest system, that of one person, diverse roles may be enacted at various times. In more complex systems, various roles are attributed (and enacted) simultaneously. These roles are not necessarily stable across time, for they change in response to perceived internal and external influences and exigencies. Role changes affect the balance of the whole system to some degree. In this respect, then, each member of the system is an intervenor.

Systemic stability, though, demands change and alternation on a different scale. Needed are periodic, large-scale changes comparable to the scientific revolutions Kuhn saw necessary to the progress of science as an ideology. These changes do not come about through
natural laws operating in the realm of human motion, nor by economic pressures operating in the realm of class struggle, but by symbolic interaction operating in the realm of human action. This is not to say that an intervenor deliberately and consciously sets out to preserve the stability of a system by making opportune changes in the system's ideology. But the intervenor does intend to alter attitudes and behaviors of whomever he or she may be able to get to listen. In Bitzer's term, the intervenor perceives a rhetorical situation. The intervenor, then, either tries to promote an alternative way of seeing, or else tries to discourage or retard the spread of an alternative way of seeing.

The promoter of change is called an "intervenor." That person identifies with members of a society or a system, yet, at the same time, stands apart from that system so as to observe it as an outsider who is able to criticize some aspect of the ideology uniting the system. This intervenor may also be called a "change-agent," a term which recognizes that he or she acts deliberately to alter ways of perception in a system, or to prevent such alteration. The same person may also be called a "vision-manager," because he or she does not strictly control society but is a catalyst for change. Brown used this latter term in order to promote the perception of this model by other scholars as one that is
complementary to Bormann's idea of "rhetorical vision."

This present study will treat Campbell as the most prominent and effective change-agent within the system of the Stone-Campbell Movement, but it should be noted that a change-agent may be either an individual or a group of intervenors. Also, as Corley wrote, an intervenor's attempts to change a system may be worth studying even when they fail:

Just as interesting as successful shifts are those that fail, especially comparisons and contrasts can yield detailed indications of reasons for particular successes and failures.98

If the control of change within a system is rejected as a realistic aim for the intervenor, what remain are "the strategies of facilitating or inhibiting such successive developments as the growth, flourishing, and maintenance or demise of rhetorical visions."99 In order to discover what visible forms rhetorical intervention may take in specific types of cases, we must apply to each of the sub-cycles these two alternatives of inhibiting or facilitating ideological change. Broadly speaking, intervenors in the attention-switch cycle may (1) re-organize data into a fresh worldview, presenting an alternative ideology with new ways of knowing, being, and valuing. The new worldview is a push of the pendulum in the other direction, counteracting extremist tendencies that threaten to destroy the system, or perhaps replacing a dying
ideology with one that revitalizes an enervated system. In any case, the spread of this new worldview functions to preserve the system. Intervention into the needs cycle takes the form of (2) emphasizing or minimizing group- or individual-based needs in the system. Intervention into the power cycle occurs by (3) re-allocating power among various roles, or redefining interrelationships.

Forms of intervention may be analyzed more specifically. Brown categorizes them by a military metaphor: broad strategies are achieved through more specific, intermediate tactics, and these are realized by basic, more concrete maneuvers.

In the interpretative sub-cycle, where attention-switches occur, the two strategies that are available are those of anomaly-masking and anomaly-featuring. Both of these strategies are based on the tendency of those who share a worldview to "act as if hiatuses in a worldview would invalidate it." Thus, the advocate of a new ideology is likely to focus, as he or she interacts with other members of the community, on gaps or anomalies in the present worldview. As the intervenor presents an alternative, he or she gives presence to ways in which the new ideology seems to fit, accounting for the gaps that existed in the previous ideology. Conversely, the strategist who wishes to maintain the present ideology will emphasize the strengths of the accepted worldview, masking
or explaining away any gaps, and pointing out con­
dictions in the proposed alternative.

In order to achieve either strategy successfully, three tactics may be used. (During the development of his model, Brown at different times gave various names to these tactics. Here, I am telescoping the various accounts into the three tactics that embrace the others that he some­times named. It should be remembered that combinations of the three are possible.)

First, the change-agent may promote an alternative epistemology, such as suggesting an experiential source of knowledge rather than an authoritative one. In the second place, one may promote an alternative axiology, such as valuing corporate identity over individual achievement. Finally, one may promote a change in ontology as when, for example, a woman is encouraged to see herself as a victim of sexist stereotypes, rather than as a housewife or mother.

Tactical changes are actualized on the lower level of maneuvers. These are the most visible forms of inter­vention and the most thoroughly studied. Examples of the many categories of maneuvers include the classical forms of proof—artistic and inartistic, including ethical, pathetic, and logical suasion; attempts to achieve identi­fication through gesture, ideas, organization allegiance; the use of formal language patterns, such as climax and antitheses, in order to encourage formal assent, as
discussed by both Perelman and Burke; the staging of pseudo-events; using or changing ritual in order to support or reject the social order; creation of fantasy themes; all the varied catalog of argumentative devices derived from topoi and loci; appealing to myths; the use in fiction of certain narrative styles as propaganda; perhaps even Freud's dream techniques of condensation and displacement, whereby the ego addresses the id and super-ego.  

These maneuvers are the most visible level of intervention both to the members of the system and the researcher who is studying the relics of attempted intervention.

It should be clear by now that a change in ideology in the attention-shift cycle by necessity affects the needs and power cycles. Nevertheless, the change-agent may intervene directly into those two cycles. In attempting to affect the power cycle, an intervenor may use any of three strategies. Because power is shared among those who have a share in future choosing, one may encourage the "sharers" to view their interrelationship as complementary, as competitive, or as a mixture of both. Of course, it is not necessary to reallocate all the power shares in a system in order to intervene.

The actualizing of these strategies takes place through specific tactics. Brown's taxonomy of tactics is
borrowed from Boulding's *Ecodynamics*. On the tactical level, one may depict the power shares as based on policies of threat, or, "You do something I want or else I will do something you do not want"; exchange, or, "You do something that I want, and I will do something that you want"; or on policies of integrity, or, "I will do something or I will ask you to do something because of what I am and because of what you are." These three tactics are the ones mentioned explicitly by Brown, although he noted that there may be other sorts of tactics.

The maneuvers that actualize the tactics on the lowest level include those already mentioned as attention-shift maneuvers. Besides these, some additional maneuvers of a different sort may be particularly suited to this cycle. For example, Brown mentions, as available tactics, the announcing of an "attribution of power," and other symbolic acts, which might include a lockout against organizing workers, announcing a strike, or a judge's imposition of a heavy sentence against a drug dealer in order to "send a message."

Intervention into the power cycle affects both the other cycles. One may intervene directly into the needs cycle, though, by two basic strategies. First, the intervenor may stress needs based in perceptions of the self as an individual, such as the need for personal equality or for self-actualization. The second strategy
is to stress needs based in perceptions of the self as a group member, such as the need for political power. In both cases, the needs are perceived as important to growth and survival, by definition. The featuring of either type of need does not eliminate perception of the other, for the strategies are "rooted in the paradox that one cannot envision either the individual or the group without reference to the other, . . . ."

Available tactics for intervention into the needs cycle include, though they may not be limited to these, the attribution or denial of a need, promotion or retarding of advocacy, and encouragement of openness or closedness to potential meters of needs. Available maneuvers include the same types of moves that are used in the other cycles. Sources of maneuvers include the constructs that may be derived from rhetorical theory, "interpersonal, small-group, organizational, and mass communication." The scholar will attend also to specific cases of intervention, being alert to "improvisation" by creative intervenors.
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CHAPTER IV

STORY OF A MOVEMENT

In this chapter, the history of the Stone-Campbell Movement will be presented in broad outline, so that following chapters may be understood in their historical context. In addition, I shall present in this chapter the claim that, from the early days of the Movement, there existed the same divisive tensions and extremist views that later split the Movement. Later chapters will describe Campbell's intervention in ways designed to counteract the pressures toward fragmentation. With the death of Campbell and other first-generation leaders, divisions became visible, due largely to the tensions and disagreements that had existed earlier.

Origins of the Stone-Campbell Movement

The earliest distinctly American stirring that would contribute to the Stone-Campbell Movement came from a conflict within the American Methodist Church. One of Francis Asbury's more influential lay preachers was James O'Kelly. His energy earned him the name, "Asbury's Ironsides." His loyalty to Asbury, though, was not as strong as his desire for independence, which was apparent in his
advocating the separation of the Methodists from the Church of England in spite of Wesley's and Asbury's unwillingness to take such a step. Later, at the first Methodist General Conference in 1792, he petitioned for the right to appeal Asbury's ministerial assignments. When his petition was voted down, O'Kelly withdrew from the Asbury Methodists and organized the Republican Methodist Church in Surry County, Virginia. Seven months later, on August 4, 1794, under the influence of Rice Haggard, who was one of O'Kelly's preachers, the Republican Methodists changed their name to "The Christian Church," and espoused the Bible as their only creed. In both of these acts, they anticipated the later Stone-Campbell Movement.

Before O'Kelly's churches had a meeting house built, they had 1,000 members; within a few months, there were ten times that many. In 1794, James O'Kelly wrote *Cardinal Principles of the Christian Church*, in which he presented the principle espoused by most reforming churches before and after him: "the Holy Bible . . . our only creed, and a sufficient rule of faith and purpose." In a foreshadowing of another great idea of the Stone-Campbell Movement, O'Kelly affirmed that unity of all churches could be achieved by allowing everyone the right of "private judgment and the liberty of conscience." In other words, Christians could enjoy visible unity in
spite of diversity of opinions. Still, the members of the O'Kelly Movement were distinguished by the fact that the unity of all Christians was never the impelling drive for them that it was for Stone and the Campbells. A few years later, the O'Kelly churches became loosely affiliated with the Stone churches, and formed what was called "The Christian Connection."\(^5\)

Another foreshadowing of the Stone-Campbell Movement came from churches of Abner Jones and Elias Smith which arose among the Baptists in New Hampshire and Virginia about 1801. The members of these churches labeled themselves simply as "Christians" in preference to more sectarian names, just as did the members of the Stone-Campbell Movement later, but there was little else in common between the two movements. The dozen congregations of the Smith-Jones Movement do not appear to have had a strong dedication to the ideals either of unity or of reformation.\(^6\)

The Stone-Campbell Movement found its earliest major source in the work of a Presbyterian minister, Barton W. Stone. He had been ordained to the Presbyterian ministry at Cane Ridge, Kentucky, on October 4, 1798, in spite of some doubts he felt about some of the tenets of the Westminster Confession of Faith. He played a leading part in the Logan County revival of 1801, which was centered at Cane Ridge, Kentucky. This revival was part of
the Second Great Awakening that swept Kentucky and Tennessee in the early 1800's. At Cane Ridge, the revival included some thirty or forty preachers, Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian, and from 12,000-25,000 participants. Because of the ecumenical nature of the revival and the non-Calvinist tendencies of some of the preaching, some of the leaders were charged and brought before the Synod of Kentucky. Stone and four other ministers, including two of the accused, issued a protest and declared themselves to be no longer members of the synod, but independent or free Christians with the right to interpret the Bible for themselves, unrestrained by the Westminster Confession of Faith. As far as the leaders were concerned, this first step toward reformation was not taken at the expense of unity with the established church. The written protest that they signed stated that they did not "desire to separate from your communion, or to exclude you from ours."

As historian Leroy Garrett points out, the dissenters still considered themselves to be essentially Presbyterians, though they had rejected the authority of the creed and of their superiors, for they immediately organized their own presbytery in Springfield, Ohio. Within a year, though, they became afraid that their own presbytery was sectarian in nature and they dissolved it so that they might consider themselves more truly united with all Christians, regardless of denomination. By 1804,
Stone's followers had fifteen congregations in Kentucky and Ohio. 

(By 1811, he was the only one of the original leaders still dissenting within the Presbyterian Church; two of the original five rebels had recanted and returned to the Synod, and the other two had joined the Shakers in Kentucky.)

In 1831 and 1832, most of Stone's churches united with the churches of the Campbells. Those that did not choose to unite formed a separate Christian Church (made up of mingled Stone and O'Kelly ancestry), which later united with the Congregationalists in 1931, and thus became part of the United Church of Christ in 1957.

The remaining tributary into the Movement was provided by Thomas Campbell and his son, Alexander. Thomas left Ireland, where he was a Presbyterian minister, in 1807, and came to the United States for his health. He arrived in Washington, Pennsylvania, and became a circuit riding preacher for the Seceder Presbyterian Church. Like Stone earlier, Thomas Campbell was eventually brought to trial because of his liberality—he had encouraged his people to share their communion service with members of other denominations who happened to attend the churches where he ministered. When his reply to the charges was found to be unsatisfactory, his right to preach for the Presbytery was suspended. He appealed to the Synod, but achieved no more satisfactory result, so he withdrew from
the Seceders, although he still considered himself to be a Presbyterian.

He continued to preach in private homes whenever he was permitted or invited, emphasizing a basic message of the need for unity of all Christians based on a devotion to the example of the primitive Church, which he believed was recorded in the New Testament. He formed the Christian Association of Washington, expecting that it would serve as an auxiliary church society. The members of the Association requested of him a statement of its aims as he saw them, and Campbell replied by writing the "Declaration and Address." This became one of the primary documents of the Stone-Campbell Movement. As W. E. Garrison has summarized it:

The Declaration states the aim and the means of attaining it. The aim: "unity, peace, and purity." The means: "rejecting human opinions, . . . returning to, and holding fast by, the original standard."

The rest of Thomas' family, including his son, Alexander, arrived from Scotland in mid-1809, just in time to read the "Declaration and Address" in galley proofs. His son was surprised to find that, during Thomas' months in the United States, his father had come to conclusions similar to those Alexander had reached in Scotland.

Unanimously, the Association accepted the "Declaration." In it, Campbell called on Christians to seek to unify the church, for disunion is shameful. In fact, the
church already is "essentially, intentionally, and constitutionally one." Such unity needed only to be realized and appreciated by demonstrations of mutual love and tolerance among Christians. His program for restoring the unity enjoyed by the primitive Church was simple; "Nothing ought to be inculcated upon Christians as articles of faith, nor required of them as terms of communion, but what is expressly taught and enjoined upon them in the word of God." This idea is the seed of the reformation ideal within the Movement, although it certainly was not the rigid adherence to a pattern that later would be advocated by many followers of the Campbells.

Alexander, who held similar ideas about reform and unity, did not arrive at them entirely on his own. During a year at the University of Glasgow (1808-1809), he had become acquainted with a number of Scottish reformers, including the Haldane brothers and Church of Scotland preacher, Greville Ewing. According to Garrett, some of his ideas may be traced back further to the inductive thinking of Bacon, to Locke's ideas of understanding and toleration, and to the Scottish Common Sense School of philosophy of Reid and Stewart.20 Another strong influence that may not be overlooked was that of his father, who had been his first teacher. By the end of his year in Glasgow, Alexander perceived a need for thorough reform in the Presbyterian Church.
Within three years of his arrival in the United States, he became the unofficial leader of the Campbell branch of the American reformation. A long study led Alexander to the conclusion that the primitive method of baptism was immersion of adult believers, and that, therefore, he should be immersed. His father followed his example and it is from that moment that Alexander Campbell's biographer dates the passing of leadership:

"From this hour, therefore, the positions of father and son were reversed, and each tacitly occupied the position allotted to him. Alexander became the master-spirit, and to him the eyes of all were now directed."

This leadership was purely unofficial, though. One of the peculiar characteristics of the members of the Stone-Campbell Movement was that they never would acknowledge any person as a "leader." Anti-authoritarian by design, they recognized only the leadership of local elders or "bishops" who presided within individual congregations. Campbell would not acknowledge himself as having any formal leadership role except that of an elder within his own congregation at Bethany, Virginia. Any power he had, he believed, came from his spoken and written arguments. Thus, opponents have always found it easy to irk the members of the Movement by referring to them as "Campbellites."

No longer welcome among the Presbyterians, the followers of the Campbells joined the Redstone Baptist
Association, although they hardly fit the Baptist mold better than the Presbyterian one (except that they shared with the Baptists the practice of baptism by immersion). Growth among the reformers was slow and Campbell had only small audiences for his early sermons until about 1820. At this time, Presbyterian minister, John Walker, challenged the Baptists to debate the meaning and the proper mode of baptism. Alexander shared his father's doubt as to whether debates were the most effective way of settling religious differences; but, after months of pressure from his Baptist friends, he agreed to represent them.22 The results of the debate were eminently satisfying both to the Baptists at large and to Campbell, and he made arrangements to have the debate published in written form. This was the first of five oral debates that served to spread Campbell's fame, to make him more acceptable to the Baptists (and, later, to other Protestants), and to disseminate the Campbells' ideas of reformation. The first edition of one thousand copies quickly sold out, and a revised edition of three thousand copies was printed at Pitts­burgh.23 Campbell's views on the utility of debates changed quickly. As he remarked after his second debate,

This is, we are convinced, one of the best means of propogating the truth and of exposing error in doctrine or practice. . . . And we are fully convinced that a week's debating is worth a year's preaching, such as we generally have. . . .24
As he rode to Washington, Kentucky, for that second debate, in 1823, he carried in his saddlebags the first issues of a new monthly journal, the Christian Baptist, which was both written and published by him. Even more than the debates, this magazine helped to popularize his cause of reformation throughout the United States.

The Movement soon outgrew the Baptist umbrella, and Campbell's followers were invited to remove their membership. This excision was entirely the responsibility of the Baptist Churches, for the reformers were reluctant to leave as long as their hosts would tolerate attempts to reform the Baptist Churches. In some places, the Baptist Associations expelled whole reforming churches, and in other places, Baptist Churches simply withdrew from any member who was a Campbell sympathizer—sometimes including anyone who only admitted to reading Campbell's paper. According to Campbell, the break became permanent in 1828 as a result of the threat posed by the reformers' increasingly effective evangelism.

As a result of three debates, the circulation of the Christian Baptist, and his service as a delegate at the Virginia Constitutional Convention, his fame spread. Garrett has estimated that, especially in the West from Cincinnati to Pittsburgh, Campbell was as well known "as Billy Graham would be known in those parts today." This may seem less an exaggeration when one considers that the
newly completed National Road to Wheeling ran practically through the Campbell estate, and that the Campbell's were well-known for their hospitality. Just after his return from the Convention in Richmond, Virginia, in a letter to a friend, he remarked that he had preached on Sundays during the Constitutional Convention, and that, for three months (in good weather), 3,000 had heard him preach.29

As the Campbells' followers spread south and west, they began to encounter Stone's reformers more frequently. In their personal travels, Campbell and Stone occasionally met, and they developed a warm, mutual respect, although they could not be said to be close friends. By 1831, the occasional presence of two reforming churches in the same community (one for the followers of Stone and one for the "Campbellites," ) was looking increasingly absurd. Reformers in both camps decided that their similarities were stronger than their differences. In 1831, they began to unite with each other.30 Since there was no church structure or office above the local level, the process of uniting was a gradual one. Persuaded by traveling evangelistic teams, most of the congregations had united within three years. The Movement now had between twenty and thirty thousand members, most of whom were in Kentucky and Ohio.31 From this time until the Civil War, the membership would grow four times as fast as the population.32
The original union in Georgetown and in Lexington, Kentucky, which took place over Christmas and New Year's Day, 1831-1832, did not enjoy Campbell's presence; he blessed it cautiously from afar, feeling that it might be premature. Stone, on the other hand, was fully committed to it, and he later called the union, "the noblest act of my life." The union was a test of Stone's nobility, and not only because such a union was a landmark event in the divided Protestant world. Beyond this fact, one of the consequences of the union, which Stone could have foreseen, was that he was no longer the leader of his own movement, but now only one of several gifted men, influential though they were, who lived in the shadow of Alexander Campbell.

During 1830-1840, Campbell's powers were at their height—and so was the challenge that the growth of the Movement brought. Having begun as a rebellious stepchild of the Presbyterians and the Baptists, it was moving out onto its own, a separate, if not quite respectable, voice for Protestant reform and unity. Campbell's activities during these years are summarized well by Garrison:

From 1830 he was increasingly occupied with wide interests—an extensive correspondence, many visitors, long tours for preaching, lecturing, and visiting the churches, the editing of a monthly magazine, the management of a printing plant and a publishing business, the administration of a post office, and the operation of a large farm.
The following more specific summary of his activities during these eleven years should prepare the way for a more careful analysis in Chapters IV, V, and VI.

Campbell's Activities from 1830-1840

1830. This was the seventh and last year of the small monthly written and published by Campbell, the Christian Baptist. Concurrently, he began a larger magazine called the Millennial Harbinger, and claimed as its object, "the development, and introduction of that political and religious order of society called THE MILLENNIUM . . . ." The new magazine was designed for a broader audience than the Christian Baptist and was much less satirical than its pungent predecessor. Campbell continued to edit the Harbinger until 1863, though it was done with the help of co-editors from 1836 on.

After serving at the Virginia Constitutional Convention, which was Campbell's only venture into political life, he returned home to Bethany on February 1. Later this year, the crisis with the Baptist Churches came to a head. Some Baptist congregations in the Beaver Creek Association of the Western Reserve of Ohio published a condemnation of Campbell as an enemy of "the doctrines of the Holy Scripture." This publication was widely circulated and it helped encourage the Appomattox Association in Virginia and the Franklin Association in Kentucky to
denounce Campbell, his writings, and those who shared his views. In congregation after congregation, the reformers were voted out of the Baptist family.

At about the same time, some of the reformers began to raise doubts about the propriety of any extra-church organizations. Against Campbell's wishes, their own loosely-knit Mahoning Association was dissolved. In the spring, he made a short speaking tour to Cincinnati. In October, he started a longer tour of Kentucky, where he addressed the medical school at Transylvania University in Lexington, and visited some other states. In December, he engaged in an impromptu debate with a Presbyterian minister, Obadiah Jennings of Nashville, who was critical of the principles of the Movement. In all his speaking tours, Campbell addressed formal audiences at least once a day, on the average, as well as conducted private interviews as time permitted. He returned home from this winter trip of one hundred days on February 3rd, after crossing the ice of the Ohio River.

In December, the Baptist process of exclusion continued as the Dover Association of Eastern Virginia reported on the mistakes of Campbellism, suggesting that the Baptists should have no further fellowship with his followers. This was especially painful to Campbell because he had great respect for some of the members of the
1831. Several troublesome problems surfaced during this year. One of the original Mormon settlements was in Kirkland, Ohio, so Campbell wrote some articles for the Harbinger analyzing the Book of Mormon. In June, he spent 22 days in northern Ohio, attempting to slow the growth of the Mormon Church. What made Mormonism particularly galling to the members of the Movement was that one of its leaders, Sidney Rigdon, had been an influential Campbellite preacher only a short time before.

Less spectacular but more persistent was a second problem. The rapid growth of the Movement coupled with the general disdain that the members felt toward a paid clergy resulted in a serious shortage of preachers and traveling evangelists. Furthermore, most of those who were able to preach had to make their living from some other occupation, such as farming. For them to make a preaching tour, then, meant that they had to neglect their regular work; the church members, though, remembering many of Campbell's earlier attacks on a "hireling clergy," did not feel much need to support the preachers, although they gladly listened for free. Aware of this problem, Campbell began to suggest in the Harbinger that some form of informal cooperation among the churches in an area would be useful, since it would allow several congregations to support one traveling evangelist. His suggestions, though, had
only a limited effect.\textsuperscript{43}

In December (and in January of the next year) came the union meetings in Georgetown and Lexington between the followers of Stone (who called themselves "Christians") and those of Campbell (who generally favored the name, "Disciples").

\textbf{1832.} In 1831, Nat Turner's Rebellion took place in Southampton County, Virginia; widespread uneasiness followed it. In January 1832, Campbell wrote against the evils of slavery and presented a plan for the resettlement of freed slaves the following month.

Few of Campbell's activities this year were recorded. The contents of the \textit{Harbinger}, though, reveal what his concerns were. There are a number of articles on church cooperation; several protests to the leadership of the Baptists against what he considered to be misrepresentation of his ideas; and several continuing discussions with various correspondents. Campbell's practice in the \textit{Harbinger} was to publish fully the arguments of those who disagreed with him. He would then give his answer and invite a further response. As long as the writer presented arguments in an orderly and decorous manner, Campbell allowed equal space.

\textbf{1833.} During this year, the \textit{Harbinger} manifested Campbell's increased interest in the interpretation of
prophecy, church cooperation, and the continued persecution by the Baptists. In January, the Indiana legislature granted a charter for a college to be started by some of the Disciples, but apparently it never came to pass. 44

The highlight of Campbell's year was a "tour to the East." Leaving in October, he was accompanied by his father as far as Richmond, Virgina; then Alexander traveled on to Baltimore and New York. In New York, he was instrumental in uniting several small congregations. 45 While there, he also addressed the "sceptics" several times both in Concert Hall and Tammany Hall. He received a note of thanks from them later, expressing admiration for his erudition, honesty, and courteous treatment of them. 46

In understandable contrast, he was refused the use of Baptist meeting houses both in New York and Philadelphia. Instead, he enjoyed the hospitality of the Universalists. 47 One result of his trip was the founding of new congregations in Baltimore and in Philadelphia. 48

1834. This was a relatively uneventful year. Problems of church order and discipline continued to trouble the young Movement, as the number of new converts outstripped the ability of the congregations to indoctrinate them. 49 Two topics that particularly claimed Campbell's attention this year were the threat of Roman Catholicism in the United States and the need for improved
1835. In February, Campbell began another speaking tour, this time traveling to Nashville, Louisville, sites in Indiana, and Cincinnati, Ohio. In Georgetown, Kentucky, he addressed the Choctaws at the Indian Agency. Upon his return to Lexington, he addressed the students of Transylvania University twice.

1836. This year, Campbell obtained editorial help when Dr. Robert Richardson moved to Bethany. Not only did he help with the *Harbinger*, but he also became Campbell's personal physician, a professor at the college Campbell later founded, and finally Campbell's first biographer. With Richardson able to edit the *Harbinger* in his absence, Campbell was able to spend more of his time in travel. In May, he left on a long tour of the Northeast that lasted until October. In northern Ohio, then an active center of Free-Thinkers, he spoke a number of times, inviting responses from the audience after his lectures.

From the area of Cleveland, he went to New York, sampled the waters at Saratoga Springs, then headed west through Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts. After returning home for a month, he went to Cincinnati to address the College of Teachers. In his October 3rd address on "Moral Culture," he drew a parallel between social and scientific advancements and the attitudes pro-
duced by Protestantism. This was not received well by John B. Purcell, a Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, who made reply. After encouragement from local citizens, Campbell and Purcell agreed to a public debate on the truth of the Roman Catholic Religion. Because Campbell had previous appointments, the debate was scheduled for January 1837.

In November, the first Disciple school, Bacon College, was started in Georgetown, Kentucky, with evangelist Walter Scott as its president. (The school united with Transylvania in 1865.) Campbell had mixed feelings about Bacon at first because he feared that the Movement could not support two colleges, and he had been thinking of starting one himself.  

1837. The Campbell-Purcell debate lasted from January 13-21. Campbell's stance enhanced his credibility with many listeners who had categorized him as an eccentric sectarian, and yet still hoped for his victory over the Bishop. In his first two sentences, Campbell attempted to establish for himself a broad position as the representative of Protestantism more than of his own Movement:

My Christian Friends and Fellow-Citizens—I appear before you at this time, by the good providence of our Heavenly Father, in defence of the truth, and in explanation of the great redeeming, regenerating and ennobling principles of Protestantism, as opposed to the claims and pretensions of the Roman Catholic Church. I come not here to advocate the particular tenets of any sect, but to defend the great cardinal principles
Richardson later remarked, in reference to the Protestant clergy who heard or read the debate, "It had a happy effect also in disabusing them of much of the prejudice they entertained against him [Campbell]; and of gaining for his plea for primitive Christianity a more candid hearing."54

During this year, Campbell also began two written debates, in the pages of the Harbinger. The first debate lasted for over two years, as Campbell discussed Universalism with a Mr. D. Skinner. The discussion, which concerned the nature of future punishment, and whether all people ultimately will be reconciled to God was somewhat tiresome, centering as it did around technical questions of Hebrew and Greek translation.55

The second debate was with S. W. Lynd, a Baptist minister in Cincinnati.56 Lynd espoused a traditionally Calvinist view of faith and conversion, and Campbell defended a more rationalistic view of faith and of the Holy Spirit.

In October, he began with some members of his Movement a discussion that would show that his religious opponents were not the only ones who could misunderstand him. A reader in Lunenburg, Virginia, was surprised to read one of Campbell's articles in which he referred to Christians among other churches. She wrote to him, posing
half a dozen pointed questions designed to get him to explain a paradox. If he believed that only the reformers (or Disciples) had restored the original gospel, and only they practiced the primitive baptism by immersion for spiritual rebirth, then how could he speak of Christians in other denominations? In a brief but potent reply, Campbell made his position so clear that he alienated some of his strong supporters and gave his enemies reason to gloat. In his opinion, he said, he could not "make any one duty the standard of Christian state or Character, not even immersion." Furthermore, he added, if he should find a Presbyterian who was more spiritual and more devoted to God than a person who had been baptized in the way Campbell taught, "I could not hesitate a moment in giving the preference of my heart to him that loveth most."

Campbell's bold answer caused a great stir. The immersion of adult believers was the most visible characteristic of the Stone-Campbell Movement, inasmuch as the members believed baptism to be a divine ordinance, as well as a part of the process of conversion to the Christian faith. This belief was in contrast to that of the Baptists, who baptized believers because they had experienced conversion. No less than three of Campbell's five oral debates were on the subject and meaning of baptism; probably no single individual since the days of the primitive church, even among the Anabaptists, had been a
stronger advocate of the importance of baptism. Yet, in his reply to the Lunenburg letter, he asserted that there existed members of other denominations who ought to be considered Christians in spite of their failure to share the insight of his followers.

He was surprised by the response from readers who felt that his reply excused people who were disobedient to God, and that he was "neutralizing" his formerly good teaching. Campbell remarked later that the outpouring of criticism proved one thing—there certainly were not many "Campbellites" around!60

For the next two years, the discussion continued in the pages of the Harbinger until he finally refused to publish any more pieces on the subject. But, as pointed out by Garrett and by others, the argument only went underground, emerging decades after Campbell's death to help split the Movement.61

In October, Campbell again attended the annual College of Teachers' meeting, then went on a brief speaking tour. He spoke three times in Dayton, Ohio, then traveled through Kentucky, including Versailles and Lexington, then returned home on October 24.62

Before the year was over, more controversy arose. This time it was triggered by a young physician from England, Dr. John Thomas. Thomas was converted soon after his arrival in the United States. He showed early promise
of becoming an effective preacher for the reformers—in fact, he preached his first sermon at the Bethany Church as a result of Campbell's encouragement. Within a year, he started his own journal, the Apostolic Advocate; the first issue hinted at Thomas' concerns as it contained a study of the Book of Revelation. In later issues, he continued to show his interest in what Campbell condemned as "speculation." He began to teach that baptism was valid only if both the subject and the administrator understood the complete meaning of the ordinance at the time of baptism. This meant that any Baptists who wanted to join the Movement should be "rebaptized." At first, Campbell kept his peace, thinking that Dr. Thomas would manage to bring his unorthodox opinions under control. What happened was that he enlarged the scope of his interests. Thomas began to doubt—in print—the existence of the soul and of future punishment. Campbell labeled him a "half a Sadducee." When Campbell's tolerant silence did not seem to help, he turned his heavy guns on Thomas and published a 14-page Extra (a free supplement to the Harbinger) in December devoted to disproving Thomas' doctrinal system. This did not end the matter, however.

1838. As a result of many requests from southern states, Campbell planned a fall tour to visit them. He left home on October 8th and traveled to Baltimore, to Washington, and then went south into Richmond, Virginia.
He had already decided not to pay any more attention to John Thomas' ideas, but as he traveled through Virginia, he found a small coterie of Thomas' disciples in nearly every congregation. He began to speak against Thomas' teaching both publicly and in private.

After a visit to Jefferson's grave and Monticello, he sent word to Thomas that he intended to discuss Thomas' ideas in Painsville, and that Thomas was invited to reply if he chose to attend. The result was a discussion of several days that was carried on courteously, but it did not show any promise of bringing about an agreement. Both men agreed to submit to the decision reached by a group of twenty-three "principal brethren" who had attended the discussion. Their decision was that, because Thomas' theories seemed likely to divide the Movement and had no practical value, "we recommend to Brother Thomas to discontinue the discussion of them, unless in his defense when misrepresented." Campbell was optimistic about the results, but Thomas did not choose to follow the recommendations of the committee for long. The verdict they had rendered, though, provides a good example of the attitude of some of the members of the Movement toward divergent opinions—heterodoxy was no sin as long as divergent opinions were not forced on others. Such dogmatism was the true mark of heresy. A decade later, Thomas toured England and was welcomed by one
of the Disciples' leaders there. He was told that they would listen to him gladly, "if he would proclaim the gospel, and not more than incidentally introduce his favorite topic." 69

When his teaching was finally rejected by the English, he returned to the United States and started a new journal in Illinois, the Investigator. He died in 1871, leaving behind only a small group of followers called the "Christadelphians." 70

Campbell left Virginia and continued his 1838 tour through the Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi. He returned home to Bethany in March of the next year.

1839. His tour of the South impressed Campbell with the need for improved education among the ministers and the families within the Movement. Accordingly, he began to publish in the May issue of the Harbinger a serial article containing a plan for education that would encompass the nursery school through college. The many articles both by himself and others on the subject of education that he printed this year were designed to prepare his readers for the founding of Bethany College the next year.

1840. Campbell built the college on his land, donated the first $10,000, and committed "his life to it as its president and fund raiser," as Garrett remarks. 71 It
was opened for students on October 21, 1841.

Although preparations for starting the college took up much of his time, Campbell did attend a general meeting of representatives from fifty-six congregations meeting at Charlottesville, Virginia, for the purpose of considering cooperation in mission work and education. At the same time, he also addressed the Jeffersonian Society of the University there and sent a written address to the Charlottesville Lyceum on the question, "Is moral philosophy an inductive science?" On October 12, his tenth daughter was born; he named her "Decima."

In the next three chapters, some of these episodes will be discussed in more detail. Throughout the remaining twenty-six years of his life, Campbell continued to shape the Movement, although his influence waned somewhat as did his health during his last five years. His life after 1840 may be summarized briefly, showing the results of some of the projects and controversies begun in this decade.

Campbell's Later Life

The founding of Bethany College increased the demands on Campbell's travel time. The states that earlier had been jealous of Campbell's personal attention began to make their contributions to the College contingent on his visiting them. Fundraising became his responsibility,
along with his daily lecture on Sacred History for the whole student body, as well as the courses he taught in Moral Science, Evidences of Christianity, Political Economy, and Intellectual Philosophy, plus his Sunday preaching, student advising, and the administration of his farm, along with the writing and publishing of the Harbinger. 73

In 1842, he toured Kentucky and Ohio. Later in the year, a tour of New York raised $5,000 and procured 1,000 books for the library, as well as some chemistry equipment. 74 In 1843, he conducted his last public debate; this one was held in Lexington with Presbyterian clergyman N. L. Rice. Four of the six topics that were discussed during those sixteen days related to baptism.

In 1845, he began to write more on slavery. His position was that, as far as the Bible was concerned, slavery in itself was not condemned; therefore, he could not be an abolitionist. Nevertheless, he condemned the mistreatment of slaves and he saw slavery as a corrupting influence on both slaves and owners; hence, he urged its voluntary end. 75

He returned to his homeland for the first and only time in 1847, when he toured Great Britain, Scotland, Ireland, and France. While he was in Scotland, he earned the enmity of the Scottish Anti-Slavery Society by refusing to support the abolitionists. By suing him on a false
charge of slander, they managed to have him detained in jail for ten days, until a judge ruled the warrant illegal. Several friends had offered to pay his bail but, because he felt he was being persecuted for religious reasons, Campbell refused the offers, choosing to stay in the cell. The confinement in the cold, dark cell left him with a bad chest cold. According to his physician, it was "a number of months" before he recovered from this trip.76 No doubt his recovery was hindered by learning, upon his return to the United States, that his favorite son, Wickliffe, had drowned a month before.

In 1850, he traveled to Baltimore and to Washington again, where he addressed both houses of Congress at their request—not in a regular open session but in a sort of "congressional church" meeting.77 He preached from John 3:16, contrasting God's love with patriotic love.

In October 1852, he toured Missouri because the churches there had promised to endow a chair at Bethany. For the next three years, he spent every spare minute translating the Book of Acts from the Greek language for the Bible Union, which was preparing a new English version of the Bible. His contribution was finished in 1855, though at the cost of his health. His physician, Richardson, blamed the strain of such concentrated, critical work for lapses of memory and vagueness of ideas that Campbell began to exhibit—more so than Campbell's age, which was 67.
Later in 1855, he toured Canada. Two years later, he revisited the South, especially Louisiana, still raising money for an endowment for the college. Later that year, he toured Illinois and Iowa, returning home on November 28. Finally, it appeared that he could relax from his fundraising tours—Bethany College seemed fairly well-endowed, bringing great satisfaction to him, at the age of 69. Twelve days later, a fire destroyed the College Building, along with the science equipment and the libraries. At the request of the Board of Trustees, he immediately set off on a tour of the East, along with one of the professors, in order to raise money to rebuild the college. The new cornerstone was laid in the summer of 1858.

In 1860, he toured Indiana with his wife for eight weeks, continuing to speak at least once a day. A tour of eastern Virginia the next year had to be shortened because of the outbreak of the Civil War at Fort Sumter. He soon found it necessary to give up most of his teaching duties; at the same time, readers of the Harbinger were finding his articles less frequent and more rambling than usual.

His old age was surprisingly untroubled by physical problems, though his mental abilities were fading. For some two years, he was subject to mild hallucinations. He would awaken in the middle of the night, thinking that he
was conducting worship services, and he would lead in prayer or even preach an entire sermon to an imaginary audience.81

In November 1865, he was seriously ill, although he recovered enough to preach at Bethany. Richardson thought it was "one of the most interesting and animated discourses of his life."82 Perhaps much of his interest came from the fact that it was Campbell's last illness. Illness recurred and he died on March 8, 1866.

Later Developments

It must be amusing to a student of American history—especially one familiar with the effects of the Civil War on the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches—that the students of the Stone-Campbell Movement still cannot decide whether or not their Movement split as a result of the Civil War. Immediately after the war, the opinion was unanimous. One of the more prominent editors, Moses Lard, exulted in 1866:

Not a rent in our ranks did the war produce. True, for the time being it cooled many an ardent feeling, and caused old friends to regard one another a little shyly. Still it effected no division. . . . We can never divide.83

The war was virtually ignored in the letter columns of the Millennial Harbinger, as reports of conversions continued to come in from both the North and the South. In one post-war column, W. K. Pendleton (Campbell's successor
as editor and publisher) reported that many church build-
ings in the South had been destroyed as a result of the
war. He reminded the readers that the southern church
members were destitute and could not repair and rebuild
their churches. Admitting that it was only natural to
expect feelings of prejudice and coldness to exist between
the North and South as a result of the War, he added:

Here are men and women who come to us with none of
these feelings—who hold out their hands in confidence
to us as their brethren in Christ, and ask us to help
them. They appeal in the spirit of true brotherhood to
ture brothers.84

Disagreements in the churches soon became manifest,
however, and four decades later (in 1906), the Movement
divided. Some Disciple historians have named the Civil
War and disagreements over slavery as the ultimate source
of the split, but this conjecture was rejected by earlier
historians. In the classic history of the Disciples,
Alfred DeGroot wrote that the Movement endured the War
without division because of the drive for unity that was
shown by the first leaders, some of whom were still
alive.85 Earlier, DeGroot had claimed that the Disciples
was the only Protestant denomination that failed to
divide as a result of pressure from the War.86

It was not until 1966 that an alternative thesis
was presented by Harry K. Shaw, who wrote that there had
occurred "a de facto division among the Disciples over
slavery and the war."87 It was this division that later
led to the separation of the non-instrumental churches (which are more conservative churches typified by their refusal to allow musical accompaniment in worship) from the rest. A little later, David Harrell performed a statistical analysis of the churches based on the census information of 1906. He found that most of the congregations that split away from the mainstream were located in the South, thus suggesting that geographical differences during the War were significant.\(^88\) In similar vein, Tucker and McAllister wrote recently:

\[\ldots\text{the effect of the war on Disciples cannot be minimized. Seeds of discord, sown and cultivated, grew to full bloom with the separation of the Churches of Christ a generation later. The Civil War was nothing less than a watershed for the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ).}\] \(^89\)

Henry Webb also shared this viewpoint in a recent article:

\[\text{The issue of the use of the musical instrument in worship can much better be understood not as the cause of division in the brotherhood so much as the excuse for a division, the causes of which are to be found in the sectional bitterness produced by the war.}\] \(^90\)

In spite of this trend, Garrett has been unwilling to accept Harrell's thesis. In the first place, he wrote, the division was not so clearly geographical as Harrell claims—he finds numerous exceptions to such division. A more significant factor than sectional tensions, in his opinion, was the influence of argumentative editors. In the second place, he pointed out that not one division but many need to be accounted for, including an instrumental/
non-instrumental division in the churches of Canada. There are several reasons why the students of the Stone-Campbell Movement find it impossible to agree on the cause of the division. (1) There was a significant delay between the end of the Civil War and the division that did not become official until 1906. This delay is in contrast to the other three major denominations that had sufficient representation in the South for division to be a threat--the Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians. These churches were divided by the end of the War.

(2) Available evidence on the behavior and attitudes of the Disciples during the War and Reconstruction is not univocal. Some of the leaders of the churches were strongly partisan. Both Stone and Campbell stayed aloof from the War, but each had a son who fought for the Confederacy. B. F. Hall, another first-generation preacher, claimed first shot at the Yankees, even if they should claim to be his Christian brothers. On the other hand, some churches had soldiers who fought on both sides, yet who worshipped in the same pews during the War. According to Tucker and McAllister, most of the Disciples chose sides during the War, but Garrett claimed that most were pacifist, or at least moderates. Garrison and DeGroot described the Disciples as behaving as the general population did during the War. Of the Disciple periodicals, only one was clearly abolitionist. As Harrell
said, "Most of the Disciples periodicals remained at least nominally neutral." As already noted, Garrett pointed out that reports and letters to the Harbinger (at least those that were printed) were almost completely free of references to the War.

(3) Another reason for confusion over the question of division is that there was no clear organizational structure in the church. Although congregations could divide on a local level, there was no ecclesiastical mechanism on any higher level that could undergo a rupture. When Campbell died, there was no power struggle for his official position, for he had none. (He was president of the American Christian Missionary Society, but by the time of his death, it was in shambles.) Both before and after his death, there were a number of editors of other journals, each having its own loyal readership, and there were many other influential preachers. Isaac Errett's new Christian Standard received much of the respect that had gone to the Harbinger, but there were still other power shares in the world of Disciple publishing. As Osborne has written, in reference to Campbell's death, "No one succeeded him, for his leadership was charismatic, not official, and the leaders who came after him had diverse spirits."

(4) A final reason for the difficulty of assigning a causal relationship between division and the Civil War is
that Campbell died in 1866. Scholars have long recognized that he wielded a powerful influence on the unity of the Movement, so it is difficult to tell whether division resulted more from Civil War tensions, or from the absence of Campbell. Garrett said of him, "So penetrating was his influence for a united reformation that 'the period of controversy' is usually dated from his death." 105 He further added that, at the start of the post-war era, the Movement was "at the brink of division": "If someone could have taken Alexander Campbell's place, it might have retreated from the brink." 106 (Campbell had acted deliberately as a unifier within his Movement. In 1845, he wrote, "To preserve unity of spirit among Christians of the South and of the North is my grand object.") 107 England wrote, forty years before Garrett, "Alexander Campbell, who was the greatest individual figure in the movement during this period, stood firm against division at a time when division would have been the easiest course." 108 Garrison and DeGroot noted that the passion for unity in the Movement lasted only as long as the first-generation leaders were "still on the scene," as they were until about the end of the War. 109

Sidney Ahlstrom seems to strike the right balance when he briefly discussed the Disciples in the aftermath of the War:
the border-state mentality which prevailed in the chief areas of Disciple strength greatly reduced the divisive impact of abolitionism, and even of the war itself. As the Disciples expanded northward and southward, characteristic attitudes did take shape and schisms with social and sectional overtones would occur, but not until the postwar era.110

This conclusion seems harmonious with that of Garrett, who rejected social and economic determinism in favor of the guidance of individual leaders, although he recognized that it is necessary to take into account environmental considerations.

Such conclusions which minimize the immediate effect of sectional dissension are consistent with the fact that the Disciples, as a whole, never were a particularly political people. To consider politics as a secular service to God is not a characteristic teaching among Disciples. In fact, political interest was considered to be a carnal distraction from more important concerns. The saints should concentrate, instead, it was believed, on social progress and that religious growth that results from personal conversion and reform. To do otherwise is to try to clean up a river at its mouth rather than at its source, as Campbell frequently said. As an example of political aloofness, David Lipscomb, a second-generation leader, "decided as a matter of principle that he should not even vote in political elections much less maim or kill another person."111
As previously mentioned, division did not become official until 1906, when the conservative wing of the Movement demanded separate listing, apart from the Disciples, as "Churches of Christ" in the Federal Census. Although today these churches frequently are known as "non-instrumental" churches, dispute about the use of an organ or piano in worship services was only one of the precipitating causes of the split. Perhaps more divisive was an attitude of opposition to interchurch cooperation in such matters as missionary societies. Both problems ultimately are derived from the question of whether the New Testament should be considered normative in its silences as well as in its positive precepts. So, as Garrison and DeGroot remarked, "The estrangement began in the 1830's and 40's with the resistance of some to the first feeble efforts at co-operation among the churches." Such a controversy could not be carried out without a medium, so Garrett blamed the editors of the Movement more than the churches for the trouble.

Between fifteen and forty-five years after 1906—the date is not so easy to fix—a second division occurred, ostensibly over the question of open membership. Open membership was the practice among some more liberal churches and missionaries of accepting converts from other denominations into the Disciples Church without requiring them to undergo baptism by immersion. As Garrett points
out, such a policy had been debated since the early days of
the Movement.\textsuperscript{115} The extent of cooperation with other
churches also was a divisive issue in this second split.\textsuperscript{116}

In 1946, before the second split had been com-
pletely realized, Stephen England discussed the extremes
he saw within the Movement. He found "unitists" and
"restorationists." The extreme unitists emphasized the
importance of unity among the churches, while neglecting
the importance of scriptural authority. The restoration-
ists emphasized the restoring of the church to the New
Testament pattern, forgetting that historically, in the
Movement, reformation was only a means to achieve the
goal of unity.\textsuperscript{117} McAllister and Tucker, among others,
also found these two themes in the Movement.\textsuperscript{118} The
emphasis on these two themes, which has contributed to
division more than once, is not of recent origin.

In amplifying England's discovery, Garrett claims
that division has always been imminent in the Movement
whenever the goal of restoration took precedence over the
idea of unity. It should be noted that he makes a dis-
tinction between "restoration" and "reformation." A
reformer is one who, like Luther, sees within an imperfect
church certain faults or abuses that need correction and
who, like a prophet, speaks out against them. On the other
hand, a restorer, like the Anabaptists, sees within the New
Testament a perfect primitive pattern that has been lost
and, with it, the primitive church. The restorer attempts
to restore that perfect pattern, thus restoring the church.
In the Stone-Campbell Movement, Garrett says that "the
great and small alike always referred to their unity
movement as this reformation, not restoration, . . ."119
This claim of Garrett's is, to an extent, overdrawn. Even
Walter Scott, the fourth most significant figure in the
early Movement, was not careful in distinguishing between
the terms.120 He wrote in the first issue of his paper,
The Evangelist, in reference to his Movement, "At present,
a very numerous and rapidly encreasing party, plead for,
not a reformation only, but an entire and unqualified
restoration of every thing warranted in the holy scrip-
tures, . . .121

Richardson and Campbell could also be cited with
similar effect. Nevertheless, the distinction seems to be
generally valid, and Garrett is right when he says about
restorationism, "While this concept was present in the
Stone-Campbell Movement, it was the principle of refor-
mation that dominated, at least for five or six decades."122
This echoes the conclusion of DeGroot, whose co-author did
not approve of the distinction between reformation and
restoration: "The principle of restoring a fixed pattern of
a primitive Christian church is divisive and not uni-
tive."123
In the area marked out by the borders of restorationism and reformationism, two major questions lurk.

(1) If the self-image of a church entails such insight that the members are able to discern where reform is necessary in other churches, or where a perfect pattern for the church may be found and what it looks like, then what is their verdict about those who are less enlightened? That is, what about those who are unable to see a need for the particular reforms that are advocated, or who see the primitive pattern either differently or not at all? This introduces the question of fellowship across denominational lines. Essentially, it is the question asked by the woman in Lunenburg—are there Christians among the sects? "Sects" are those who consider themselves to be Christian, but who are nevertheless an "out-group" in relation to the reformers because they lack some essential characteristic.

(2) A further question is: if there is an original pattern or an approved precedent, then how can a church be faithful to that pattern while still adapting to changing conditions? Are the members of the church free to augment the basic pattern with whatever measures and aids seem expedient, or do such ad lib measures destroy the pattern? As England puts it, "What do we do with the silence?" Harrell describes it as "The question of whether the silence of the Scriptures was 'binding' or
'loosing' . . ."125 From this question flow concerns about the propriety of innovations such as Sunday Schools, musical instruments used in worship services, interchurch cooperation in mission work (within the denomination), and the usefulness of tract and Bible societies. In one form, the essence of these questions was faced when the Movement wrestled with the problem of slavery. It was met again more directly with the arrival of problems over cooperative societies and meetings among churches. England was correct, in his summary, "It is perhaps significant of our brotherhood development that every basic problem which we have faced in our organized existence came up for consideration during the seventeen-year period of 1832-49."126

Enough has been said to give some credence to my claim that the same tensions that later split the Movement existed within it from the very first. More detailed evidence will be presented in the next three chapters as I discuss the role of Alexander Campbell in maintaining harmony within the Movement by his timely interventions.
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CHAPTER V

INTERVENTION INTO THE POWER CYCLE

In preparing to study the Stone-Campbell Movement as a system, Brown's contention, which is being tested, is that the ideology of a human system is the product of three sub-systems, each of which constitutes a communication system in itself, and all of which are interrelated. Because each cycle shapes and is shaped by the others, my choice of beginning with the power cycle should not be misunderstood. Preparatory to explaining Campbell's intervention into the power cycle of his movement from 1830-1840, it seems logical first to discover how he received a measure of influence, or a power share, within the larger system of American Evangelicalism. Without such a power share, he could not have become an intervenor, either among American evangelicals or in his own Movement. At the same time, though, the acquiring of a power share within a system entails an attention-shift, as well as an alteration in the needs cycle such that the new power holder is perceived as able to satisfy felt needs. In short, in this chapter I will first highlight an early power intervention of Campbell before I discuss a later intervention, which occurred in the 1830's. This emphasis should not blind us
to the fact that a power intervention has side effects in the other cycles.

The power share that was attributed to Campbell within the system of American Evangelicalism became the basis of his intervention later on within his own Movement. It was during the decade of 1820-1830 that Campbell attracted the attention of the religious public, especially of American evangelicals.

By 1823, Campbell was a promising young minister who had become locally well-known as a result of his preaching and one debate on behalf of the Baptists. For some time, he had been an unorthodox Presbyterian in his religious behavior. He had preached for a year and a half before he was ordained, mostly to audiences in private homes. He refused to join any established church, although his congregation at Brush Run, Pennsylvania, united "conditionally" with the Redstone Baptist Association in 1813. When his first daughter was born on March 13, 1812, he was faced with the decision of whether to baptize her, as was the custom in the Presbyterian Church whence he came. After making "an inductive study" of the New Testament, he viewed the ordinance of baptism in a fresh way. Like the Baptists, he concluded that the appropriate form of baptism was immersion; unlike the Baptists, he decided that baptism was for adult believers who wished to become Christians. His father eventually agreed and, in a service
that lasted seven hours on June 12, 1812, the Campbell family and seven others were immersed. This was a "watershed event," not only because it was doctrinally significant to the Campbells, but also because this event marked the point at which Alexander Campbell's influence in the small movement transcended that of his father. As Campbell's biographer observed, in relation to the leadership of the young Movement, "From this hour, therefore, the positions of father and son were reversed, and each tacitly occupied the position allotted to him." In Richardson's opinion, Alexander was recognized already to be a more effective preacher than his father.

This change in his views of baptism was less important than the fact that his inductive re-study was the beginning of Alexander's new conception of the Christian system. Years later, he described the change that he had experienced.

It was not a simple change of views on baptism, which happens a thousand times without anything more, but a new commencement. I was placed on a new eminence—a new peak of the mountain of God, from which the whole landscape of Christianity presented itself to my mind in a new attitude and position.

By 1823, even though he had been exploring the new "landscape" for eleven years, his Movement was still small and Campbell's personal influence limited. This situation began to change with his second debate for the Baptists, which was with Presbyterian minister W. L.
Maccalla. The published debate quickly went into a second-printing, and his fame spread through the state.  

Seven years later, in 1830, after experiencing massive growth, the followers of Campbell emerged from the Baptists as a separate group. Although the Movement was gifted with preachers who were more effective than Campbell, such as Walter Scott, who baptized an average of 1,000 people a year for 30 years, there were no serious threats to Campbell's power share as the mind of the Movement, as he exercised his influence both through his own speaking and through his monthlies.

During those earlier years, the denominations strongest on the frontier—the Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists—felt the unsettling influence of the new Movement. To the Evangelical wing of American Protestantism, Campbell was seen as a competitor and a threat to the established churches. The question to be answered in this chapter is, what intervention did he engage in to invite such attribution of power to himself during those seven years? What was the power intervention that led to the birth of Campbell's branch of the Protestant Church? How was Campbell assigned, through symbols, a share of power, and how did this perceived power become a "dynamic for social change"?

In this chapter, three claims will be presented. (1) In the Protestant Church system, Campbell encouraged
perceptions of competitive relationships between the laity and the clergy. To this end, he invited allocation to himself of the role of "prophet" by identifying himself with traditional Christianity, and yet engaging in symbolic actions signifying a critical role. He exercised power by his communication as he demystified the role of the clergy, eliciting their disfavor and persecution. (2) Within the new Movement (consisting of those who attributed to him the prophetic role), Campbell communicated through power by personifying myths of the American Protestants. (3) As his Movement grew from a sect in rebellion to a denomination (from 1830 to 1840), he attempted another intervention, this time creating a new clergy and encouraging a cooperative interrelationship between the clergy and the laity within his Movement.

Power System Before Campbell's Intervention

A perceived opportunity or crisis invites intervention. What was the crisis in the churches as Campbell saw it that invited his power intervention? Much of the following information concerning the state of the church is taken from Campbell's writings, and thus reflects his perceptions. While the historical context is significant, it is more important to discover how Campbell saw the situation as one that was ripe for intervention. The crisis he saw was largely a problem of power shares, although at the root it
sprang, he thought, from a misinterpretation of the Bible. Let us consider the shares in the contemporary church as he saw it, which was primarily the Evangelical Church. Within the Judeo-Christian religion, traditionally there have been three power shares: the clergy, the laity, and the prophets. These titles suggest the respective responsibilities of the standardizer, the consumer or participant, and the originator.

To the American Protestant, a prophet or apostle is the one who originally delivers the word from God, the ultimate originator. The messages from the prophets are ratified and systematized by the clergy, who fill the roles of mediators and interpreters to the common people. The clergy find their sources of inspiration in the words written by the prophets, whose messages they sanctify by treating them as divine and which, in turn, give to the clergy their position within the religious hierarchy. In the Jewish religion of the Old Testament, the clergy were priests; during the intertestamental period, the role of clergy was expanded to include rabbis, scribes, and Pharisees, all of whom are familiar to the reader of the New Testament. In the early Christian Church, the role of clergy was occupied by evangelists and elders. In the course of time, the Christian clergy developed their own hierarchy of bishops and other offices. When the prophet speaks, it is frequently to criticize the religious estab-
lishment of clergy; nevertheless, the clergy later co-opt the messages of the prophets, adapting them and taming them at the same time.

The laity live out the role of consumers. They exercise the choice of whether to receive the clergy or not. In early 19th century America, it was not unusual for such choices to be made and repudiated repeatedly. The religious versatility of the American Protestant of the time was summarized by Page Smith:

He proved capable of forming endless new combinations and permutations, political, social, and religious. Like recombinant DNA, he went on mutating with bewildering speed and facility. In one lifetime such an 'individual' might encompass half a dozen careers or occupations and move twice as many times to new locations, changing his religion as often as his occupation.11

This phenomenon was described by Whitney Cross in his study of religion in western New York, where so many revivals occurred that it was called the "burned-over district."12 Smith added later that such behavior was not limited to New York alone:

But if the burnt-over district was notorious for its susceptibility to new and bizarre religious movements as well as plain, old-fashioned revivals, it was in that respect no different from most of rural America. Reading the diaries and letters of the period, especially those of individuals whose struggle to remain solvent was constant and often distressingly arduous, the anxiety over the state of their souls is abundantly evident as well as their susceptibility to 'visions.'13

Such changeability was symptomatic of what Schlesinger, Jr., called "revivalism":

The characteristic cycle from spiritual "deadness" to revivalist ecstasy to "backsliding" revealed a condition of apathy, occasionally energized by guilt into a frenzy of belief, but soon relapsing into the original indifference.¹⁴

As constant and persistent consumers, then, the laity are those who attribute to the clergy their power, and who bear either the responsibility of supporting the clergy or else the curse of neglecting them.

The prophet may arise either from among the clergy (as Luther and Zwingli) or from among the laity (as Amos, Ellen G. White, the Wesleys, and Joseph Smith). They live between the clergy and laity, partaking of the nature of both. They are laity in sympathy, but in authority, they are clerical (speaking for God, as clergy do, but with an originality denied the clergy). The prophet aims at reform by presenting a new revelation, by calling the church back to the old religion, or else by doing both at the same time. As the prophet speaks afresh on behalf of God, he or she is, to that extent, above the clergy, who are limited to the expounding of the old revelation. The responsibility of the prophet is to be faithful in communicating the divine word, to reward those who reform according to the inspired message, and to punish the recalcitrant. To the extent that a society reflects the religious milieu, the prophet may attack society, but generally the prophet's target is the established religion. This was especially true during this first half of the century as what Schlesinger, Jr.,
chose to call "a predominant Jacksonian mood" discouraged the church from speaking to political situations. Regardless of what a "Jacksonian mood" is, Niebuhr confirmed that a distancing from political activism was a result of the revival movement which emphasized "faith working by love," and which produced a manifold activity, as its theory was certain it would do. It was effective moreover far beyond the boundaries of the groups who participated in it directly. First of all, it resulted in a new tendency toward the withdrawal of the Christian community from entangling alliance with the world and particularly with politics.

When Campbell examined the religious system of his day, he could find no prophets speaking the message that he thought needed to be heard. They were either silent or dead. Of course, prophets are always appreciated more after their death. Campbell could see no effective critics of the system ruled over by the clergy. There were some traveling revivalists who spoke in the fiery tone of the prophets, even calling down miracles from heaven, such as the charismatic "exercises" that fascinated Barton Stone and repelled Campbell. The only targets of criticism from these revivalists, though, were the laity, either real or imagined, who were seen as greedy, violent, and wayward. Such preaching served the valuable purpose of upholding the church hierarchy—one could expect no serious criticism of the system from such clerical agents. When Campbell observed each denomination busy at sponsoring its own revival, he saw the
effect of revivals in legitimizing the system behind them:

... in the production, increase, and exaltation of moral authority, I know of nothing which contributes so much as those revivals, ... It seals the mission of a man to be "the instrument" of, or the great actor in, a revival; pretty much the same as miracles did the mission of the apostles.20

As a class, then, there were few contemporary voices raised against the clergy, with the exceptions of their natural enemies, such as the deists, who had no significant power share among the evangelicals.21 The established ministers suffered no competition for the sanctified right to speak to the laity. In describing the local church system at this time, Martin Marty mentioned the centrality of the preacher.22 The ministers subsumed the voices of past prophets (both of the Bible and of their own denominations), and used them to give authority to their own preaching and ruling. The effect was that of critical approval from the prophets, for surely God can be counted on to raise up new prophets when He is unhappy with the system:

![Diagram](Figure 8: Interrelated Power Shares in Protestant Church)
The clergy enjoyed a monopoly of God's truth, like that of the modern scientist, our secular priest, on technological truth. This was one source of their power. As Brown noted, truth is a medium of power. The clergy were the scholars and interpreters of the Bible, having been trained either in college or else (especially among the Baptists and Methodists) informally. Their testing and licensing gave them denominational approval as safe defenders of the faith.

Further guaranteeing their monopoly, as Campbell saw it, was their way of interpreting the Bible in an allegorical and mystical way, which kept their hearers ignorant of the Bible and thus dependent on them for religious teaching. Campbell would have approved of Marty's comment:

In a sense, the denominations could be compared to price-fixers sharing a single market. They were representatives of different brands who had formed an informal union to protect themselves from outsiders.

As long as the common people believed the Bible to be important to them, their dependence on the clergy to retail scriptural knowledge to them reified the power of the clergy.

Such power was further enhanced by the clerical responsibility for celebrating whatever rites and sacraments the churches observed. Such behavior reaffirmed, apparently with divine approval, the existing hierarchy.
The American system of revivals provided a further source of perceived power. The spectacular and emotional nature of the Great Awakenings appealed strongly to the frontier inhabitants. If the revivals were primarily useful for making converts and strengthening the churches, they also served to confirm the hierarchy of the practitioners—especially the Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian clergy. After all, while an individual could "have an experience" on his or her own, these essential experiences did proliferate when the clergy brought in "seasons of revival." The speaking of the ministers, "which was emotional in nature, was directed toward helping people feel an 'experience of salvation.'" In fact, the power of the preacher was attributed on the basis of his ability to bring about these experiences. After the time of the First Great Awakening, "A sermon now was judged by its effect. . . . The minister was judged by whether or not he could bring about this experience." Even when the convert had a solitary experience, it had to be submitted to the congregation and minister, in the case of the Baptists, for their approval.

One further source of legitimized authority of the clergy was the fact that the local preachers wielded governmental powers over their congregations.

The result of all this was that generally there was a complementary relationship between the laity and the
clergy. As the lack of critical disapproval upheld the order, so the legitimacy of the order was confirmed by the acquiescence of the laity.

By cooperative behavior, the laity ascribed to themselves the role of religious consumers. Their responsibility was to listen to the clergy, obey them, and support them in exchange for their ministrations. Of course, not all the laity were as supportive as the clergy wished. New converts often fell away when it was time for the local churches to claim the fruits of the revivals. Still, even such lapses affirmed the religious order as the "backsliders" showed by their behavior the need for clerical guidance.

As long as the laity upheld the clerical monopoly, there was little danger of criticism arising in the form of a condemning prophet, a rebel leader:

Figure 9: Interrelated Power Shares in Protestant Church
In this power system, Campbell perceived the cause of the crisis the Church was experiencing. Options are always limited when one must place the blame for the failure of a divine institution. The Church lives in a valley between two eternities—the perfect, primitive past before the Fall and the coming time of perfection, either in a Millennium or in Heaven. Its present failure must be understood as due either to sin within or attack from without. Campbell saw the Church as divided, ignorant, and splintered into warring factions. He diagnosed the cause of this failure as internal sin—there existed a "kingdom of clergy" who were more interested in winning advocates for their peculiar creeds than in teaching the revealed gospel. They exploited the people more than they served them. As long as the clergy maintained their power, the church would be impotent. The clergy and their creed thus became Campbell's target. The abuse was in the power share itself, which corrupted even the sincere ministers. There was needed a new Samuel Adams to encourage, by his words and example, a new revolution.

Campbell's Power Intervention

Such was the situation as Campbell perceived it. After the personal attention-shift occasioned by the birth of his daughter, he began more actively both to exercise power through his communication and to communicate through
Ironically, in order to attribute power effectively to the laity, he first had to invite the ascription of power to himself.

In discussing the "topoi for power creation," we will examine Brown's levels of intervention—those of strategies, tactics, and maneuvers. This discussion of strategies should not lead to the inference that Campbell deliberately and carefully planned all the effects of his intervention. Certainly some results were unplanned and unwelcome, but our concern here is to understand what happened, how it happened, and what the effects were.

Brown has suggested that there are two strategies available for power intervention—the facilitating of feelings of competitive interrelationships or of cooperative interrelationships. Campbell's strategy was to encourage competitive feelings between those who lived the role of clergy and those who were the laity in the evangelical American Protestant churches.

In the enterprise of making this shift in perceived relationships, Campbell used the tactic of integry, which calls on people to act in harmony with their role—"Behave this way because of who you are and who I am." In Campbell's case, is "one whose responsibility entails the labeling of relationships between clergy and followers." In other words, Campbell must invite those in the other roles to label him as a prophet—the only person
in the Protestant system whose ability and authority would permit him to speak to both other shares. Unless the social order is to be overturned, the form of its hierarchy must be observed; Campbell cannot be a pope in the Protestant churches, for example, but he can be a prophet. (He would have rejected such a title with repugnance, had it been literally bestowed. He was never willing to wear any religious title beyond that of "bishop," one of several in his home congregation of Bethany--and that was given to him against his will. The label of "Reformer," on the other hand, was acceptable to him and, as far as our study of the power share is concerned, is practically synonymous with that of bishop.)

As already mentioned, a prophet is most similar to the clergy in use of media and tone of message, yet most like the laity in sympathy and even common origin. Campbell would speak to the clergy in the presence of the laity with a castigating message as he reinterpreted their behavior in a new way that would invite feelings of competitive interdependence between them. At the same time, this intervention would facilitate a cooperative interdependence between the laity and whoever was given the role of the prophet. "Persons make power real," wrote Brown, "by ascribing it interdependently to one another. . . ." While the laity ascribe to Campbell the right of naming (and judging) the behavior of the clergy, he ascribes to
them a freedom of choice—a freedom that was culturally plausible. By acting on such freedom, they complemented his ascription and reified for themselves the power that he attributed to them.

As a result of Campbell's intervention strategy, there would ensue a competitive relationship between the clergy and the prophet. This result seems unintentional on Campbell's part. Apparently, he thought that his criticisms of the clerical office would be received with thanks from those who held that office. He advocated the reformation of the clergy, not the abandonment of them.

As an innovator, a prophetic voice, he saw his responsibility as that of a religious critic, a doctor whose prescriptions ought to be followed, no matter how painful. He followed in the tradition of Luther, Calvin, and Wesley, who attempted to reform their mother churches rather than trying to start their own churches. When he recalled the kindness of the Presbyterian Church, his original home, he felt gratitude that compelled him to act a faithful reformer: "... a better return I cannot (as I think) make, than to admonish them of their errors." In the same generous way, he would treat the hospitable Baptists:

So long as they will bear reproof, suffer exhortation, and allow us to declare our sentiments without restraint; so long as they manifest a willingness to know the whole truth, and any disposition to obey it; so long as they will hear us and cordially have
fellowship with us, we will have fellowship with them, we will thus labor for their good, and endeavor to correct what appears to be amiss—commending when praise is due, and censuring when it becomes necessary.38

Nevertheless, his attacks on the clergy were interpreted by some as an attempt to build up a party of his own, or else to amass a fortune from subscriptions to his monthly papers. One ungrateful foe wrote, in The Baptist Recorder:

I take this to be the whole secret: Mr. C has set out to cut a figure in the learned world, and no plan so likely to succeed as to set himself to oppose the whole religious world. . . . [T]his, however, is no new thing under the sun, for in every instance where new sects start up, their leaders must (in order to [attain] success) show that every body else is wrong as to religious matters, and themselves right.39

A prophet does more than criticize, though. A second task is to call people back to their original heritage, for the prophet is a "custodian of the past."40 So Campbell had not only to "unmask the clergy and their kingdom," but also to "call the attention of our readers, occasionally at least, to the contemplation of that glorious superstructure built by the founder and his skillful architects, described in the New Testament."41 Like the Jewish captives in the days of Nehemiah, "the saints are yet in Babylon," and needed to be called back to Jerusalem.42

The clergy, then, should listen to the critiques of the prophet and reform, while the laity ought to listen and accept the deliverance he offers. In speaking of the religious inertia he saw among the laity, Campbell said,
I labor incessantly to convince and to persuade the people who fear God, both out of the law, prophets, psalms, and apostolic writings, that such are their character and circumstances, and to induce them to return.43

Such was his attribution of the proper role behavior of the laity.

The claims that have been made about the nature of Campbell's strategies and tactics should appear more firmly founded after we consider in some detail the visible maneuvers he used to implement them. The first maneuver invited the attribution to him of the quality of "orthodoxy." The second maneuver invited the attribution of the title, "prophet."

One of Campbell's maneuvers was that of identification. By the display of various signs, he practiced identification with both the clergy and the laity, desiring to be seen as orthodox at heart and, hence, consubstantial with both. (As already discussed, his relationship with the clergy was a thorny one. He claimed that he was not critical of the sincere clergy, but only of the abuses of the system—a distinction that not all his readers appreciated.) By labeling himself as a Christian, a Protestant, and a Baptist, Campbell invited identification with the Baptists (both clergy and laity) and, to a lesser extent, other Evangelicals.

His attacks against deists and atheists—the common foe of all Christians—helped to identify him as a
Christian. For example, Campbell had attacked the ideas of Robert Owen, the most celebrated socialist and agnostic of the time, in a series of articles in the Christian Baptist. When Owen challenged the clergy (in New Orleans on January 28, 1826) to answer his charges against all religions, Campbell was the only one willing to accept.\textsuperscript{44} His further defense of the Protestant faith against Catholic Bishop Purcell at the request of the Protestant clergy in Cincinnati earned the respect of many of his foes, and further served to identify him as, at least in some respects, an orthodox Protestant. (After the debate, he received a note of thanks from the Protestants of Cincinnati.) A further sign was his use of Presbyterian and Baptist authorities in his writings and his debates. By such appeals, he frequently claimed to be more orthodox than the clergy who opposed him. (For example, he cites George Campbell's \textit{Essay on Miracles}.\textsuperscript{45})

Especially did he identify himself as a Baptist by calling his first journal \textit{The Christian Baptist}. (Later, he would reject this title as too limiting, preferring the \textit{Millennial Harbinger}.) He claimed the title of "Baptist," occasionally siding with the Baptists against the Presbyterians.\textsuperscript{46} In a letter to a Baptist leader, Campbell wrote, "Pray lend a helping hand. It is neither my cause nor yours, but our cause."\textsuperscript{47} Furthermore, he was a member of the Mahoning Baptist Association from 1824 to 1830.\textsuperscript{48}
His publishing, in the Christian Baptist, of letters from Baptists, both in criticism and support, also legitimized him, for, "Only equals can discuss and argue." 49

All of this served to attract to Campbell the label of "orthodox Baptist," thus inviting the identification of himself with all Baptists and giving him the right to communicate through his role as a fellow-Baptist. Such identification was especially important to him as an intervenor, because those who were threatened by the changes he called for could find some continuity of Baptist order amid the change. 50

In a second maneuver, Campbell invited the attribution to himself of the label, "prophet," by communicating the power of a prophet in various ways. There are certain traditional qualities of a prophetic message that have been signs of every prophet from Isaiah in the Old Testament, through Joseph Smith and Mother Ann Lee, to Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. In the first place, the message must have its source in the scripture (written or implicit) accepted by the audience. In the second place, the prophet's message is original and fresh or at least it seems so to a corrupt age. This is another reminder that an intervenor must be both in and out of the system at the same time.

It was important to Campbell, then, that he be seen both as a person of the Book, and as an "original expositor." 51 Campbell's personal expectations of himself
coincided with the rhetorical exigencies faced by an inter­
venor. Campbell seems to have derived at least part of his
own role expectations from the examples of the prophets of
the Old Testament, and the apostles of the New, as well as
the Protestant Reformers. His originality consists in the
presentation of ancient and (in Campbell's view) forgotten
truths in a fresh way, so that they seemed new. He fit
the category of "traditional symbolists," described by
Claussen and Brown as those who "define their beings 'in
the name of' symbols from the past, carried pristinely to
the present or purged--from time to time--of any contem­
porary heresy."52

The first sign of the prophet, then, is a message
that is rooted in the accepted scriptures. Above all other
claims, Campbell asserted that he spoke the word of God
revealed in the Bible. Believing that there was a need for
the reform of the church, Campbell perceived a pattern--
neglected though it was--in the New Testament, from the
days of the primitive church.

But what kind of a reformation is requisite. . . .?
It is not the erection of a new sect, the inventing of
new shibboleths, or the setting up of a new creed, nor
the adopting of any in existence save the New Testa­
ment, . . . . It is not to go back to primitive Calvin­
ism, or primitive Methodism, or primitive Lutherism,
but to primitive Christianity.53

Campbell justified his complaints against the
clergy and his calls for reform by appealing to the scrip­
tural precedents and patterns. Since nearly all Protestants
held the Bible in high esteem, the effect of his justifications (to those who believed them) was to invite the ascription of high authority to his doctrine.

The second traditional sign of the message of the prophet was originality. Since scriptural authority is hard to refute, Campbell's opponents tried to attribute his teachings to secular sources, such as the Haldane brothers, Robert Sandeman, or John Glas, all Scottish reformers. Such attribution would not prove Campbell wrong--but it would show him to be derivative. Such lack of originality is acceptable in a clergyman, but not in a prophet, whose only source is God. Campbell, though, insisted on his own originality, acknowledging no formative influences on his ideas except the Bible. Of his Christian Baptist, he said, "Many sentiments in this work are original to me. I dug them out of the mines of revealed truth." In this claim, he implied that he was speaking for God; he thus escaped the most deadly sin of a prophet, that of speaking from his own mind rather than the mind of God.

In summary, Campbell exhibited the two traditional characteristics of a prophetic messenger--an original application of a traditional source. These characteristics served as signs of a prophet. But besides traditional characteristics, there are also local or cultural qualities that make a message seem prophetic to a particular
audience. Perhaps it is universal for people to think that when God speaks, He will sound much like us. At any rate, as Duncan learned from Kenneth Burke, "Only when voices from without speak in the language of voices within is persuasion complete." The voice in which one speaks helps to determine the audience that will hear.

The environment in which the Stone-Campbell Movement especially flourished was inhabited by "individualistic, self-reliant, optimistic, and aggressive pioneers." Two cultural qualities of Campbell's message that made it acceptable to such people were its rationality and its democratic, individualistic nature.

There was in American Protestantism a strong strain of mysticism and emotionalism, from which Campbell's branch of the Movement was distinct. After a visit to America in 1839, Captain C. B. Marryat reported the emotionalism he had witnessed with distaste:

Indeed, ... with their anxious seats, their revivals, their music and their singing, every class and sect in the states have even now so far fallen ... to such an extent that religion has now become more of an appeal to the senses than to the calm and sober judgment.

The Enlightenment and the common sense philosophy from Scotland also were strong influences. "The most noticeable feature of American religious thought in the early nineteenth century was its rationality," said E. Brooks Holifield. Niebuhr also was willing to use the
label of "rationalists" in a limited sense:

The leaders of the religious enlightenment were rationalists—if logical and intense use of the reason may be called rationalism—but they were aware that reason can operate only on the basis of presuppositions prior to all logical processes.⁶⁰

A rational approach to religion was encouraged as a result of the widespread acceptance of common sense philosophy, especially as it had been advocated by John Witherspoon, President of the College of New Jersey.⁶¹

At the heart of the Enlightenment were the approaches to knowledge that had been developed by Newton in the field of science and by Locke in the area of philosophical inquiry. Garrison and DeGroot have summarized the "corollaries" of Locke's theory of knowledge:

. . . that religious ideas, like all others, can come only through rational reflection upon materials received through the senses; that feelings and the mystical consciousness give no valid religious knowledge; that, since man cannot know God through direct testimony of the senses, knowledge of God can come only through revelation, which itself must come originally in clear sensory form; that faith is an intellectual act, the belief of testimony given by revelation; that, while civil society is governed by laws which society itself makes, religion is governed by laws made by an outside lawgiver—God. Taking the Bible as a repository of sacred truth about matters otherwise inaccessible to the human mind, he [Locke] saw that differences of interpretation were not only possible but actual. Since interpretation is an act of human reason, therefore individual and fallible, none has a right to impose his belief upon another. Difference of opinion should not be an occasion for persecution, acrimonious controversy, or division. Men should hold their theological opinions subject to the consideration that they may be wrong and put the emphasis upon the simple fundamentals of faith and the practical virtues about which Christians generally agree.⁶²
Campbell's approach to religion and to the Bible, when presented to people who lived in a culture shaped in part by such influences as the ones just described, seemed to harmonize with the independent spirit of the pioneers who felt naturally endowed with sufficient faculties to understand knowledge in any area. In particular, this approach appealed to the wave of rationally-minded Scotch-Irish settlers who, as Riley declares, "carried along with their Presbyterian connection their philosophy of common sense." As Bever remarked, "... Reid's ideas in regard to 'common sense' permeated the thought of the Restoration movement, and they assisted in making the restoration plea effective on the American frontier."

For such people—and he was one of them—Campbell demystified the Bible and provided a religion that was rational in that it was based on common sense presumptions concerning the mind and its faculties, but which was not rationalistic. That is, its assumptions allowed for a God who might act supernaturally, but never irrationally. He demanded from His followers a faith that may be beyond reason and sensory experience, but never contradicts them, inasmuch as they are divine gifts. As West said, in summarizing Campbell's combination of reason and faith, we can only conclude that he made reason a necessary servant of faith and of revelation in the quest for religious knowledge. Faith is rational in so far as it can comprehend divine truth. But faith goes beyond reason, although never contrary to it. In his arguments, Campbell appealed to human reason rather than to human authorities or to emotions.
As a person influenced by the widespread theory of faculty psychology, as mediated by the common sense philosophers, Campbell perceived that a rational approach to the theory of preaching recognizes that:

All evidences are addressed to the higher and more noble faculties of man. The understanding, and not the passions, is addressed; and therefore an appeal to the latter, before the former is enlightened, is as unphilosophic as it is unscriptural. As the helm guides the ship, and the bridle the horse, so reason is the governing principle in man.66

Believing as he did that God operates on the human mind through motive appeals, Campbell lamented that clear and forceful arguments have no power against a mind blinded by prejudice. As evidence of this, he referred to his recent experience with the aristocrats in the late Virginia [Constitutional] Convention. Orpheus could, by his music, as easily have caused the oaks to follow him, as could the republicans, by their arguments and demonstrations, have caused the oligarchs in power to consent to extend equal rights and immunities to the proscribed cast[e]s in this commonwealth.67

Campbell presented a common-sense way of understanding the Bible. He claimed that it should be read as one reads any other book, using the same rules of interpretation that are applied to any piece of literature.68

Besides Campbell's rationality, a second cultural quality that made Campbell an acceptable speaker for God in the eyes of many was his anti-authoritarian, democratic emphasis. Each issue of his Christian Baptist carried the motto,
Style no man on earth your Father: for he alone is your Father who is in heaven; and all ye are brethren. Assume not the title of Rabbi; for ye have only One Teacher: neither assume the title of Leader; for ye have only One Leader, the Messiah.

--Messiah

Campbell encouraged free inquiry and the challenge of dogmas. Like Luther, he had confidence in the laity, and elevated their work, making it as "spiritual" as that of the clergy.

Now I am led to think, from the apostles' doctrine, that the poor widow, or the waiting maid who labors industriously in her station, and who obeys Christ, is just as good a servant of God and "minister of Jesus Christ" as ever John Calvin was, or any other preacher or teacher is.69

In a similar vein, he elevated the effectiveness of the religious behavior of the common Christian:

Now I am just such a simpleton as to believe that the preachings, exhortations, and prayers of sister Phebe, the maid-servant of his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, are possessed of as much authority and efficacy as those of her master.70

Such comments from Campbell no doubt reflect his attempts to identify with the common people.

Again in the footsteps of Luther, he gave the Bible to the people. In reference to one opponent who disapproved Campbell's own version of the New Testament, he said, "I gave it to them [the public]--and he will take it from them."71 Not only did he give them the Bible by issuing a fresh translation of the New Testament, but also by teaching principles for understanding the Bible without clerical mediation and interpretation.72 He urged that the
laity should be told that "men of common education, by strict attention, may be able to understand the Christian facts, and teach their meaning to their own households as usefully as any one of the privileged classes." The implications of this belief that the laity could read and understand for themselves were caught and emphasized by Schlesinger, Jr. He compared Campbell's attack on religious obscurity to the criticisms of the Jacksonians against "the obfuscations of the common law":

In each case there was a desire to render the subject accessible to the common man and thus to cut the ground from under the privileged class—whether of priests or of judges—who held power through their vested interests in obscurity.

John William Ward did not share Schlesinger's views of class conflict, but he did see in Jacksonian democracy a rejection of the importance of formal higher education in favor of a higher Reason (in the language of the Transcendentalists), which is inherent in human nature. Writing of the "Jacksonian rejection of the mind," he explained, "The reason of the university was rejected in behalf of the higher reason of nature."

It is not difficult to detect a common resonance between Campbell's attack on the privileges of the clergy, bought at the expense of their flocks, and the words of President Jackson, which expressed "the social philosophy of the Jacksonian movement." In vetoing the recharter of the Bank of the United States, Jackson wrote,
... [E]very man is equally entitled to protection by law; but when the laws undertake to add to these natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities, and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics, and laborers—have a right to complain of the injustice of their Government.

One of the "exclusive privileges" that marked the clergy as superior was their divine calling to the ministry. The calling was a mark of sanctification and approval, but Campbell demystified it and attributed it to any Christian who is faithfully serving God. For example, in a private letter to Philip S. Fall, he wrote:

... a man qualified to be a teacher of the Christian religion may in all places where he finds persons in need of instruction address them on the Christian religion—and his having the aptitude and they needing his assistance constitutes a call upon him whethersoever he goes,...

Campbell acted as a Prometheus, stealing the signs and privileges of the clergy and giving them to the common Christians. This was much to his democratic taste—he thought that genuine religion was more likely to be found among the laity than among the clery. The Baptists were a better church than the Presbyterians because they had fewer clergy—and they would be better still without any.

As already suggested, his democratic attitudes were communicated both in his exaltation of the laity, and in his demystifying of the clergy. He recognized, for example, the mythic value of names and titles, as they exercised a "wonderful fascination":

Beside the fancied dignity, the sacredotal titles had always been understood to convey the notion of certain rights which conduced both to the honor and the emolument of those to whom these titles belonged.  

Understanding this, he showed the anomaly of Protestant clergy wearing names and titles forbidden to them in their scriptures. He attacked the doctrine of the divine call to the ministry by appealing to reason:

How then does he [a preacher] demonstrate his authority? By producing a license, or a certificate, from Papists, Episcopalians, Prebyterians, Methodists, or Baptists, that they considered him competent and authorized to preach and teach Christianity. Does this prove that he is called by God. No, assuredly; for then God calls men to preach different gospels and to teach different kinds of Christianity.

By appealing to primitive precedent, he suggested that the earliest preachers (those closest in spirit to Christ) were not paid for preaching:

That any man is to be paid at all for preaching, i.e. making sermons and pronouncing them; or that any man is to be hired for a stipulated sum to preach and pray, and expound scripture, by the day, month, or year, I believe to be a relic of popery.

He condemned a "Reverend Divine" for preaching four sermons in Pittsburgh, then charging forty dollars for his performance. He once described a preacher as a hireling who agrees to sell fifty-two sermons a year at a wholesale price.

The education a young ministerial student received at divinity school was anything but sanctifying, Campbell thought. He pictured the student as he gradually assumes a sanctimonious air, a holy gloom overspreads his face, and a pious sedateness reigns
from his eyebrows to his chin. His very tone of voice participates of the deep devotion of his soul. . . . With his sunday coat, on a sabbath morn, he puts on a mantle of deeper sanctity, and imperceptibly learns the three grand tones—these are the devout, the more devout, and the most devout.

Meantime he reads volumes of scholastic divinity, and obtains, from sermon books and skeletons of sermons, models for future practice. Bodies of divinity, adapted to the sect to whom he looks for maintenance, are closely studied; . . .

Campbell desanctified the clergy, then, by his attacks on their badges of office (such as titles, a ministerial voice, the divine calling). He further profaned their authority by his tone of irony, through which he communicated the power to doubt. It seems that in his personal conversation, even with opponents, Campbell was "mild, pleasant, and affectionate," as one critic wrote. But he was, "as a writer, rigid and satirical, beyond all the bounds of scripture allowance." No doubt the writer had in mind some of Campbell's pieces such as his "Third Epistle of Peter," which he called "A Looking Glass for the Clergy."

Let the houses in which you preach . . . be divided into seats for the congregation, and let every man know his own seat; and let the first seats in front of the altar be for the rich that pay by thousands; and the next for the poorer that pay by hundreds; and the last for those that pay by tens. And let the poor man sit behind the door. . . . If any man go into a foreign land and seize upon his fellow man, and put irons on his feet and irons on his hands, and bring him across the great deep into bondage; . . . tell him not that his doings are of Antichrist; for lo! he is rich and gives to the church . . .

And when you shall hear of a church that is vacant and has no one to preach therein, then be that a call
to you, and be you mindful of the call, and take you charge of the flock thereof and of the fleece thereof, even of the golden fleece.

And when you shall have fleeced your flock, and shall know of another call, and if the flock be greater, or rather if the fleece be greater, then greater be also to you the call.87

Such a sarcastic tone is anything but respectful to men who are supposedly called and directed by God. Campbell claimed that his reason for writing in such a way was that it helped to gain the attention of lethargic readers.88 Such writing, though, also served the rhetorical end of defrocking the clergy. "Irony holds belief, the tragic moment of truth, open to doubt," wrote Duncan. "It exposes motives which the actors do not know or seek to hide. Roles shift and change."89

Having demystified the role of the clergy, and having invited the attribution to himself of the role of "prophet," Campbell was free to criticize the clergy themselves without inviting from the laity the charge of sacrilege. This business of attacking "the kingdom of the clergy" was undertaken, he professed, only for the sake of the common people. His intention was not to join the infidel cry against priests or priest-craft; it is not to gratify the avaricious, or the licentious; but it is to pull down their [the clergy's] babel, and to emancipate those who they have enslaved, to free the people from their unrighteous dominion and unmerciful spoiliation.90

By picturing the clergy as hirelings, as men covetous of honors and titles, as priests in the lineage of the
Roman Catholic Church, as teachers who were ignorant both of the Bible and of the English language, he suggested that the clergy were using the hierarchy of the church for their own good, not for the good of those they professed to serve and shepherd. In this way, he encouraged the laity to view their relationship with the clergy as a competitive one. Such a perception would lead to altered behavior of those who shared it: "... when inferiors do not think their superiors' privileges are being used to uphold the principles of hierarchy, love and obedience turn to ironic obedience or open disobedience."92

While a significant number of the laity (enough so that, before the Stone-Campbell union, there were "scores of churches" with "thousands of members") were willing to listen to Campbell as a legitimate reformer (and so were a few of the clergy), most of the clergy of the Evangelical churches--the ones threatened by Campbell--, rejected him as prophet. Instead, he was labeled a "heretic," one whose role was competitive with the established teachers. This was no less than Campbell expected, "To repudiate the system, is to desecrate the priest, and whosoever has profaned or made common the priests, has been not only unchurched, but unchristianized."94

The response of some of the Presbyterian and Baptist clergy was to attack Campbell in various ways--and Campbell was careful to report much of the persecution to his
readers, for such behavior legitimized his claims about the clergy. He told about the occasion on which a preacher burned in public a copy of Campbell's edition of the New Testament.\textsuperscript{95} Campbell expressed thanks that the law would not let the preacher treat the editor of the book the same way. He reported on some ministers who had forbidden their congregations to read \textit{The Christian Baptist}.\textsuperscript{96} He listed the titles they had given him: "unregenerate," "a devil," "Unitarian," "Arian," "Socinian," "drunkard," "horse thief," "Deist," "every thing almost but a christian."\textsuperscript{97}

Against the background of such attacks, Campbell emphasized his own scrupulous fairness. He always professed to keep his columns open to anyone who disagreed with him and wished to reply.\textsuperscript{98} He followed that policy so fully that, as West remarks, "many of the most effective criticisms of Alexander Campbell's ideas are found in his own magazines."\textsuperscript{99} He frequently published extensive criticisms of himself, though he usually replied just as extensively.

Campbell used the attacks against him as evidence that confirmed that he was in the right. One corollary of being a prophet is that suffering attends success:

\begin{quote}
John the harbinger of the Messiah, lost his head. The Apostles were slaughtered. The Saviour was crucified. The ancient confessors were slain. The reformers all have been excommunicated. I know that we shall do little good if we are not persecuted. If I am not traduced, slandered, and misrepresented, I shall be a most unworthy advocate. . . .\textsuperscript{100}
\end{quote}
Campbell was reenacting what might be called the "myth of Abel," the good man suffering for his righteousness. By such attribution, Campbell used the attacks as confirmation of his prophetic mission.

Those who criticized Campbell had a different interpretation of the situation. Even some of his friends feared that he was "outstepping the fixed boundaries of truth" and endangering the positive aspects of the religious order when he attacked the use of creeds and Bible societies, and when he seemed to ally himself with freethinkers and deists by sharing their dislike of the clergy.101

Criticism of his ideas and complaints against his followers led eventually to a division of the "Reformers" from the Baptists. Campbell was then left as an intervenor within that subset of American Evangelicalism that consisted of those who attributed to him, and thus to themselves, the title of "reformer." From those who listened to him, Campbell had derived power through communication. By winning the attribution of prophet from this group of American Protestants, he "subsumed worldviews"—being granted not explicitly by his followers the power to make choices for them, to correct them, to champion their cause, and to share in choosing their future.102
The New Movement After Campbell's Intervention

By 1830, for the reasons already explained, the split between the Baptists and the Reformers had occurred, and Campbell's followers were a new sect on their way to becoming a denomination against their will.

In that year, Campbell simultaneously finished The Christian Baptist and published the first volume of the Millennial Harbinger. His new journal reflected a change in tone. There was evident less criticism of the rule of the clergy, although specific opponents were still dealt with vigorously. Campbell made angry protests at the unchristian way Reformers were being excluded, sometimes from churches they had helped build. As a whole, though, his tone was more constructive, aimed at edifying the Movement, rather than criticizing its opponents. He was less ironic and more irenic. There were more explanations of scripture, more questions from readers answered, and more discussion of the proper church order and conduct.

In the United States of 1800, only one out of fifteen people professed church membership, so the new church had many prospects for conversion. By 1832, there were 12,000-15,000 members in some 200 congregations; half of these, perhaps, were from the Baptists, and most of the rest were fresh converts.
Because of their separations, members of the Movement could no longer view themselves as a group of guerilla fighters in occupied territory; they were now a separate Movement. As the mind of the Movement, Campbell's power share was unique, although there were other editors and many amateur preachers. By self-selection, the Movement comprised mostly those who already allocated to Campbell the largest power share (except for some of the followers of Stone, who united with Campbell in 1832).

The numerical success of the group, which Campbell reported regularly in the Harbinger, must have confirmed to Campbell the wisdom of his choice of identity for his followers. Certainly it suggested a glorious vision of the future--perhaps even the realization of the Millennium. For now, though, we shall direct our attention to the subsystem of American Protestantism known as the Stone-Campbell Movement, which became the system of Campbell's power intervention after 1830.

The New Allocation of Power Shares

After Campbell's successful power intervention, there was a new cooperative relationship between him as chief reformer or prophet and the lay members. The power each share attributed to the other helped define the mutual roles, and Campbell sometimes appeared uncomfortable when his ideas were accepted uncritically. Through the power he
exercised via his monthly Harbinger and in person, he communicated hierarchy within the group as he gave commendation and blame and prescribed behavior appropriate to good reformers. At the same time, the hierarchy communicated his power as his wishes were obeyed and his verdicts accepted, sometimes without questioning. Without his attributed power, originally based on the signs of an American prophet, Campbell could not have intervened so effectively in the attention cycle and the needs cycle of the Stone-Campbell Movement.

Between the laity and the unofficial and sometimes untrained clery in the Movement, there was a distrust which was evidenced by the complaints of evangelists and preachers whose letters of complaint were printed in, among other places, the Millennial Harbinger and The Evangelist. The evangelists and lay preachers themselves were received gladly, but reimbursement or support was scant. To pay a lay minister (or "tent-maker," after the example of the Apostle Paul) seemed too much like rebuilding the hireling structure they had just torn down. (The Stoneites, who united with the Campbell followers in 1832, had a more tolerant attitude toward the clergy, and had both ordained and unordained preachers, although they never adopted the clerical superstructure of presbyteries and synods of their Presbyterian neighbors.) 105
In the new Movement, Campbell gave the clerical role to all Christians. There was no scriptural need for ministers nor for ministerial training, "... there is not one word, from Genesis to John, which says that it is the duty of the church to prepare pious youth for the gospel ministry."¹⁰⁶ There is no special divine call to the ministry, except as far as a person perceives a need and has the ability to meet it:

"I know what you term "a call" is just what I felt a hundred times when a boy. And I still feel it. I feel that it is my indispensable duty to call upon sinners to reform, and to flee from the wrath to come. I also feel that it is my indispensable duty to write and publish this paper, and to make use of all righteous means to circulate it far and wide. ... I am as much called by the Holy Spirit to publish the "Christian Baptist," as any man upon the earth is called to preach the gospel. What think you of this? A man that can read well, and who finds persons who cannot read the testimony of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, is also called by the Holy Spirit to read those testimonies; and in so reading, he is preaching the gospel."¹⁰⁷

To "preach," to Campbell, was to announce the basic claims of the gospel to those who are ignorant of them. He certainly did not expect every Christian to interpret and expound the Bible, or to teach an assembled body of Christians, but he did expect every Christian to be a "preacher" in the limited sense of being able to report the gospel story.

To instruct a congregation of believers and to preside over worship services were the responsibilities of one or more elders chosen by the congregation from its members,
and responsible only to it. When such overseeing took a significant amount of the elder's time, he was to be paid for his work, Campbell taught. In the case of a congregation that was so new that there were no members mature enough to be chosen elder, it was appropriate to use the services of a traveling evangelist who specialized in starting new congregations and attending them in their infancy.

Such was Campbell's idea of the role of the non-professional clergy in the new order. Within the Movement, suspicion toward professional clergy was so strong that Lynn Hieronymus writes, "The first three decades of the history of the Disciples of Christ are unique in that they evidenced a general absence of any sort of a professional ministry." The share of influence allocated to the lay ministry of the Movement, then, was severely limited. Now let us consider the power share of Campbell within the new Movement.

As resident prophet within his own Movement, Campbell now followed the old proverb, "There is a time to break down and a time to build up." In 1849, he recalled the events of 1828, and remarked, "Reformation and annihilation are not with me now, as formerly, convertible or identical terms." As the foremost writer and one of the most sought-after speakers in the Movement, he continued to
communicate through his power as if it were taken for granted that he always spoke rationally and scripturally, on behalf of the divine truth. He was consistently treated as the philosopher, the primary thinker, within the Movement. Not all of his readers followed his reasoning in the way he intended, so he was sometimes misunderstood, but all readers could at least obey his wishes, if they chose to, even when the reason was not clear to them. Campbell's power, then, became a shortcut for communicating his choices, and decisions were sometimes made "without deliberating in the classical sense." Occasionally, now, he would answer questions that had been posed to him without taking the time to give his reasons. For example, he gave firm answers to four questions a reader presented having to do with preaching and missionary activity. Then he added,

Had I room for the demonstrations and proofs from which these conclusions are drawn, which would occupy at least an entire number of this work, I would not despair of making the above answers apparent and convincing to all honest inquirers. But in the mean time I submit the answers without the premises for examination and reflection. It was enough to invoke the ideograph of "rationality."

The word of the prophet subsumed individual reason, and Campbell reveled a little in the mystery of the office of the prophet. As Duncan wrote, "We do not ask a priest or a prophet whether he has interpreted the rules correctly; we ask him to tell us what to do." Sanctions against straying included the danger of facing Campbell's
still-devastating criticism.

Since the Movement had now separated from its parent denominations, Campbell's influence was used in a fresh way. It is true that he still attacked clerical abuses and he still defended himself from criticism that came from outside the group. Now, though, more of his time was spent in edifying words to his readers; his role expectations included more teaching and less evangelizing. To his own people, he urged personal piety and sound principles of order within the church. The proper and expected response from the readers was to obey his hints. In turn, the readers continued to ratify Cambell's position of domestic prophet by inviting him to speak to them in person, by obeying his wishes, and, of course, by renewing their subscriptions, an act which attributed to him the right to speak to them. As a result, Campbell's influence was more impressive than a casual reader of the histories might suppose. One of his critics appraised his position in the Movement in a letter: "No man probably in America has as much in his power as you. The eyes of thousands are upon you. You certainly occupy a most responsible station; . . ." 114

In spite of his share of influence, he continued to exhibit the marks of a person to whom honor is unexpected and even somewhat unwelcome. He still refused the overt ascription of a leadership position, although he was not backward about insisting on the persuasive influence that
inherited in his arguments apart from his person. He reported once that a Baptist preacher had warned his congregation to beware of "Campbellism." Campbell added, to his own readers,

This is just what it ought to be. I renounced myself when I vowed allegiance to the Lord. Shall he become a leader of others who dare not follow himself, but has vowed to follow the Lord!\footnote{115}

Campbell continued to direct the Movement through his writing, while disclaiming any personal authority beyond that of his arguments. In this way, he institutionalized the role of the prophet within the Movement, creating what would later be called, facetiously but accurately, the role of "editor-bishops." This was an acceptable way of exercising leadership among an anti-authoritarian people.

The Stone-Campbell Movement was not the first source of religious newspapers, although its members contributed more than their share of reading material to a literate America. Elias Smith (who had earlier espoused some beliefs that would characterize Campbell's followers) published the first religious newspaper in America from 1808-1817.\footnote{116} The Harbinger and the Christian Baptist were remarkable, though, for their independence combined with a large readership. The power of the editor so exemplified was particularly attractive to people who were suspicious of any sort of clerical influence.
In the new Movement, Campbell was not the only one to assume this innovative role of editor-bishop. Both Barton W. Stone and Walter Scott used their journalistic voices to present their original ideas. Stone had emphasized the ideal of Christian unity in his *Christian Messenger*, and had pressed for its visible manifestation by urging the union of his followers with those of Campbell. Scott, an early evangelist who was responsible for the conversion of many thousands to the Movement, had simplified and organized the primary points of the gospel so that they could be proclaimed clearly and concisely to popular audiences. While Campbell always believed that he himself was responsible for rediscovering the primitive gospel in theory, he attributed to Walter Scott the honor of having been the first preacher to carry the theory into practice. Both of these innovational ideas were eventually ratified by Campbell, although only after some initial scepticism.

By his approval and ratification of such innovations, Campbell, along with Stone's and Scott's readers, attributed to them a share of prophetic power. Other editors proliferated, though, and their contributions were not greeted as enthusiastically by Campbell. At first, he welcomed his fellow-editors, but by 1836, there had been at least one dozen periodicals within the Movement, at one time or another. So, when a reader named Brother
Howard asked Campbell to publish a plea for subscribers to his struggling paper, the Christian Reformer. Campbell complied, but he wrote privately to Richardson, his assistant editor:

3. I can not say much for Brother Howard: There are now [too] many papers: but to tell him that, or to comment on the excess of printing—would rather vex than comfort him. As a simple item of information; and as a solemn warning to others, it might be as well to publish his letter without note or comment: . . .

Regardless of whether there were too many papers, no other journal had either the circulation or the influence in the Movement of Campbell's Millennial Harbinger. His ethos, or perceived credibility, was unique among the editors. Since the time of Aristotle, "ethos" has been considered to be one of the most effective means of persuasion. Brown pointed out that ethos is derived from the presence of culturally relative signs of charisma. Campbell, I believe, personified and harmonized two powerful and widespread myths, and thus communicated in the popular power code.

The first myth was that fostered by the American democratic experience—the nobility of the common person. Frederick Jackson Turner emphasized this aspect of what he saw as Jacksonian democracy, which was "strong in the faith of the intrinsic excellence of the common man, and in his capacity to share in government." Of course, Turner's view of Jacksonian democracy has not been unchallenged;
nevertheless, according to Charles Grier Sellers, Jr., "The pro-democratic orientation that transformed Jacksonian historiography at the turn of the century has continued to be the dominant influence on writings about the Jackson period ever since." Not only did "Jacksonian democracy" apparently exalt the worth of the individual, but it also entailed the possibility of the betterment of the individual's situation. As Robert Remini described the situation,

In America it was expected that children would improve their station, make more money than their parents, get a higher-paying job, find a better life. That's what "go-ahead" was all about.

... Restless, searching, driving. By the time of Jackson's inauguration in 1828 it was the prevailing mood of the country.

The possibility of betterment was expected mentally as well as materially. There was a strong "faith in individual reason." These observations are not unique to twentieth century historians. Tocqueville described America during the prime of Jackson (and his fellow Scotch-Irishman, Campbell):

[Americans] have a lively faith in the perfectability of man, they judge that the diffusion of knowledge must necessarily be advantageous, and the consequence of ignorance fatal; they consider all society as a body in a state of improvement, ...

... Everything in the world may be explained, and ... nothing in it transcends the limits of the understanding. ... Everyone ... attempts to be his own sufficient guide and makes it his boast to form his own opinion on all subjects.

Campbell embodied this mythic complex. As an immigrant, he had broken with his old country and religion to
come to the United States. Campbell's spiritual migration is well-described by what James Oliver Robertson said of physical migration: "Migration meant a break with the past, and that break required justification. The justification was and is, quite simply, improvement of one's lot."

Such a justification is not necessarily a crass one, for to emigrate to a new country in order to serve God better surely is to "improve one's lot."

The independent Campbell respected the common people more than he admired religious authorities. The few clergy that he did respect were outstanding to him for their honesty and fairness, not because of their office. Campbell relived symbolically in the Protestant world the rebellion of the colonies against the mother country, the act which Robertson called the "ritual American act of courage." In his writing, Campbell implied that there was a parallel between the earlier American Revolution and the religious revolution he was engaged in. On July 4, 1829, he wrote,

It is right that I should keep to the rights of man, as I have proposed to wear out one pen on them. . . . This is the fourth day of July, the day on which this nation was born, and the day on which Thomas Jefferson and John Adams died. On this day I wrote the preface to the first volume of the Christian Baptist, and it is the day on which I write the preface to the seventh and last volume of this work. . . .

In his 1830 "Fourth of July Oration," he treated the American Revolution as a mythic event, and then drew
a parallel between it and the work of his Movement:

The fourth of July, 1776, was a memorable day, a day to be remembered as was the Jewish Passover—a day to be regarded with grateful acknowledgements by every American citizen, by every philanthropist in all the nations of the world. The light which shines from our political institutions will penetrate even the dungeons of European despots, for the genius of our government is the genius of universal emancipation!

A more glorious work is reserved for this generation—a work of as much greater moment, compared with the Revolution of '76, as immortality is to the present span of human life—the emancipation of the human mind from the shackles of superstition, and the introduction of human beings into the full fruition of the Reign of Heaven. . . . This revolution, taken in all its influences, will make men free indeed.130

Campbell's sympathy for the American political experience and the significance to him of the Fourth of July has been summarized in Robert Frederick West's chapter on "The New Revolution of July 4."131

Campbell had been a champion of popular rights, both politically and religiously, having served as a delegate to the Virginia Constitutional Convention primarily for the purpose of putting an end to slavery.132 He criticized the mistreatment of Indians for the sake of financial gain.133 In the area of religion, he helped to place clerical powers into the hands of the people instead of the religious "aristocrats," those who cherished the title of "reverend" and the honor of the "D.D."134

In his half-dozen debates (all but one of which were oral), Campbell attempted to enact the victory of the common person over the privileged oppressor. Such
exhibits provide an arena for ideological encounter on one level. Hence, though Campbell entered his first debate with reluctance, he soon came to see these verbal fights as useful events that would serve to keep his ideas before future generations and distant audiences:

Written debates and discussions are useful, but not to be compared with those that are spoken, with the earnestness and force of an active mind and the intonations of an appropriate elocution. Again they may be taken down by an accomplished stenographer, and soon scattered, far and wide, through the community.

They are, too, in this case, read with more attention, a greater intensity of interest, and according to the Roman aphorism—Picta tabula manet, they can be read again, and again, till fully comprehended and appreciated. I presume to add that ninety nine per cent of mankind will prefer to read the report of an oral discussion, than to read a copy of one that was not spoken, but merely written.135

On another occasion, he concluded, "A week's debating is worth a year's preaching, such as we generally have, for the purpose of disseminating truth and putting error out of countenance."136

On another level, though, the debates were dramatizations of hierarchy.137 Speaking of such symbolic actions, Duncan observed, "The structure of such actions is dramatic, but from a sociological view the function of this drama is the creation and sustainment of social order."138 Even the encounter itself communicated the authority of Campbell, for, in a democratic society, "free, open, and informed discussion can take place only
between equals. Gods do not discuss; they command."139
In his later debates, Campbell always insisted on facing
the highest-ranking of his opponents.140 He also would
exalt the abilities and reputation of the foe, when it
was possible: "To-Morrow, Deo volente, I depart from
home for Cincinnati, in the expectation of meeting there
the Champion of Infidelity in two continents."141 Too,
since "[o]verweening personal ambition . . . was not use­
ful to American society," he considered it important to
try to prove that he was never the aggressor, but
always the challenged party.142 In all these ways,
Campbell was the common American confronting and over­
turning the aristocratic oppressor (or, in the case of
the debates with Owen and Skinner, the champions of
infidelity and universalism).

If it is true that, as Hensley claims, commit­
tments to "individual liberty, rural-agrarian supremacy,
worth of the individual, and human equality were incor­
porated into the Disciples' rhetorical vision," it is
also true that they recognized these commitments as they
were expressed in the rhetoric of their leader and as they
were embodied in him.143 From the first, he had refused
to take pay for any of his religious service. In the
preface to the first issue of the Christian Baptist, he
let his position be known:
we have long since afforded such evidence as would be admitted in most cases, of the disinterested nature of our efforts to propagate truth, in having always declined every pecuniary inducement that was offered, or that could have been expected, . . .144

Against such background, his challenges to the clergy must have been especially irksome:

The modern clergy say they do not preach for money. Very well; let the people pay them none, and they will have as much of their preaching still. Besides, there will be no suspicion of their veracity.145

These words are quoted here to begin to show Campbell filling out the myth of the self-made man, but we should also note that such comments would haunt him when he attempted a second power intervention within his Movement, as we shall see shortly.

He had arrived in the United States a poor immigrant, and had become prosperous, not by being paid for his religious services, but through his own ability and a marriage into wealth. His biographers, though, agree that he probably would have become wealthy as a result of his administrative and farming abilities, even without the generous farm that his father-in-law gave to him. He farmed for several years, but eventually added a sawmill, grist mill, sheep ranch, printing office, post office, and occasional schools, as well as becoming a shrewd manager of real estate.146 He was versatile, as the prototypical American pioneer ought to be, and he was rewarded with money, the secular sign of grace in a Protestant capitalist
The self-made man was respected and admired, as Hofstadter explained in bringing Turner up to date:

... the self-made man generally received a measure of casual deference from the coonskin element, which itself was constantly generating new candidates for the local aristocracies. ... Frontiersmen may have resented alien Eastern aristocrats—as Jackson did himself—but felt otherwise about those bred in their own community, as they thought, out of competitive skill rather than privilege.148

Religiously, also, Campbell was a self-made man, having carved out his own way, and he now owed nothing to anyone.

A second mythic persona that found embodiment in Campbell was that of the landed gentleman, the aristocrat. This persona seems incompatible with the previous one, but, as Robertson observed, "Myths are the mechanism by which people believe contradictory things simultaneously; they are also the mechanism by which those contradictions are ... held in a tension which is not uncomfortable to the believers."149 Such contradictions may be especially characteristic of this period of American history.

Sellers mentioned that some historians have concluded that the Jacksonian movement was essentially paradoxical. Louis Hertz describes the American democrat of the Jackson era as a hybrid personality—both a class-conscious democrat and an incipient entrepreneur—at once the "man of the land, the factory, and the forge" ... and "an aggressive entrepreneur, buying 'on speculation,' combining 'some trade with agriculture,' making 'agriculture itself a trade.'"150

Myths serve as shorthand for complexes of images and attitudes; being shorthand, they are not likely to cause
serious dissonance when they carry paradoxical meanings. The details which could have made contradictions serious are planed away by the generalizing and subsuming quality of the myth.

Campbell enacted the persona of the aristocrat in a number of ways. Although he had had less than one complete year of college, his education set him apart from the common people. During his debates, he showed himself as learned as his opponents. His mansion compared favorably with Jackson's Hermitage. His wealth, of course, made him an aristocrat. His travels helped give him a broad understanding of the land and people he had adopted, and such experience also invited others to treat him as one of the more cosmopolitan Virginians. His founding of Bethany College and his campaigning for a public system of free schools helped bring him credibility among educators, so that he was welcomed as a speaker at many colleges and schools.

Still, while Campbell enacted the aristocrat, he was an aristocrat in the service of the people. As Robertson explained the American ideal of the individualist, "While the individual developed his capabilities in the pursuit of his own happiness, success for the individual came only if he served his society." As he traveled the country, staying in the homes of governors and other of the elite, he observed them with a bemused attitude,
never taking their status, or his own, too seriously.

Wrather wrote that:

> When Campbell made his one foray into politics to sit, along with Madison, Monroe, and Marshall, in the distinguished Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1829, he considerably alarmed Eastern conservative delegates at the outset by the jesting assurance that he had come to Richmond with "a pruning knife to lop . . . . a few aristocratical branches" off the "venerable" tree of liberty.155

When he was criticized for his wealth, he showed no embarrassment—his wealth, he said, was not for himself: he hoped to become still richer so that he could propagate the reformation even more effectively.151

By picturing himself as the self-made aristocrat on one hand, and the trustee of wealth in the public service, Campbell enacted in himself the myths of the noble commoner and the aristocrat. It is to this combination that Garrison referred when he labeled Campbell a "Pioneer in Broadcloth."157 The power of this appeal was suggested in Campbell's observation about the makeup of the Movement in 1839: "We have a few educated intelligent men, as we have a few rich and powerful; but the majority are poor, ignorant and uneducated."158 Despite this estimate, the Movement had a strong appeal to members of the upper and middle class. In explaining Campbell's broad impact, Garrison explained, "He could speak to the condition of all its [society's] levels because he had all these levels within his own personality."159
No other leader attained such a mythic stature in the Movement. When he grew older and was less active, his name was still invoked in order to sanction various views held among his followers. When he died, his biographer, Robert Richardson, wrote the Memoirs of Alexander Campbell in two large volumes. It is considered an indispensable history both of Campbell and of the Movement up to the time of Campbell's death. Although Richardson was a careful historian, the details he omitted from his biography show it to be an exercise in hagiography in which he took care not to tarnish Campbell's mythic image.

There is no mention, for example, of a misunderstanding between Richardson and Campbell in 1857 and 1858, a dispute which seems to show nobility in Richardson and a streak of jealousy in Campbell, which Richardson generously attributed to his age. In Richardson's private notes are observations he recorded of "Mrs. C's excessive and absurd watch over his personal movements. Its effects in weakening his memory of places etc." These notes and others that might appear critical of Campbell or his family are omitted from the book. Too, there is no explicit reference to the bitter debate over his will, which centered upon the question of whether he had been mentally sound shortly before his death when he changed the will, giving most of the inheritance to his second wife and her children. The court trial was detailed in
the newspapers, including the fact that Campbell's second wife was defended by lawyer James A. Garfield, but there is no discussion of the issue in Richardson's book. No doubt, his editorial self-censorship came from Richardson's love for the Movement and for Campbell, but its effect was to contribute to the myth of Campbell, the prophet. A later book by Selina Campbell, his wife, was even more mythopoetic.164

Campbell's mythical status did not insulate him from all criticism or opposition on the part of his followers. When a movement is built on a foundation of independent thinking, and when a cardinal principle of its structure is to challenge authority, one must expect others to follow the example of the leader. Too, sometimes Campbell chafed under the problems of being a leader in an anti-authoritarian Movement. He found his ideas sometimes caricatured or carried to extremes by well-intentioned followers who misunderstood him. For example, his opposition to ecclesiastical organizations was interpreted by some to forbid any interchurch meetings, so that, to his regret, the Mahoning Baptist Association was dissolved around him in less than fifteen minutes. He later remarked,

I then, and since contemplated that scene as a striking proof of the power of enthusiasm and of excitement, and as dangerous, too, even in ecclesiastical as well as in political affairs. Counsel and caution, argument and remonstrance were wholly
in vain in such a crisis of affairs.—It would have been an imprudent sacrifice to have done more than make a single remonstrance.165

Still, he did not often have to engage in a direct confrontation (within his Movement) or a contest of wills, since there were no serious rivals. For the most part, he presided over his followers with eloquence and even charm just as he presided over the long table in the huge dining room of his mansion at Bethany. That seemed good to him for, while he was a champion of democracy, he was never sure that anyone else knew how to be democratic as well as he did.

A New Power Intervention

As the Stone-Campbell Movement grew even more rapidly in the years immediately following its separation from the Baptists, Campbell perceived problems that operated as exigencies inviting a power intervention. In a systemic power cycle, Brown suggests that "reified social hierarchy would be periodically confirmed and challenged, with change wedded to continuity."166 In the infancy of the Movement, Campbell had confirmed its hierarchy, but soon, for the sake of stability and the continued growth of the Movement, he perceived a need to challenge its hierarchy. Campbell's new emphasis, which I will discuss shortly, would certainly appear to many readers as a complete change in attitude, although Campbell always
protested his consistency. For example, since he called for financial support of the preachers within the Movement, it appeared to some that he had changed his position about a paid clergy. He explained, though, that he had not:

I never did say that those who labored in the word and teaching ought not to be sustained by the brethren for whom they labored, or by whose appointment they labored for the benefit of others. But some cannot, or are unwilling to discriminate between him who prepares himself for the office, learns the trade, and him who comes forward at the call and solicitation of the brethren—between supplying the necessary wants of him who labors all his time in obedience to the call and appointment of the brethren, and him who hires himself out for the Sabbath and the pastoral office at a certain per annum, in obedience to which he shapes his course through life.  

Campbell's explanation was that he had not changed his mind, but different circumstances called for different emphases, and while he would not admit to substantive change, he did confess that he had changed emphases and did not always maintain a balance. Changing needs, together with his frequently expressed belief that people naturally tend toward extremes, explained his shifts, at least to his own mind. Not all his readers, though, accepted Campbell's subtle distinctions; they sometimes concluded he had simply changed his mind. For example, in view of Campbell's early opposition to para-church organizations, G. C. Brewer supposed that he must have been showing early traces of senility when he allowed himself to be chosen president of the American Christian
Missionary Society. 169

The use of Brown's model suggests that we might view Campbell himself as a microsystem. His own survival and growth necessitated alterations in his worldview, as in the case of more complex systems. A perfect consistency would have marked an impending system breakdown.

The problems that now required a new intervention included a lack of cooperation among the churches, which made it difficult to raise financial support, thus discouraging many potential evangelists. In addition to this, with every Christian perceived as a clergyman, the quality of preaching suffered. Furthermore, few churches felt a need to support those who spoke for them, even speakers who were especially gifted and hard-working.

Brown observed that "for the sake of maintaining society-as-system, alternating of 'complementary' power interpretations with 'competitive' ones appears to be necessary." 170 In the face of the problems that the churches were suffering, Campbell saw that the time had come to change his emphasis. There were in most areas certain members who could fulfill the role of clergy (without the title) better than others could. That is, they could teach in the local congregations more effectively, and they were able to start new churches and to indoctrinate new converts. These gifted workers should now be seen, Campbell thought, not as competitors to other members, but as
co-workers with them, related to them in a complementary way.

Where Campbell previously had engaged in a leveling process, now he began to emphasize natural abilities and the education that some people possessed. Whereas he had before criticized the notion that training is a *sine qua non* of the preacher, now he explained that there was no premium on ignorance; in fact, a respectable public speaker ought to have at least a rudimentary education. In place of his previous attacks on the hireling clergy, Campbell now urged the churches to support those who were serving them by preaching. This support should include any missionaries who the churches ought to be sending out.

In the years after the break with the Baptists, then, he wrote on such subjects as "Co-operation of Churches," about which he argued,

> Our political and territorial divisions, are counties and states. — The churches in each county should therefore, form an intimate acquaintance with one another, and co-operate first in all means necessary to the conversion of the county in which they are located, and of which they are a part. 171

One purpose of such cooperation was to commission and support representative evangelists. 172

He attempted to provide guidance for a new clergy (though he would never use that term) in a series, "The Christian Preacher." He pictured a distinct class of public proclaimers that existed within the priesthood of
believers:

Few, comparatively, can address men in the public places of resort. All Christians are preachers, in some department of society; and if ever this is lost sight of, there is an end of reformation. But still there is need for public preachers so long as there are persons not accessible to the brotherhood and sisterhood of the congregations, in the private walks of life. 173

These gifted few who served the church had the right to be paid by the church for their preaching, at least if they were fit to be prayed for:

Christians place a very humble estimate upon their prayers, and a very exaggerated importance on their cents, when they can in real earnest pray to God for the health and prosperity of a proclaimer of reformation, and feel any doubts or misgivings in their minds about the propriety of giving him his dinner or his shoes. 174

As in the previous intervention, Campbell supported this alteration in power relationships by appealing to divine precedent and to explicit commands in the scriptures. As Duncan wrote, "A college president, a bishop, an army general, is expected to relate action to the 'sacred principles' of learning, religion, or defense, . . . 175

He still rejected the idea of a system of ordained clergy who served and ruled over the churches. In fact, his will provided support for Bethany College on the condition that it never establish a chair of theology. He anticipated the time when each church would have its own called and experienced elders to lead and to teach the
congregation. Until that day, though, there was a need for traveling evangelists:

Perhaps the present distress requires such persons as much as any former period. But when Christian congregations cover the country, and walk in the instituted order of the new constitution, such persons will not be necessary, any more than a standing army in time of peace. 176

His strategy in this power intervention was to promote a perceived cooperative interrelationship between the clergy and the people. By his advocacy, he also promoted a cooperative interrelationship between the new clergy and himself as prophet, through tactics of integrity. For example, his school at Bethany, which was established in 1840, though not a preacher-training school by intention, became in reality the "principal training school for preachers." 177 The old foe of the "kingdom of the clergy" was now perceived to be the best person in the Movement to train its own clergy.

After Campbell's intervention, the new power cycle may be seen in this way:
Although the figure may look familiar, when a trend-reversal takes place, the result, Brown wrote, is not just a return, but a return "with differences". The situation and the balance are never exactly the same as before. The new interrelationships after Campbell's second intervention were different from the original interrelationships, especially the one between the clergy and the laity. In his earlier intervention, Campbell redefined the clergy, ideally, as servants rather than leaders. Such a role has remained typical of the clergy in the churches that are heirs of the Stone-Campbell Movement, although it is less commonly found among some of the churches of the Disciples of Christ than among the other two branches.

Again, as a result of his first intervention, Campbell had encouraged a suspicious attitude toward the
clergy. The relationship between the clergy and laity, in spite of his counter-intervention, would never again be seen as purely cooperative, but as a mixture of relationships. This was particularly true of those followers who were not willing to make the second shift with him. What Niebuhr wrote of American Protestantism in general is especially apt:

Seeking to escape anarchism in religion it has come exceedingly close to a new absolutism; the reaction against the latter has brought it into close proximity to skepticism. And so the movement has gone on; but insofar as it has been a vital movement the principle of the Kingdom of God has rescued it again and again from lapsing into one of the heresies, though never without the loss of some of its adherents.  

An intervention is an effort to influence but it cannot control absolutely; it is evident, then, that, when a movement has been brought into being through an intervention into a larger social system, a second intervention directed only at the subsystem (the movement) necessarily will influence fewer people than were affected by the original intervention. Perhaps Robert Richardson should not have been surprised when he wrote about the Disciples in 1872 to an Australian correspondent, "The brethren here have not recovered from the wrong views they formerly entertained respecting missions, and it is with the greatest difficulty they can be induced to contribute."  

For all of Campbell's later writings on church order, the exact nature of the role of the clergy in the
Movement remained a vague one. This confused attitude was captured well in a story told by William Martin Smith:

W. W. Hayden, reports in 1877 a discussion arising . . . [in a meeting of] an Ohio ministers' group. He tells of a young minister who explained a common confusion, saying he had recently accepted a church and yet was not chosen as an elder, or a deacon, by the congregation. "What am I?" he asked the group. Hayden says that his question really went unanswered, "yet one brother ventured a negative suggestion. 'First of all,' said this brother preacher, 'divest yourself of any ideas that you are an evangelist.'" Apparently such pastors were nowhere really related to the church.181

Among the members of the Movement, the clerical role was formed in part by the contemporary culture, in part by their traditional suspicion of the clergy, and in part by the particular bent of the individual churches and ministers. The nature of the clerical role and its relationship to the other power shares has still not been clearly settled. Within the Movement, the innovators are strictly defined and so are the consumers, but the role of the ratifiers—the clergy—is vague. It is not clear how the new clergy in the Stone-Campbell Movement, if they must exist at all, are supposed to differ from the old clergy that the Movement rebelled against. This lack of clarity about the calling and the authority of the minister also aggravates the difficulty of enlisting new ministers. In their efforts to find appropriate models, contemporary clergy have often adapted the patterns set by ministers in other groups, such as the Baptist Churches, to the
needs of the Stone-Campbell heirs.

A further effect of Campbell's power interventions was that, having originated the role of the iconoclastic bishop-editor, he could neither control it nor eliminate it. As Boulding wrote, "when we try to do one thing, we succeed in doing half-a-dozen other things that we had no intention of doing and did not want done."\(^{182}\) Campbell expressed his exasperation in 1849:

> We have too many periodicals. I have seen many pieces in print which should never have seen the sun. . . . Boys, and comparatively uneducated men, make better preachers than writers. We allow self-created Editors, and not self-created Elders and Evangelists, and yet the former is incomparably more to be feared and guarded than the latter. . . . we have much more to learn on these prudential matters. The children of this world in this respect, as in many others, are wiser in managing their affairs than the children of light. They do not employ novices and uneducated persons to fill the most important and responsible offices in the community. There is quite too much of the spirit of adventure amongst us in preaching, teaching, and writing.\(^{183}\)

Although other editors could not compete with Campbell in influence, they did sometimes rebel against his authority, especially when one of his attempted interventions made it appear that he had changed his beliefs or else abandoned one of his early emphases. During his later years, when he was relatively inactive, and in the years that followed his death, these editors, upon whom he had inadvertently bestowed a power share, would vie with each other, using their influence to split the Movement that he had kept united through his influence.\(^{184}\)
In this chapter, I have explained the origin of Campbell's power and influence in symbolic terms. How he used that influence to create continuity through change in ideology is the subject of the next chapter.
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CHAPTER VI
THE ATTENTION-SHIFT CYCLE

The first issue of the Christian Standard, a weekly newspaper that began on April 7, 1866, reported the death of Alexander Campbell.1 Editor Isaac Errett wrote an obituary in which he commended Campbell's restrained ambition:

It will ever be remembered to his honor, that with an almost unbounded personal influence over a religious community numbering hundreds of thousands, he never sought the least ecclesiastical control.2

So long as he had the influence, of course, he did not need formal control. Even his opponents recognized that he had such influence, when they gleefully labeled him the "bishop" of his anti-clerical followers. From the early days of the Movement until today, the easiest way to irk a member is to call him or her a "Campbellite." For example, in a letter to Campbell, Thomas M. Henley, a loyal Virginia minister, complained to Campbell about a Presbyterian editor, S, C, Jennings:

We know what sort of a spirit animates a sectarian Priest, having tasted of the wormwood and the gall of sectarianism. He [Jennings] would make us believe, if he could, you are our sectarian Bishop, in the popular sense, and we are as much your servants as all the sects are the servants of the priesthood. Now be it known to Mr. Jennings and all the sectarian priesthood on earth, we own no man as master or father on earth in spiritual things--Jesus Christ alone is our King--his word is our rule--his
commands our law—his worship our delight—and we will not suffer any man to usurp a throne among us.  

When Campbell discussed the charges that his followers were Campbellites, he would sometimes print the word, "C—ites," as if it were a profanity.

In spite of such protests, Campbell's influence within the Movement was impressive, even among those who were former Stoneites. That influence was most directly exercised through the pages of the Millennial Harbinger, yearly volumes of which he bound in annual volumes for future readers. Historians Garrison and DeGroot have observed, concerning the longevity of Campbell's influence in print, that

There was a generation of Disciple ministers who felt ill equipped without a full set of the Millennial Harbinger on their library shelves. It spoke as could no other paper for the brotherhood.

Because of the power share that was granted to him, Campbell was called on as an arbiter, invited to pass judgment in various cases of dispute about problems of church policy and propriety. His verdict was sought as to appropriate discipline for a church member who was habitually drunk, about whether Christian forbearance should permit tobacco chewing and spitting in church, and about the meaning of difficult verses of Scripture. His personal presence had special attraction, as is evidenced by the continual requests from many states for a personal visit, accompanied by promises that much good would be
accomplished if he would come.

The attribution of this power share invited his intervention into the ideology of the Movement he had helped to create and also made that intervention more effective. Such intervention seemed particularly welcome as the Movement faced the stresses that accompanied its development as it grew from a relatively small group of rebels into a denomination of some respectability largely in the decade of 1830-1840.\(^6\) (H. Richard Niebuhr claims that, in the early nineteenth century, in the aftermath of the Awakening and the revivals that followed, not only the Stone-Campbell Movement, but all American Protestantism was busy at the "institutionalization of the Kingdom of God."\(^7\) That is, a living faith is concretized into systems, creeds, and organizations.)

In the process of attaining a separate existence, the Movement had to do more than break away from the parent churches. It had to develop an ideology with significant internal integrity to provide a positive definition of the Movement, to define the in-group and the out-groups,\(^8\) to provide a way of knowing (as well as naming the unacceptable ways of knowing), to order values in a way that would justify the group's hierarchy of roles and prescribe appropriate behavior for the members.

In previous chapters, I have established the claim that, from the beginning of the Movement, there existed
within it tensions and disagreements that originated among members who held extreme views. Neith...
within the Movement, and as characteristic of the churches, there is no simple chronological development. As a whole, there is more emphasis on purity before 1836, but to stop with this observation is an oversimplification of the themes that run throughout Campbell's writings from the earliest days of the Christian Baptist.

The changes in emphases on different elements of his ideology as expressed from 1830 to 1840 cannot be accounted for by varying economic pressures or sociological exigencies alone, although these ought not be completely disregarded. (For example, see West's thorough study of the development of Campbell's millennial views.\textsuperscript{11}) These changes are accounted for most economically by Brown's model, which proposes that there are symbolic and thus ideological exigencies that subsume other sorts of explanation, and which are made manifest through public and private discourse.

Campbell's leadership extended through several decades and, in a group of such size and complexity, it was not possible for him to encourage a once-and-for-all choice of paradigms. Rather, he continually intervened in the shaping of the ideology of the Movement, as he perceived constant needs and opportunities for his intervention.

The careful student who finds change and counter-change present in Campbell's writings has two alternatives to the view that I am presenting here of Campbell as a
change-agent operating deliberately in order to impede opposing attention-shifts that threatened the stability of the Movement. On the one hand, one might carefully select some of Campbell's ideas according to one's own notion of salience, and thus extract and isolate certain positions he held at specific times. This is the course taken by those of Campbell's heirs who, although they are on opposite sides, find that each is able to cite Campbell as supporting his or her own position. However, this approach is not always faithful to the complex artifacts—over fifty volumes besides letters and notebooks—that Campbell has left. (One recent example is that of a series of letters that were sent to hundreds of Christian Churches in 1985 by a minister who was outraged that one of the Christian Church colleges tolerates a historical-critical approach to the study of the Bible. In his letter, he invoked the name of Campbell in order to sanctify his own indignation. The writer must have had only a superficial knowledge of Campbell, though, and did not realize that Campbell was an avid student of the historical-critical approach and believed in using any rational tool that might illuminate the Bible.)

This view of Campbell differs from the one I am espousing in that I claim that, while Campbell's views of some subjects changed over the course of his career, there is no change in his opinions about the necessity of a
pure reform as essential to unity and the need for careful adherence to the Bible, accompanied by tolerance of those in error; these are basic elements of his worldview which were constant from the start of his public career in 1812 until the end, at least, of the decade under study here, in 1840.

On the other hand, a second alternative to the view I present here is to abandon the search for a system in Campbell's writings. In this case, one may observe apparent inconsistencies and may conclude that Campbell, driven either by idealism or by his own ego and desire to succeed, was responsive only to whatever were the changing requirements for that success. This construal of Campbell as an opportunist, which seems to be Posey's interpretation, fails to treat the Movement as a system, does not explain the unity that resulted from Campbell's intervention, and also makes his followers somewhat gullible, which is not necessarily a fatal flaw in the theory.

The application of Brown's model of social intervention explains Campbell's behavior in a parsimonious way, accounting for the various emphases in his communication and for the harmony that resulted, as he impeded attention-shifts that threatened to lead the Movement into one of two exclusive worldviews.
Balancing Interventions
or Erratic Inconsistency?

Campbell's public communication, which aimed at impeding attention-switches toward competing paradigms (which will be described shortly), was responsive to his changing perceptions of exigencies that needed to be addressed. As these felt needs gave him opportunities to emphasize the salient elements of his own worldview, Campbell's alterations sometimes were seen by both his critics and followers as evidence of his inconsistency. For example, he was criticized for appearing in his debate with Bishop Purcell as a defender of the same Protestantism he had attacked for several years; later, he drew severe criticism for apparently changing his position in relation to the necessity of baptism by immersion.\textsuperscript{13}

He recognized the seriousness of such charges and the perception of his messages from which they were derived, at the same time he denied their accuracy. He did not pretend to infallibility— to one critic he wrote,

\begin{quote}
You will, I doubt not, admit, that in a controversy so long and so diversified, and with such a host as have opposed our progress, it would have been super-human, and beyond the good fortune of erring mortals, not to have spoken or written something which ought to have seen the light.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

Nevertheless, he recognized that vacillation was not becoming to an advocate of the "original gospel." Innovation in religious ideas was, to him, criminal.\textsuperscript{15} The truth, presumably, was unchanging and non-contradictory, especially to a people committed to the rationality
of the Enlightenment. "Consistency," he said, "is essential to a good character, and especially in any person who would call the attention of men to the bible." Therefore, he occasionally answered those charges, claiming an essential consistency in his writings.

What appeared out-of-focus in his teaching he thought was simply the astigmatism of his critics, or else was an outgrowth of the situational constraints he saw shaping the emphasis of his communication. With respect to the progressive elaboration of some of his ideas, he wrote,

. . . prudence required that the developments should have been as gradual as they were. Some imagine that our course has been changed because certain matters have been much more discussed now than formerly. But no attentive reader can believe this. They will see in embryo, in the first three numbers of the Christian Baptist, all that has been developed in the last nine years.17

After being accused of inconsistency in his response to the Lunenburg letter, he cited his past writings and appealed to the current Harbingers to prove that

I have neither conceded nor surrendered any thing for which I ever contended; but that, on the contrary, the opinion now expressed, whether true or false, is one that I have always avowed.18

Seventeen years later, as he looked back over a long career of writing, he said again, "... I am not conscious of any change in any Christian doctrine since I wrote the first volume of the Christian Baptist."19

Regardless of whether his correspondents believed him, he saw himself not as a weather vane responding
to shifting winds but as a man of consistent beliefs and a worldview with integrity, inhabiting a middle ground between extremes. In one suggestive article, he listed twenty-six extreme theological positions on various subjects "between which we have endeavored to stand." Then he added, "I incline to the rational mean, or to some point equidistant from these remote ends of conflicting theories." After he experienced the attention-shift at the beginning of his religious life (mentioned in the previous chapter), he did not undergo another personal paradigm change. Moderation is the key to understanding his worldview and avoiding the false interpretations I have just mentioned. Campbell's consistent attempt to avoid extremes has been remarked by one recent biographer:

In a world of extremes . . . only the uncommon man of sound sense and fine sensibility is able to pursue a sane and moderate course. . . . Alexander Campbell proved himself such a man. . . . For he was naturally of a rational and tolerant temperament, and he was reared in the common-sense school of Scottish philosophy.

The extremes that Campbell attempted to balance were summarized by Harrell:

Disciples were New Testament primitivists and Christian humanitarians; they were temperamentally fanatics and moderates; they were out-group iconoclasts and in-group constructive critics; they were noninterventionists in civil government and they were political activists; they were sectarian and they were denominational. The uniqueness of the mind of the movement rests not in the fact that there were Disciples who were each of these things but that most Disciples were all of them. The Disciple of the pre-Civil War period did not simply tolerate diversity—he was diversity.
Among the sources that contributed to Campbell's mental equilibrium were his brief but broad education in Scotland (where he was exposed to the Common Sense philosophers, such as Dugald Stewart), the constant advisory presence of his moderate father, and the influence of his physician and sometimes editorial assistant, Robert Richardson, who tempered Campbell's rationalism with his own emotional sensibility and touch of mysticism.  

Campbell's readers, of course, did not have the benefit of such training or of such advisors, so misunderstanding was inevitable. Even had there been no exaggeration of his positions, as a social intervenor, he could hope only to influence and not to control his readers. Too, having a consistent worldview is not the same as being able to explain it to others. As Campbell recognized, the constraints of argumentative and expository writing militate against balance and restraint, seeming to encourage extremism. In explaining why he emphasized immersion in his presentation of the gospel, he gave as one reason that "extremes produce one another--that in avoiding Scylla we are wont to dash upon Charybdis." The result of these factors was that some of Campbell's followers would seize on one idea that he made prominent, and others would fasten on another. Campbell was aware of this and tried to respond to it.

... we have always been cautious of extremes; and allow me to add, that if at any time, or at any point,
we have seemed to lean a little over, it was only for the moment—as one recovering his balance after the pressure of some extraneous force is wont to throw himself back or forward for the sake of preserving the centre of gravity.  

Campbell's conception of changing constraints encouraged some emphases that, in a more elaborate presentation, might have been more carefully balanced, but which, under the circumstances, were not. Most of his writing was done under the pressure of a monthly schedule. Campbell discussed the influence of circumstances:

There is but little need of controversy upon the question in which there is a very general agreement. . . . But he that thinks the reason why so much is said about any one truth, fact, or institution, is that all stress is laid upon it, reasons without reason, or without observation: for it is the opposition to any one truth, which generally gives it emphasis and notoriety.

The upshot of this situation, then, was that Campbell's balancing of extremes was designed to impede attention-shifts to either of two competing paradigms. Mentally, he thought he inhabited a middle ground, but his exposition often had the effect of balancing one extreme by a pull to the other. This was Campbell's way of maintaining the continuity of the shared ideology by compensating "for vicious circles that otherwise exacerbate gaps in human beings' construed worlds." These periodic reversals helped the Movement to avoid the vicious circles that would affect the whole Movement by tending to a moderate position. Such behavior is harmonious with an organismic model which, according to Brown, "will account for human
interactions . . . as progressive developments which either hold or fail to hold in tension countervailing ideas, roles, and groups."29

Campbell was aware of what he was doing. In one essay, he admitted that reforming movements generally went to extremes in counteracting prevalent errors, and eventually produced a "salutary residuum" after the two extremes neutralized each other. He added that he thought the Disciples were avoiding such extremism, though.30 As for his unexpected moderating intervention in the affair of the Lunenburg letter (and, no doubt, in many other such situations), he explained his action.

Some of our brethren were too much addicted to denouncing the sects and representing them en masse as wholly aliens from the possibility of salvation— as wholly unchristian and corrupt. . . . I felt constrained to rebuke them over the shoulder of this inquisitive lady. These very zealous brethren gave countenance to the popular clamor that we make baptism a saviour, . . . . Now as they were propounding opinions to others, I intended to bring them to the proper medium by propounding an opinion to them in terms as strong and as pungent as their own.31

Both of the potential worldviews that threatened to disrupt the balance that Campbell tried to maintain shared some common ground with the worldviews of other American evangelicals, such as a reverence for the Bible and a respect for human reason, a belief in the "separation of church and state, evangelizing, and social conscience."32 Furthermore, the two competing paradigms also shared some common themes with each other and with Campbell's moderate
view—a belief that the Church had fallen from its pristine state, and that it could be restored to that condition, at least to a substantial degree; that among Satan's best allies were corrupt leaders among the denominations who could be depended on to oppose genuine reform; that those in the Stone-Campbell Movement had been raised up by God both to reform the existing church and to restore the primitive pattern of Christianity. (As will be seen, though, the two extreme paradigms would use different means to restoration.)

I do not believe there is enough evidence to justify the belief that the first-generation members perceived a dichotomy between reformation and restoration. Leroy Garrett is in error when he says, "... these pioneers referred to their efforts as reformation, not restoration." Campbell frequently wrote about "The Restoration of the Ancient Order." By this, he did not mean to imply that true Christianity had been extinct for centuries until he came along to restore it but rather that there was a divinely-ordained order that had become obscured by purely human accretions and that needed to be restored in its original purity to the churches. No doubt one reason why Garrett finds the term "Restoration" used less frequently than "Reformation," which he prefers, is that "Restorationism" already was commonly used to refer to the belief that, after death, all people would eventually be
saved and restored to God's favor. This belief was, to those in the Movement, a Universalist heresy. In short, it seems to me that the early Movement saw both reformation and restoration as aspects of the same task—to bring the modern church up to the original standards.

All of these themes are prominently featured in the hundreds of letters the members wrote to Campbell, excerpts from which he published under the heading, "Progress of Reform." A reading of some of these reports shows the extent to which the members of the Movement shared these common ideas. As a typical example, from Tennessee came this report: "The brethren who have commenced their march out of Babylon are making more accessions now than all the sects in this district." From Minerva, Ohio, came this: "There are about two hundred disciples in this place, who, I think, are endeavoring to follow the primitive example of the old Apostles." From Columbia, Kentucky, this report was written:

The reformation here is making gigantic strides, yet 'tis all done with the sword of the Spirit; and notwithstanding we have had severe opposition, at present we have a temporary calm by reason of the sectaries having to leave the field of investigation for want of fair and manly argument.

In spite of these shared themes, there were potential within the Movement two ideologies that were shaped in part by Campbell (since they were extreme versions of his beliefs), and which he wanted to prevent from gaining prominence. "Ideology" here is used in Brown's sense to
refer to "any symbolic construction of the world in whose superordinate 'name' human beings can comprehensively order their experience and subsume their specific activities." These two ideologies would later fragment the Movement after Campbell's death. As Harrell explained,

Within the movement, the schizoid common mind showed signs of fracturing by 1865. Two distinct emphases emerged. One group conceived of Christianity in the denominational framework of practical religion, social and political activism, and, often, a nationalistic postmillennialism. A second group emphasized the sectarian tradition of Biblical legalism, a fanatical disposition, and uncompromising separation from the world.

Both the ideologies that led to the split Harrell mentions were present among some members during 1830-1840, and the public communication shared within the Movement's journals was clearly constrained by the elements belonging to these two ideologies.

Alexander Campbell's intervention is also apparent as his articles both reflect his perception of the threat of extremism and also carry out his intervention into the Movement. Just as an intervenor may act to encourage an attention-shift either by marking or masking anomalies in a worldview, one may also intervene to prevent or impede an attention-shift. Though Brown discussed it in little detail, apparently the same strategies are available to the intervenor who attempts to impede an attention-shift. He or she may either mask anomalies in the present ideology or else feature anomalies in a new one.
Campbell used both strategies in his intervention to impede shifts to either of two alternative paradigms. He masked present anomalies by showing the consistency of the prevalent paradigm with reason and with revelation, and he marked anomalies in a proposed new paradigm by warning of the dangerous extremes that would accompany its adoption.

It is time to consider one of the two exclusive worldviews that hovered in the Movement, threatening to gain prominence. Both the paradigm of purity and that of unity, which will be discussed shortly, were plausible, derived as they were from ideas already present in Campbell's writings and, therefore, in the Movement. The difference is that the advocates of these paradigms carried certain ideas to extremes, rather than maintaining them in tension as Campbell did. First, I shall discuss the origin and nature of the paradigm of purity, before considering Campbell's intervention to impede its spread.

The Paradigm of Purity

The advocates within the young reform Movement who had just separated from their parent churches placed a controlling, compelling value on purity of doctrine and of behavior. By choosing expulsion from the Baptists rather than uniformity with them, those in the Movement demonstrated a belief that unity, though admirable, was not a goal to be attained at the expense of compromise.
Only the pursuit of a superordinate value for restoring the primitive church pattern could justify their behavior which resulted in fragmenting existing congregations. This value preference was exemplified by Campbell's defense in the Harbinger of his earlier monthly, which had stimulated dis­sension within the traditional churches.

The good done by the Christian Baptist in a thousand instances in the illumination of many minds—the conversion of many sinners—the reformation of many churches, might . . . be made so apparent (admitting it had done all the mischief which they allege) as in the estimation of all incomparably to overbalance all the evils ascribed to it.41

Since the "sectarian" churches generally would not permit reformers to remain in their midst so as to reform them from within, the reformers adopted the battle cry, "Come out from among them and be ye separate!"42 Here is how Campbell explained the need for separation (in the form of questions and answers) in an 1832 article:

Q. 190. And are all sects who exclude for noncon­formity as such, the children of them who excluded and condemned the Prophets?
A. Every man who understands the scriptures, and fears God, will answer, Yes. But in these sects are found many individuals who, like Joseph and Nicodemus, would not consent to the deeds of their party.
Q. 191. Ought not such, then, to come out, and not partake of their sins, that they may not receive of their plagues?
A. Reason and Religion both answer, Yes.43

There was, then, no doubt in Campbell's mind as to the proper order of reform and of unity in the hierarchy of values.

From my heart I pity the living who are united to the dead. It is to live in a charnel house. Churches
without the life of religion are whited sepulchres. . . . It is better first to try for reform; but when reform cannot be obtained, it is a sin against Heaven and ourselves to continue among them who care for nothing but the name.44

In other words, pure doctrine was to be valued above any uniformity that might arise from compromise. In fact, to attain purity was the only way to obtain unity.

I sincerely deplore every division and every sectarian feeling which now exists; . . . But the peace, the harmony, the union, and love of Christians, the purity and joy of the household of Faith, can only be promoted by a devout, spiritual, and unwearied attention to the lively oracles [New Testament]--. . . .45

In the new Movement, then, right beliefs were all-important--the members must not be tainted by the old ideas they had left behind when they were separated from their parent churches. After the gradual division, Campbell frequently reminded his readers of the nature of the churches they had left--churches that generally were, he believed, apostate, ignorant, or else irrational.46 For example, when the Presbyterian Church in the United States issued its 1830 annual report, Campbell analyzed it in an article on "The Inefficiency of Presbyterianism," telling his readers how many dollars and how many clergy were needed to make one convert to Presbyterianism.47 Such pieces were common in the Harbinger through 1834; but during 1834 and 1835, and through the rest of the decade, Campbell offered less criticism of the standard denominations. His religious targets became the Catholic Church, Unitarians, and the Mormons.
This high value for purity of belief was supported by the claim that it was the use of impure (unscriptural) language and confused ideas that had led to the birth of denominations in the first place. Therefore, false teaching was criticized and right thinking was emphasized.

False teaching was embodied most clearly in creeds, those symbolic passwords that served to keep out aliens and to enforce uniformity within the denomination. To Campbell, creeds as statements of personal belief were harmless until they were enforced on others. Often, Campbell thought, they took the place of the Bible, which they were thought by their supporters to resemble. When creeds were used as terms of fellowship, they became divisive. Campbell gave an ironic reply to the question, "Of what use is a creed?"

Of much use to build and keep up a party; to cause professors to revile, slander, and hate one another; to hold formalists, hypocrites, and prevaricators together; and to exclude weak Christians and honest disciples from popular establishments. They, like strainers, retain all the feculent matter, and suffer the pure liquor to escape.

Proper doctrine, on the other hand, consisted in adhering only to the Bible—more particularly, the New Testament—and in avoiding the use of theological terms and human inferences and opinions.

Of the two great goals of the Movement, then, reformation of religious beliefs could be seen as more valuable than unity, if that unity appears to require the toleration of unscriptural beliefs.
Such an axiology led naturally to, and was shaped by, an epistemology based on adherence to the New Testament, which was considered to be the divinely revealed truth. The system of religious reality (and, to the extent that the members lived according to their professed belief, their social and political reality) was based on the Bible. Harrell wrote about the primacy of this belief:

One of the basic articles of faith which cut deeply through the whole movement during the period 1800 to 1865 was that the Bible was authoritative and final and that intelligent investigation of this source would result in the discovery of truth.\textsuperscript{50}

Though other evangelical groups shared this belief, Harrell noted that the Disciples, more than others, distrusted emotions, and thus were "Biblical rationalists."\textsuperscript{51}

If the Bible is the source of all revealed truth, then there must be a concern for accurate exegesis of the text. This is evidenced by the hermeneutical discussions and translations of difficult verses that were often prominent on the pages of the \textit{Harbinger}, as well as in Campbell's debates. For example, one early six-page article discussed the proper way to translate an active participle in the imperative mode in Matthew 28:19.\textsuperscript{52} The queries Campbell answered in print often dealt with exegetical questions. Since all truth about religion is revealed truth, and since the New Testament was written in the Greek language, those who had the ability should study the New Testament in the original language, Campbell thought. Certainly, one had no right to speak as
a critical expert on matters of interpretation unless he or she could read the original languages. While any literate person could understand the basic story of the Bible, even piety and prayer could not take the place of a classical education in preparing a person to interpret the Bible.

It is as plain as the light of the sun that no man can be the interpreter of a language which he does not understand. . . . To understand the meaning of a plain sentence, or to illustrate to the apprehension of others a large portion of the New Testament narratives and sayings, is quite possible to those who are well read in the book itself, without either classical, or even the most common grammatical attainments; but to presume to act the critic without the knowledge of the ordinary rules of construction, contained in the elementary grammars of our mother tongue, will ever appear ridiculous in the eyes of all men of reflection. . . .

. . . How far the most illiterate may understand the sayings of the Apostles, I presume not to decide. I know the gospel history is so plain that he who runs may read; but I am far from supposing that all who apprehend and believe the gospel can be expositors of the New Testament.53

Campbell saw in the primitive church a clear distinction between preaching and teaching. "Preaching" is the simple announcement of the facts of the gospel, with attending proofs, to people who had not heard the news before. Therefore, it is not appropriate to preach to church members. On the other hand, to explain the meaning of the Bible and its application to the behavior of the professing Christian is the work of the teacher. Teaching, then, requires more ability and training than does preaching. "All Christians are preachers," he said, but only a few have the ability to teach.54 Teaching requires the ability to exegete and, therefore, implies an education beyond what
is needed to tell the gospel story.\textsuperscript{55}

Such care in the study and use of language is important because all knowledge of God is communicated through language. As West noted, Campbell agreed with Newton that "God has given us both reason and religion in the gift of speech."\textsuperscript{56} In the same way, unchristian ideas were brought into the churches through unbiblical language. If one desired to restore purity of thinking, one must first restore a pure language. Such restoration meant Christians must discard the "consecrated words and phrases" created by theologians, and which were responsible for creating controversy among the churches. These terms included "The holy Trinity," "free will," "total depravity," "original sin," "general and particular atonement," "sacraments," "Eucharist," and "consubstantiation."\textsuperscript{57} Campbell was fond of saying, "Let us call Bible things by Bible names."\textsuperscript{58} The church must avoid adopting "the language of Ashdod," because, while it is true that words reflect the mind, they also shape it.\textsuperscript{59} This belief reflected a strict construction of the Bible as "a set of sovereign wishes."\textsuperscript{60}

Religious terminology in the Movement should be restricted to that which was sanctified by divine precedent. For example, one may— in fact, must— affirm of the Father all that the scriptures say of Him; so also with the Holy Spirit and the Son. But to systematize these statements into a doctrine of the "Trinity" is to go beyond the
revealed word, as well as to introduce an unscriptural term. The belief system of the Movement should be no more complex than that of the New Testament days. Proper Christian behavior would then flow from a right understanding of the Bible, rather than from devotion to a creed.

With such a view of the centrality of the Bible, it is not surprising that, as corollaries, those in the Movement believed that the Bible should be taught in the schools (without sectarian comment); furthermore, it should be studied in the families, and should be the object of attention during the worship services.61

Because of their strong concern for purity of belief and for language free from contamination of the theological world, the members of the Movement perceived a need to be vigilant, watching out for the pollution that always threatened. Their ontological view of themselves was that they were the faithful remnant. Comparing the Movement to the faithful minority among the ancient Jews who had never bowed to idols, Campbell wrote,

A remnant has always been found in times of the greatest delinquency; and in the close of the times of the Gentiles we have reason to rejoice, that there is a goodly number of the Gentiles who rally under the testimony of Jesus, and are zealous for his institutions.62

Almost alone in the world, they were keeping faith. With God's help, they would surely triumph over their foes and competitors, as long as they remained on guard against the Judases in their midst.63 "Purge out the old leaven,"
was a frequent watchword, borrowed from St. Paul and applied to the Movement. Campbell was ready to help with the purging, offering a word of correction when he thought his brother editors were in error. He criticized Stone, for example, and later corrected one of Stone's writers. Sometimes the purging took the form, not of correction, but of warning and exclusion, as in the case of a professed preacher who had collected money from the churches under false pretenses and who was a known gambler.

In spite of Campbell's readiness to help keep the ideas of the Movement free of error, he was sometimes criticized himself for not being zealous enough. John Thomas, of the *Apostolic Advocate*, wrote,

> My friend of the Harbinger, you must know, is by birth an Irishman, and by education a Scotch Presbyterian. He was educated in a university in Scotland, the land itself of ghosts and witches, in all the mysticism of that gloomy sect... He has not succeeded in emancipating himself from all his popular divinity; hence every now and then, but more frequently of late, you find him standing up as the champion of human tradition, without indeed knowing it. He seems to manifest an undue sympathy with the sects of the Anti-christian World... As the faithful few, the reformers must remain true and pure—and even their leader was not beyond needing to be watched.

If only these ideas had been prominent and had not been balanced by opposing emphases, the resulting paradigm held the potentiality of leading into vicious circles. A drive for more purity of belief theoretically leads to
more careful study and exegesis of the original documents, and this provides ever stricter standards by which to measure the members. The purging of erring members reifies the existence of the Movement as a purified remnant and also gives more presence to the value of purity.

Figure 11: Paradigm of Purity

Short of a system break, there is no limit to how much purity is acceptable. The Movement is likely to fragment, with the purer ones always ridding themselves of the ones who are less holy, perpetually sending out new scapegoats to be lost in the wilderness.

Thomas Campbell seems to have seen that fragmentation threatened the Movement to the extent that the paradigm of purity prevailed. While temporarily presiding over the Harbinger, he wrote poignantly:

In the absence of the Editor, we feel induced . . . to express a feeling of deep regret, that a reformation, which we humbly suggested . . . more than twenty-five years ago, for the express purpose of putting an end to
religious controversy among Christians, should appear to take the unhappy turn, to which, with painful anxiety, we have seen it verging for the last ten years; namely, to 'verbal contentions, from which come envy, strife, evil speakings, unjust suspicions, perverse disputings,—rather than godly edification which is in faith;'. . . .

. . . indeed, if we are to calculate the future by the past, especially for the last ten years, we might live to see an exhibition of all the curious questions and perplexing controversies of the last fifteen centuries, upon the face of the periodicals professedly in favor of the proposed reformation.67

In a similar lament, Walter Scott wrote, in a private letter in 1840,

When you express your doubts of the matters connected with the recent Reformation I sympathize with you, for the thing has not been what I hoped it would be by a thousand miles. We are indeed 'a sect' differing but little, of anything that is good, from the parties around us. Alas! my soul is grieved every day.68

Such comments reflect the disenchantment some felt as they saw the Movement developing, at an early age, into a denomination, and, in Niebuhr's words, "institutionalizing the kingdom of Christ." Niebuhr's further description of the introverted church seems to delineate this Movement as seen within the paradigm of purity:

. . . that peculiar institution, the American denomination, may be described as a missionary order which has turned to the defensive and lost its consciousness of the invisible catholic church. These orders now confused themselves with their cause and began to promote themselves, identifying the kingdom of Christ with the practices and doctrines prevalent in the group. . . . The more attention was concentrated on the church the greater became the tendency toward schism.69

In order to avoid an attention-shift in the Movement toward this paradigm, a threat that he, as well as others, perceived, Campbell intervened by giving prominence in his
writings and his speaking to balancing emphases that had been present in the group since the beginning—emphases which, taken alone, could also lead to extremes, but which actually served to impede an attention-shift.

Campbell's Intervention

Because of the complexity of the Movement, Campbell's interventions were not made singly, but repeatedly, as he perceived a need for balance to be achieved and disastrous attention-shifts thereby to be avoided. Certainly Campbell was not the only intervenor who tried to balance potentially dangerous emphases—but he was the most prominent.

The strategy most employed by Campbell to impede attention-shifts was that of anomaly-featuring. Those in the Movement had the highest reverence for the scriptures as God's word; second only to the scripture was their respect for the God-given power of human reason. Among Campbell's most powerful tools, then, for maintaining continuity of perception and, thus, behavior, was the showing of a new course of action or an attitude as being inconsistent either with the express words of the Bible, the inferred divine will, or else human reason. On a microscopic level, such anomaly-featuring is visible in this brief explanation Campbell gave as to why he would no longer answer ad hominem attacks from his critics:

How could a Christian reply to the Baptist Chronicle and some other things of a similar character? There is no argument to which to reply; and to offer billingsgate
for billingsgate, or curses for curses, is not compatible
with the will of our King; besides, it is altogether
superfluous: for no man of reflection can or will say
that there is anything in such pieces which wise men will
regard.70

To reply in kind, in other words, was against the divine
word as well as irrational.

Campbell's strategy was realized through the employ­
ment of various tactics at different times and sometimes
together. For example, as the impelling concern for doctri­
nal purity tended to degenerate into a rigid and threaten­
ing patternism, Campbell reminded readers that their other
values must be derived from a belief that unity is the
supreme good for the church. This was a belief that he
extracted from John 17:13-23. A pure doctrine is of little
value without personal purity and this is what God looks
for, rather than corporate conformity:

... it must be remembered that we plead not a reforma­
tion of systems, but a personal reformation of principles
and manners, an entire submission to Jesus as the only
Prophet, Priest, and King of divine authority.71

This reformation is personal and individual--"And a refor­
tation of the temper and behaviour is more difficult than a
reformation of the creed."72 This kind of reformation
included improvements in morality, better stewardship, and
better worship in families.73 Perhaps Campbell's clearest
and most controversial attempt to reorder values to prevent
an obsession with purity of doctrine, was in connection with
the Lunenburg controversy, in which some of his readers
thought he was undoing all of the good he had done in his
debates about baptism:

The case is this: When I see a person who would die for Christ; whose brotherly kindness, sympathy, and active benevolence know no bounds but his circumstances; whose seat in the Christian assembly is never empty; whose inward piety and devotion are attested by punctual obedience to every known duty; . . . I say, when I see such a one ranked amongst heathen men and publicans, because he never happened to inquire, but always took it for granted that he had been scripturally baptized; and that, too, by one greatly destitute of all these public and private virtues, whose chief or exclusive recommendation is that he has been immersed, and that he holds a scriptural theory of the gospel: I feel no disposition to flatter such a one; but rather to disabuse him of his error.74

Here, Campbell ranked a piety that is technically imperfect but good-hearted far above strictly proper beliefs and opinions. Further endorsing such a view, he wrote a series of articles in 1838-1840 on "Morality." In these articles, he claimed that the reformers ought to aim to become a church that is united in good works, and whose piety is seen in their behavior, not solely in conformity of opinions.75 Only when this was a reality would it be appropriate to presume to write a history of the reformation, which Campbell was often urged to do, because only then would there have been a reformation worthy of the name.76

Part of the required piety that reformers should seek to manifest was the virtue of harmony. It was time to cease arguing with other denominations—winsomeness was in order, and more likely to lead to unity:

Preachers who are ever and anon preaching against errors and heresies, and declaiming against abuses . . . may be feared because of their talents, but they will never be loved—admired, but not revered—listened to,
but not obeyed. They may pull down, but they cannot build up. . . . We now want not the thunderbolts of war, nor the fierce spirits of controversy; but argumentative, mild, conciliatory preachers—persuasive words, and a full display of the good spirit of the gospel. 77

Among the testimonies to the presence of the Spirit of Christ in a community is the unity of the members; therefore, disunity and division is anomalous to the Christian Church. Dogmatism is sectarian and unchristian. While every person in the church has private opinions, no one can "make his own views a standard for any other person's views." Campbell continued:

Now it so happens that amongst those called evangelical sects, there is a very general harmony in all the great facts, precepts, and promises of the New Institution. . . . They allow each other to be right in the great matters, and wrong only in the minor matters. But their error is, that they prefer the minor causes of division to the major causes of union. . . . They would rather be sects because of the accidentals, than united in one great communion because of the essentials. 78

Campbell charged this attitude of insisting on conformity in minor areas with the responsibility of creating sects. For example,

In the Scotch Baptist system, in all climates, the attraction of cohesion is too weak to preserve the unity of the body while contending for the true theory of religion. The centrifugal force will always overcome the centripetal in every system which approves Opinionism. Hence the preference manifested amongst that intelligent and virtuous people for multiplication rather than for addition. They can make two churches out of one more expeditiously than one out of two; and they grow incomparably faster in knowledge than in numbers. 79

The simple Christian platform is broad enough for all who value Christ. Campbell appeals to the history of the
Movement to illustrate that this had always been a theme of the Movement. No doubt, it was possible to view the history of the Movement in at least two ways. If purity of doctrine is the supreme value, then one is likely to see the history of the Movement as the story of reformers who tried to correct the errors of their host churches, but who were expelled, like a prophet without honor in his own country. On the other hand, to those who value unity as the highest good, the story of the Movement is a history of a people who quietly practiced tolerance within the bosom of their host, because they loved unity too much to separate over their differences of opinion. It is this latter version of history that Campbell emphasized:

... partyism is positively and directly contrary to our declared principles. Our past writings are fearlessly appealed to in proof of this: for if there be any one feature more characteristic than another of our stereotyped testimony against the mistakes and faults of this age, it is our uniform and constant declaration that parties or denominations among Christians are evil, and only evil, and that continually. 80

The same history was presented by Robert Richardson, Campbell's assistant editor, in an 1848 article.

In the present effort at reformation, it is this unity which has been chiefly urged upon the religious community. Christian union and intercommunion were the original and ruling thoughts with those with whom this movement began. ... There has been, however, in the present effort for union, no desire to depreciate the value of purity of doctrine. But while it has been duly urged that there can be no Christian union, except it be a union in gospel truth, there has been a freedom from that morbid sensibility upon the subject of doctrinal views which has led to so many fine-spun theological abstractions,
and created so many divisions by unprofitable and unauthorized inquiry.\textsuperscript{81}

When unity is featured and made more valuable than holding correct opinions and interpretations of the Bible, any attention-shift that would change the epistemology of the group is impeded. Emphasis on unity and tolerance leads away from a legalistic interpretation of the Bible. It is not that the original documents are valued any less than by other Evangelicals; rather, the spirit of the word becomes more normative for the church than the letter is. Differences of interpretation among the believers now may be tolerated on the basis of the uncertainty of human knowledge. This was the message of a letter Campbell published in response to some criticism from a Baptist editor:

 THAT all men err, and, consequently, you and I, is, as you say, a self-evident position, and it is one reason why I never dare impose my inferences or my reasonings and conclusions upon others as terms of Christian communion. Whatever is matter of fact, plain and incontrovertible testimony, is that, and that alone, in which we cannot err— and that only should be made a term of communion.\textsuperscript{82}

(Campbell used the word "fact" in the old sense, to refer to an action done. That it rained today is a fact; that the rain was needed is a truth, in Campbell's sense.) The gospel consists of a series of facts to be believed. No inference nor interpretation of them is necessary. This minimizes opportunities for human fallibility. Regardless of how carefully one studies the Bible, one must not claim that personal inferences and conclusions that are drawn from
it are as binding on others as the facts of the Bible themselves. There always remains a right to private judgment without compulsion. As Richardson explained,

... each individual member of that body [the church], must, for himself, at his own responsibility, and at his own peril, in the exercise of the right of private judgment, determine this [one] faith, ascertain this doctrine, and render this obedience.83

Inferences are binding on a person only insofar as that person agrees with them. Campbell wrote, "... we make not our inferences terms of communion, nor denounce them who may not be able to unite with us in any matter of opinion."84 In publishing this comment under the title, "A Word to Neutrals and Partial Reformers," Campbell was not only inviting the attention of the outsiders to his ideas but also was shaping the identity of the Movement by telling its members what they already believed.

Because of the very nature of the Bible as temporally situated and of the exigencies that called into being many of the letters in the New Testament, there is sometimes a need to adapt the basic ideas of the Bible to contemporary situations. This is especially true of those areas in which the Bible is silent, such as on what is the proper order of worship. In such cases, there is room for the use of personal judgment and, if there is room for personal judgment, then there is also room for individual differences. The broad principles of Christian behavior are normative, and the facts of the gospel cannot be discarded. Each genera-
tion, though, must re-apply the principles to its own age.

If any one was to seek authority for building a house to meet in, or for printing, translating, and publishing the Bible, . . . he would never find it, if he expect to find it in the form of the ten commandments, or in the way that Moses reared the tabernacle, or David built the temple. There is, however, authority in the New Testament for building a meeting house, . . . and for every thing necessary to the comfort and edification of the church and the conversion of the whole world. But we will not find it on two tablets of stone, nor in the form of the ten commandments.85

For Christians to revere opinions and elevate them to the level of dogma— even when they were his own opinions— was reprehensible. When one critic accused Campbell of showing favoritism to his own opinions (as Saul showed favor to King Agag in I Samuel 15), Campbell replied,

I will join you in killing Agag or Campbellism, or whatever you please to call it, . . . only do not misapply these terms. Call not the weekly meeting of the disciples Campbellism; call not "immersion for the remission of sins" Campbellism; . . . In a word, call not any institution of Jesus Christ, Campbellism. Every Campbellism, every invention of mine which you will point out to me, I will help you to burn, or drown, or exile, as the case may require.86

Of course, in practice, it was not always easy to determine whether a belief was merely an opinion, or a reasonable inference. This is one reason Campbell's middle position was a difficult one to occupy. Nevertheless, such a statement from Campbell was consistent with what he had earlier written as a hint to advocates of the reformation:

SOME of the friends of the restoration of the ancient order of things are introducing matters entirely extraneous in their pleadings for this cause. To what purpose is it to preach their views of a Millennium, or of civil government, when contending for the faith formerly delivered to the saints? In making much ado
about Millennial matters, do they not see that their opponents will identify their views of a Millennium with their ancient gospel and ancient order of things?87

In summary, in his tactical intervention into the ideology of the group, Campbell pictured the Movement as a group that enjoys unity in love and tolerance, if not always in opinion; where harmony is more important than controversy; where there is a single mind shaped by the Bible, though manifested in various ways.

Various maneuvers were used by Campbell to carry out his intervention. While there are too many to catalog completely, a brief examination of a few of them not only will illustrate his maneuvers but also will shed backlight on his tactics and strategies.

One of the most basic and straightforward maneuvers available to Campbell was that of exposition. As previously mentioned, Campbell and his readers shared a common reverence for both the Bible and for human reason. Therefore, exposition that was based on reasonable argument, or else depended on revealed truth was particularly effective. As editor and gatekeeper of his own publication, Campbell exercised discretion in deciding what letters and queries from his friends and supporters would find their way into his pages. While the pages were professedly always open to his foes— at least to those who were literate and "decent" in their arguments—, Campbell was more careful with his friends. He chose to publish only those questions and
essays that would be useful and edifying to the readers at large, or that would give him an opportunity of making a point that he felt was needed. This was especially true of the letter previously mentioned from a sister in Lunenburg, Virginia, which elicited from him the most vigorous response that he had ever published.

The woman from Lunenburg expressed surprise that he had recently referred to Christians in other Protestant denominations. She asked him a series of pointed questions, all clearly arising from within a paradigm in which perfect conformity to the New Testament doctrine as taught in the Movement was essential to being a Christian—most specifically, submission to baptism by immersion. Campbell's answer attempted to feature doctrinal perfection as being less important than godly love and personal piety:

Should I find a Pedobaptist [a believer in infant sprinkling, such as a Presbyterian] more intelligent in the Christian Scriptures, more spiritually-minded and more devoted to the Lord than a Baptist, or one immersed on a profession of the ancient faith, I could not hesitate a moment in giving the preference of my heart to him that loveth most. Did I act otherwise, I would be a pure sectarian, a Pharisee among Christians.  

In this expository maneuver, Campbell appeals to his own authority, reasons from lesser to the greater, and also applies the perjorative label of "Pharisee" to the extremists inhabiting the first paradigm of purity. That label was the same one he had used for years against his enemies outside the Movement; it thus bore an animus that had been created by his local use of it, as well as carrying a nega-
tive connotation for Christians because of the opposition of most Pharisees to Christ in the revealed gospel accounts.

While not denying that there is a proper way in which the Bible should be understood, he retarded an attention-shift by masking anomalies which otherwise would seem to make it impossible to apply the label of "Christian" to most of the Protestant world. He did this by claiming that a person may have a personal understanding of the scripture that is technically in error but who, he thought, might yet be accepted by God if that person obeys to the best of his or her ability. In other words, error does not invalidate the Christian character if it is an innocent error. Note the last phrase in the first sentence of this passage, in which Campbell defines a Christian:

I answer, Every one that believes in his heart that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the Son of God; repents of his sins, and obeys him in all things according to his measure of knowledge of his will.

Many a good man has been mistaken. Mistakes are to be regarded as culpable and as declarative of a corrupt heart only when they proceed from a willful neglect of the means of knowing what is commanded. Ignorance is always a crime when it is voluntary; and innocent when it is involuntary. In the same reply, he also took pains to describe the church as an institution larger and older than the small Movement of which they were part. This he established in the reductio ad absurdum with which he began his reply to the Lunenburg letter.

In reply to this conscientious sister, I observe, that if there be no Christians in the Protestant sects, there are certainly none among the Romanists, none among
the Jews, Turks, Pagans; and therefore no Christians in the world except ourselves, or such of us as keep, or strive to keep, all the commandments of Jesus. Therefore, for many centuries there has been no church of Christ, no Christians in the world; and the promises concerning the everlasting kingdom of Messiah have failed, and the gates of hell have prevailed against his church! This cannot be; and therefore there are Christians among the sects. . . .

I cannot . . . in my heart regard all that have been sprinkled in infancy without their own knowledge and consent, as aliens from Christ and the well-grounded hope of heaven. "Salvation was of the Jews," acknowledged the Messiah; and yet he said of a foreigner, an alien from the commonwealth of Israel, a Syro-Phenician, "I have not found so great faith—no, not in Israel."

Campbell was, in effect, counterbalancing all the elements of a new paradigm of purity. This balancing seemed to some of his readers to be a complete reversal of what he had taught at other times. Several months later, he mentioned the strong responses he had received as a result of that piece:

Judging from numerous letters received at this office, my reply to the sister from Lunenburg has given some pain to our brethren, and some pleasure to our sectarian friends. The builders up of the parties tauntingly say to our brethren, "Then we are as safe as you," and "You are coming over to us, having now conceded the greatest of all points—viz, that immersion is not essential to a Christian." Some of our brethren seem to think that we have neutralized much that has been said on the importance of baptism for the remission, and disarmed them of much of their artillery against the ignorance, error, and indifference of the times upon the whole subject of Christian duty and Christian privilege.

Campbell then defended himself against the charge of having changed his stand, claiming that this had always been his position; nevertheless, it is clear that to a significant portion of his readers, his recently expressed
opinion appeared to be a strong attempt at a new intervention. Campbell admitted that his Lunenburg reply was elicited from him as an attempt to counterbalance an extreme position that he perceived as threatening. Two months after printing the letter with his reply, he wrote, "We apprehended that the propounder of the queries that called for these remarks, was rather an ultraist on the subject of Christian baptism; . . ." It was only in response to such extremism that he gave "as bold an answer as we ever gave—perhaps more bold than on any former occasion." Later, he explained that, behind the questions from Lunenburg, he saw the influence of Dr. John Thomas, the editor of the Apostolic Advocate, and an imaginative and original writer. While Thomas shared Campbell's doctrine of baptism at one time, he had by now developed his own position and claimed that no baptism was valid unless the subject understood the theory of baptism properly. It was in response to what Campbell saw as an extremist threat that he responded to the letter in the way that he did:

A little bad feeling in a few individuals has been, I learn, evinced already, although not a single preacher in Virginia has embraced the views of Dr. Thomas. This proves it to be a bitter root. The answer I gave to the sister of Lunenburg, I gave with a reference to this discussion. I saw the hand of the Advocate in those questions, and answered them accordingly: . . .

In summary, while Campbell claimed to be giving a more bold answer, it was not a different one from what he had
taught as early as 1826, when he made his position explicit in an article in the *Christian Baptist*, entitled "To an Independent Baptist:"

Dear sir, this plan of making our own nest, and fluttering over our own brood; of building our own tent, and of confining all goodness and grace to our noble selves and the "elect few" who are like us, is the quintessence of sublimated pharisasm. . . . [W]here there is a new creature, or a society of them, with all their imperfections, and frailties and errors in sentiment, in views, and opinions, they ought to receive one another, and the strong to support the infirmities of the weak, and not to please themselves. To lock ourselves up in the bandbox of our own little circle; . . . is real Protestant monkery, it is evangelical pharisasm.95

The elements of the paradigm of purity, as well as its internal consistency, were nothing more than extreme extensions of ideas that Campbell had expressed in a more moderate form at one time or another. In order to prevent a shift within the Movement toward this paradigm, he intervened repeatedly, trying to encourage others to maintain the same moderate balance he had. One possible anomaly that could seem to invalidate his balanced worldview would be a division in the churches. Such a split would reify abstract values for purity and would delegitimize the value of unity. Thus, some of Campbell's maneuvers were devoted to the strategy of masking these anomalies. By the use of his personal interventions, he featured tolerance and unity, rather than urging doctrinal precision and expulsion of recalcitrant members. He seemed particularly on guard against attempts to enforce private opinions as law, even
when he agreed with the opinions. Walter Scott recorded one brief example of Campbell's irenic intervention. In late 1834, he reported,

Some disorders this year occurred in the church at Somerset [Pennsylvania] on the senseless question of masonry; but the divisions have been healed, under Christ, by the timely care of brother Alexander Campbell. 96

Another instructive example that is documented in more detail is that of Aylett Raines. That case came up before the annual meeting of the Mahoning Association (in the Western Reserve) in 1828. One of the recent converts of Walter Scott, who was the evangelist for the Association, was Aylett Raines, who had been an advocate of one variety of Universalism, the belief that all people will be saved eventually, even if after death. Such a doctrine was thoroughly unorthodox within the Movement, as well as to Campbell. Inasmuch as Raines was doing some preaching for the Movement, and some of the opponents of the Movement criticized the members for allowing such a heretic to preach for them, there was a serious debate about whether Raines could be allowed to continue his fellowship with the Association, unless he abandoned his belief. After questioning, Raines announced that he was not ready to change his opinions about the fate of the dead, but he admitted that he considered such opinions to be no essential part of the gospel, and that he would not teach those opinions publicly. To the surprise of some, both of the Campbells
supported Raines, and the younger Campbell expressed his opinion that, if no pressure were put on Raines, he would eventually outgrow those particular opinions anyway. Raines became an effective preacher for the Movement and that prediction of Campbell proved to be right. Raines later recalled the story:

I was dealt with, and my case managed, by Bro. [Alexander] Campbell and all the chief brethren in very great kindness and wisdom. Had they attempted to brow-beat me I might have been ruined forever. But treating me kindly, at the same time that they convinced me that my opinion, whether true or false, dwindled into nothingness in comparison with the faith of the gospel, redeemed me. I became a day and night preacher of the gospel, and my mind becoming absorbed in this vast work, the opinion faded, and in ten months was numbered with all my former errors. The Lord be thanked for his great deliverance. Bro. Campbell, I ought to say, invited me to go to Bethany [Campbell's home], and told me he thought he could convince me that my Restorationist position was false.97

That Campbell's intervention was effective in respect to Aylett Raines was confirmed by Raines' own writing, for Raines later started his own short-lived journal, Christian Evidences, in which he advocated the unity of all Christians and discouraged speculation about divisive questions. In the first issue, after a warning against impurity of religion and life, he explained that the means of attaining purity had nothing to do with a forced conformity (of the sort which had threatened him):

But it may be asked, whether the writer of this article would recommend coercion, by which to destroy or impede the progress of demoralizing speculations? To this he would answer in the negative. . . . Coercion may make hypocrites; it can never make truer men.98
Another example of Campbell's intervention in order to impede adoption of a paradigm of purity is the union of his followers with those of Stone. Though Campbell was not the proposer of the union—in fact, he was somewhat aloof at first, thinking that perhaps it was premature—he soon supported the union, though knowing well that there were serious differences of opinion between him and Stone. In fact, he was later reproached during his debate with Presbyterian N. L. Rice, when Rice exposed from the writings of Stone and Campbell some of the differences that existed between the two. He suggested that, if Campbell could tolerate co-workers with unorthodox views of basic doctrines such as the nature of the Christ, then Christian unity must be to Campbell so broad as to be meaningless. Campbell explained his idea of the basis of unity in his reply.

Our bond of unity is not opinion, nor unity of opinion. It is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one Spirit, one hope, one God and Father of all. . . . We have no standard opinions amongst us. . . . It is our peculiar felicity, and perhaps, it may be our honor, too, that we have been able to discover a ground so common, so sacred, so divinely approbated, so perfectly catholic and enduring, on which every man, who loves our Lord Jesus Christ sincerely, may unite, and commune, and harmonize, and cooperate in all the works of faith, in all the labors of love, and in all the perseverance of hope.

In his lectures on religious strife, Posey failed to see the large measure of tolerance that was present in the union when he explained its existence by saying, "Each group had simplified its beliefs until a proposed union was
A further example of Campbell's intervention through setting an example is his behavior in the case of Dr. John Thomas. At first, Campbell thought he was a promising new convert (converted by Scott); Thomas visited Bethany for a month, where he preached for the first time, at Campbell's invitation. Soon, thereafter, he started his own monthly, the *Apostolic Advocate*, thus inviting the attribution of a power share to himself within the Movement. He began to specialize in discussing speculative theology, thus transgressing one of Campbell's taboos. He first insisted that baptism was valid only if the one being immersed understood its meaning as the rest of the reformers did. In effect, this attempted attention-switch to a paradigm of purity dechristianized most of the Protestant world, including the Baptists whose baptism was usually deemed valid by the reformers. Later, Thomas developed some innovative theories about the state of the dead and the immortality of the soul. He decided that humans have no immortal soul, that there is no future punishment, and that only the righteous will be resurrected. All of these beliefs were abhorrent to Campbell. Thomas, presumably, would have been welcome to hold any such opinions privately, as long as he did not attempt to propagate them to others and try to enforce them on other believers, so that they became an issue. At first, Campbell attempted to encourage Thomas
in his beneficial good work, while discouraging him from pursuing his original speculations. But a tour of the East gave him fresh insight into the condition of the church.

He wrote home from Syracuse, New York:

D[r]. Thomas' advocate has done much injury to the cause here: It is with much pain that I testify [?] the injurious tendency of his speculations, and that fondness for speculation among the brethren. I am obliged to set my face against that work on various [?] occasions, not in public but in private conversation. Materialism must be exposed and demolished for the credit [?] of our cause.104

After his interpersonal intervention, he returned home and tried to correct Thomas' errors through hints in the Harbinger. Thomas, though, was as stubborn as he, and, interpreting Campbell's behavior as jealousy, was all the more determined to spread his own theories.105 Campbell then resolved to treat him with silence by ignoring Thomas' editorial jibes, inasmuch as attending to his arguments would have the effect of recognizing Thomas' power share. Thomas, though, interpreted this silence as evidence that Campbell was unable or unwilling to refute his teaching. Campbell wrote of Thomas,

He takes it for granted that he is so plausible, so argumentative, so powerful, so irresistible, that he has become a very formidable antagonist; and that cowardice, rather than benevolence or pity, has influenced my conduct towards him.106

A few months later, some local Disciple leaders invited Thomas and Campbell to meet in Paineville, Virginia, where they discussed their problems for ten hours.107 The result was a promising resolution in which Thomas agreed to
stop his speculations except in self-defense. The peace that resulted from the meeting did not last long. Finally, Campbell published a forty-six page essay on "Life and Death," which, though it did not mention Thomas at all, was a careful and apparently convincing refutation of Thomas' theories. They were shown to be inconsistent with revealed religion as well as not a reasonable system of belief. Thomas' influence among the Disciples waned gradually, until, when he died in 1871, he left behind only "a tiny sect, known as the Christadelphians."

In the encounters with Thomas, Campbell used a large repertoire of personal maneuvers, including silence, open confrontation, interpersonal intervention, appeals through letters and articles, hints and suggestions, with the result that, by early 1838, local church leaders were eager to dissociate themselves, and publicly announced in the Harbinger that they were not supporters of Thomas' views. All of this served the purpose of impeding the spread of a paradigm that was legalistic and close-minded. Campbell demonstrated at least his intolerance of intolerance.

A further significant example of Campbell's use of the maneuver of silence is his behavior in relation to the problem of slavery. As early as August 1823, he had written against the American system of slavery when, in the first issue of the Christian Baptist, he invited his readers to picture
those Christians who are daily extolling the blessings of civil and religious liberty, and at the same time, by a system of the most cruel oppression, separating the wife from the embraces of her husband, and the mother from her tender offspring; violating every principle, and rending every tie that endears life and reconciles man to his lot; and that, forsooth, because "might makes right," and a man is held guilty because his skin is a shade darker than the standard color of the times.  

One of the subjects that Campbell expected would become a main theme of the Harbinger was

5. Disquisitions upon the treatment of African slaves, as preparatory to their emancipation, and exaltation from their present degraded condition.

He quickly began to receive responses from readers. From Essex, Virginia, came this warning:

... I have thought it my duty to inform you that your readers are not pleased with your touching the subject of slavery any further than the New Testament authorizes you to teach the duty of servants and masters to each other. This is a delicate question among us. You could offer no argument that could convince us more than we are already convinced of its evil. It is like a painful sore—it will not bear either a stroke or pressure of the hand without rousing the angry passions of our nature.

During its first two years, the subject of slavery did not occupy a large part of the Harbinger, although Campbell did publish the emancipation plan that he had intended to present when he was a delegate to the Virginia constitutional convention in 1829-1830. After Virginia debates on slavery brought defeat to the antislavery advocates in 1832, Campbell was silent for several years. His silence may have resulted from the probability of doing his cause more harm than good by taking too vocal a stand, or it may have been,
as Harrell said, that he was discouraged by the official position taken by his state. In 1835, he remarked that the political situation was such that there was little reason to think that the subject of slavery could be discussed rationally. He finally decided that the exigencies of the time demanded a moderating position and that he could best encourage the adoption of that position by avoiding clashes.

His maneuver of maintaining silence did not meet with favor from the abolitionists. In 1836, in an article called, "Abolitionism," he wrote, "I have been assailed both in the East and the West at one and the same time for not 'coming out' with all decision in favor of the cause of immediate emancipation." Harrell suggests that it was Campbell's perception of the abolitionists as extremists and a divisive element in the Movement that led him to make his own position explicit. As national tensions grew worse, Campbell grew more insistent on a moderate position, claiming that a Christian, while deploring specific abuses of slavery, could not certainly assert that slavery was always against God's will. Again, balanced moderation was to be found in allowing each Christian the right to choose a personal position, but never the right to enforce that opinion on others. By asserting that no certain position on slavery was part of the Christian gospel, Campbell, in effect, was maintaining his
policy of silence. By the mid- to late-1840's, though, such an intervention was no longer effective. Harrell summarized the results of Campbell's position:

For over twenty years the leader of the Disciples had followed a calculated stop-and-go policy in discussing the slavery issue--publishing articles on the subject when he felt that they might help and closing the columns of the Harbinger when he thought the times too tender for useful discussion. The fact that his policy never really accomplished anything to bring the warring factions together is less the responsibility of Campbell than simply the inevitability of the times. 120

Campbell's first biographer, though, claimed somewhat more for Campbell--crediting his behavior with preserving the union of the Movement:

Mr. Campbell's conservative course in regard to this disturbing question, while it preserved the reforming churches from division, excited against him the animosity of many individuals who had hoped that he would declare himself in favor of their particular views, . . . 121

By his example of moderate silence, then his firm position of neutrality, he attempted to encourage a tolerance of differences, a unity and harmony that transcended even the most bitter social and political differences.

There was an alternative paradigm, which was less often threatening than the paradigm of purity, but which also made sense of the world of the reformers by assigning them their place in the religious world, establishing their source of knowledge, and, thus, providing a source for their values and value hierarchy. In this worldview, which again is derived by extensions of some of Campbell's teachings carried to an extreme, unity and cooperation were prized
more highly than doctrinal perfection and theological agreement. Here there was less a tendency toward rigid patternism and more value for tolerance and for undoing the schisms that had disrupted the church in past years. Those who shared this worldview were concerned to maintain the spirit of the law and were more tolerant of, if not entirely open to, alternative interpretations. It was not those who held alternative opinions who were labeled heretics, but those who tried to force any opinions—even the commonly accepted ones—on other people against their will, as though even the most careful human reasoning could be as authoritative as the divine revelation. There was an interest in how the principles in the New Testament could be adapted to modern needs, and how contemporary social and technological improvements could be used in the service of the gospel. In essence, the Movement was, ideally, an accepting community, one that grew not only by proselytizing and converting those who were outside, but also by "lengthening the stakes," enlarging the defined borders of the community to take in those who might otherwise have thought themselves excluded from such a fellowship.

The danger present to the Movement in such an extreme paradigm was that, without checks on its liberality, the Movement might lose its identity in the members' desire to be broad-minded. Unorthodox ideas that were subversive of the gospel and the church could be tolerated and encouraged
in the name of Christian love. In its desire to be all things to all people, the church might become nothing to anyone.

No doubt, the risk of an attention-shift to this paradigm was less imminent than the risk of extremes in the direction of legalism and purity. Perhaps the reason for this was that Campbell's personal talents were better suited to carrying out careful exegesis and precise interpretations and to combatting errors than to tolerating alternative views. Though the risk of extremes might be less in the paradigm of unity, still there were occasions when Campbell intervened in order to prevent attention-shifts in the direction of unity-over-purity and to bring the Movement back to a stricter interpretation of the Bible, to the evaluation of purity as well as toleration and unity, and to seeing the Disciples as a unique fellowship of the elect who must keep themselves from contamination.

For instance, in his preface to the Harbinger for 1837, Campbell announced certain debates that were scheduled for the coming year, and he explained that controversy is not inconsistent with a Christian spirit. Then he gave a warning against the danger of apostasy.

... If Christianity was persecuted by its enemies, it was corrupted by its friends. The enemies of the cross sorely vexed the Christians; but the Christians, without intending it, grievously perplexed the religion.\textsuperscript{122}

Here he emphasized the anomaly of tolerating impurities within a Movement dedicated to restoring the ancient order
A more specific example is an axiological intervention featuring the value of right teaching. In 1831, Campbell took Stone to task for displaying too much liberality in his writings in which he had labeled the doctrine of baptism that he and Campbell shared as "opinions." Campbell felt that that particular doctrine deserved a more secure label, so he warned his readers.

The charitable Editor [Stone] seems to use this term, "opinion," in such a latitude as to cover almost all the laws, ordinances and worship of the Christian institution. This would not be a matter so much to be regretted, if he did not make this his opinion a principle of action; and, in fact, give it the sanction of a law.

... We are always safe when we act constitutionally, or according to the law of our Sovereign Lord the King; unsafe when we act from our opinion, or sense of expediency, or the fitness of things.123

Campbell further intervened by calling attention to the Word which was the Movement members' only source of authentically divine guidance, and which must not be treated with impunity. Instead, it should be studied, interpreted, and understood with care and reverence. There is no substitute; no other help, such as prayer or a mystic inner light, can

supersede the necessity of constant reading, thinking, and examination of what is written. When we look up to heaven for any of the bounties of the providence of God, it is not to be fed or preserved by miracle, but by the use of all commanded means. Neither do we expect a single ray of new light above or beyond what is revealed, when we prayerfully set about the study of the Bible.124

Campbell intervened also by calling attention to the church as a community of the like-minded, a pure family,
and a witness to the world as the only holy society. Hence, impure doctrine and erroneous ideas are anomalous:

What is union among christians worth unless it be for the promotion of holiness and happiness among themselves, or for the conversion of the world! And can either the one or the other object be gained, if the ancient order of things is not venerated more than all the mourning benches, anxious seats, camp meetings, protracted meetings, . . . holy days, ordinations, . . .

He ridiculed the toleration showed by a Presbyterian minister who advocated a broad-minded view of how baptism ought to be administered:

Our friend, however, is very liberal. Like Solomon's woman he says, "Let it be neither mine nor thine, but divide it." You may take the dipping mode of sprinkling, and I will take the sprinkling mode of sprinkling. Call me a good Christian, and I will say you are a very good Christian.

He was blunt about the uniqueness of the Movement of which he was a part: "We are the only society on earth who build upon the living oracles [New Testament] alone." If this favored society is ever to unite all Christians, it must be on a basis of accuracy in belief, speech, and behavior. "Purity of speech," he wrote, "must precede purity of faith, and purity of faith must precede permanent union among Christians."

These interventions aimed at impeding a shift to the paradigm of unity by featuring values of purity were engaged in by Campbell, and his father, especially when there were threats of possible defections from the Movement to the Mormons and the Shakers. Both groups claimed to be
Christians, though each professed to have knowledge beyond what was available to the uninitiated Christian. Inasmuch as they also claimed the same Lord and the same Spirit as the members of the Stone-Campbell Movement, and they possessed special insight into the impending Millennium (which was a subject of much discussion among all American evangelical churches at the time), it seemed plausible to some members of the Movement to think that such groups could be tolerated; a significant number from the Movement were converted to one or the other.

Campbell's faith in the rationality of the American people was such that, at first, he expected Mormonism would immediately die of ridicule. When the new religion showed unexpected vitality, both of the Campbells promptly attacked in person and in print. The elder Campbell wrote a stern, yet paternal, letter to Sidney Rigdon, a prominent Disciples preacher who left the Movement and became a Mormon leader. The younger Campbell wrote a careful review of the Book of Mormon, and printed (both as an article and as a booklet) what has been called the first "responsible review" of the book.129 In his article, Campbell attempted to show in minute detail the incompatibility of that book with the Bible, and made clear that it was anomalous for a believer in the New Testament to tolerate what he labeled as a fraudulent document.

... Every person who receives the book of Mormon is an apostate from all that he ever professed, if, indeed,
he ever professed to receive or value any thing we 
have ever spoken or written on the subject of 
Christianity.130

The result of the intervention was clear, according 
to Garrett's recent study—

While Mormon historians take note of the fact that many 
of their first converts were Disciples, the number of 
defections was not great, due in part to the quick 
response of the Campbells.131

Campbell's effectiveness in retarding attention-shifts 
within the Movement was directly related to his attributed 
power share. In turn, his interventions strongly affected 
the attribution of needs within the Movement. At the 
least, Campbell encouraged those who followed him to see 
more need for mutual cooperation among the churches of the 
Movement and a closer intrachurch unity as a barrier to 
intrusion from the spirit of the outside world, yet with­
out compromise of the essentials of the restored gospel.
In the case of the Stone-Campbell Movement, then, Brown's 
three subcycles that contribute to the process of ideology-
making--the attention-shift cycle, the needs cycle, and 
the power cycle, seem to influence each other in the reverse 
order from what Brown describes in his original article.132
In this instance, at least, it seems as useful and legiti-
mate to see the relationships in a different way. A power 
share is necessary to the creating of an attention-shift, 
and yet some attention-shift is necessary to winning the 
attribution of power. The promotion of an attention-shift 
involves the naming of needs and of those who can meet the
needs; simultaneously, felt needs, including the need to resolve ideological gaps, affect openness to or rejection of the attention-shift. Named needs help allocate power shares among those who can satisfy them and those who can mediate between the needy and the potential satisfiers; but some sort of power share is necessary, even if it is only the influence wielded by a model figure through identification, in order to name needs. Hence, like three beads on a ring, each of the cycles may be seen as operating between and influencing the other two.

Figure 12: Interrelations of the Cycles

A more complete understanding of the dynamics of a social intervention would require an investigation of each of the cycles and the six interrelationships, both before and after an attempted intervention. It will be enough for our present purposes to recognize that the power cycle, which was described in the previous chapter, and the attention-shift cycle, which has been described in this chapter, both influence the needs cycle, which is the subject of the next chapter.
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CHAPTER VII
INTERVENTION INTO THE NEEDS CYCLE

Garrison and DeGroot determined the separation between the Disciples and the Baptists to have occurred from 1825 to 1833. The historians of the Movement then described what happened after the split, as far as the Disciples were concerned:

The immediate consequence of the separation was that what had for seventeen years been a "movement" among Baptists became a loosely associated body of independent reformers free to merge with other groups having similar objectives. The history of the Disciples for the next twenty or thirty years is the story of how these reformers came to the consciousness of a common group life, increased their numbers and the geographical area of their activity, and developed the institutions, habits, and mechanisms by which their common life became objectively unified and effective. ¹

In this chapter, we shall view the Movement during and just after those crucial years of early separation, from 1830 to 1840, as the members experienced the growing pains that succeeded a long and difficult birth.

A study of the needs cycle provides the key to understanding the drives and motivations of the members of the Movement, as well as illuminating their perceptions of failures and imperfections that demanded remedy. ² The observer of this cycle also will see the intervention in which Campbell engaged in order to prevent the Movement from degenerating into a small, hostile, self-righteous
sect. The study of the needs cycle requires an understanding of the ideology of the Movement, inasmuch as needs are created in part by a sense of identity, and identity, in turn, is influenced by perceptions of needs. At the same time, perceptions of interdependency are related to the needs cycle as those to whom shares in future-choosing are attributed also help to name the needs of the group, and those who experience the needs attribute power to those who can satisfy such perceived requirements.³

Originally, the members of the "Campbellite" branch of the Movement were those who were attracted by Campbell's charisma as well as those who were persuaded from a distance by his arguments or the tone of his debates and by his writings first in the Christian Baptist and later in the Millennial Harbinger. Few of those early members were fresh converts to Christianity--Campbell was not the most effective evangelist the Movement possessed. Instead, many of the first members came from the Presbyterian and Baptist Churches. The Movement itself originated while nominally within the shelter of the Presbyterian Church, before loosely affiliating itself with the Mahoning Baptist Association.

Such an alliance, though, could not be maintained indefinitely. It is essential to the concept either of reformation or restoration to believe that the established denominations (including the Presbyterians and Baptists)
are corrupt, and the "true gospel" (in Walter Scott's phrase) has been obscured by human accretions. This belief was reflected in Campbell's recollection, in later years, of the conviction that had earlier led him to become a reformer:

The ultimate result of all my studies and researches, was a clear and deep conviction that, more or less, in all Protestantdom, the doctrines and commandments of men had usurped and maintained the place of the Oracles of God.

That conviction he had expressed in the following way more than thirty years earlier: "We are convinced, fully convinced, that the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint of modern fashionable Christianity..." Such an insight brings with it the serious responsibility of at least a personal reformation on the part of those who share it.

We contend that all Christian sects are more or less apostasized from the institutions of the Saviour, and that by all the obligations of the christian religion they that fear and love the Lord are bound to return to the ancient order of things in spirit and in truth.

Campbell's earliest writings in the Christian Baptist were directed to the reformation of existing congregations, rather than to the starting of a new church. Hence, he did not explicitly specify how the reformers should behave in case their well-intentioned criticism was ignored by their local congregations. His calls to "come out of Babylon" seem to be meant in a metaphorical sense,
rather than as a demand for literal separation. Later, though, he did call for a clear break—a division that was preferable to quiet conformity. For example, he presented the following question to his readers:

Are men or women that have united themselves to a [reforming] church at an assembly of saints, justified . . . in omitting to attend on every first day of the week, at the appointed place of worship, under pretence that they must go among their brethren in other churches, and that they are fulfilling their engagements to God in so doing?

His answer was an "emphatic No!"

Although he did not at first call for physical separation, as we have seen, he consistently undermined the authority of denominational leaders by portraying them as irrational and ignorant, and by associating their behavior as rulers with that of the feared Catholic priesthood, or else of the King of England. For the first few years, then, the reformers tried to stay in their home churches in order to propagate their distinct ideas about the primitive gospel and to criticize what to them were the unscriptural practices of their host churches and clergy.

To intervene into the needs cycle of a system, as Brown explained, one may emphasize individual needs over corporate ones, or else one may stress collectivity-based needs over those based on individual identity. The needs cycle consists of the creation of a perceived need, the advocacy of satisfaction of that need, and consequent receptiveness or openness to needs-meeting behavior from
appropriate sources. Intervention may take place at any of these points.

Campbell's First Needs Intervention

The first needs intervention performed by Campbell—and one that was largely responsible for the eventual separation of the Movement from the other churches—took the form of stressing an individually-based need for autonomy. This autonomy, as expressed by Campbell, entailed freedom from repressive control and pressure to conform. (As Brown pointed out, even in such an intervention, collectivity-based needs cannot be ignored entirely, although they are placed in the background.) Hence, as early as 1826, Campbell gave approval to religious associations that were non-legislative in nature. In 1830, he named "the union of christians, and the destruction of sects," as "indispensable prerequisites" to the arrival of the Millennium. These needs-attributions that called attention to collectivity-based needs, though, were not so prominent as was the stressing of the individual-based need for autonomy and independence.

Campbell's readers were invited to see themselves as the called-out, the enlightened few; therefore, they must feel a responsibility to communicate freely the truth they perceived. To feel the need to share their message was also to be an advocate. As has been explained in the
previous chapter, their advocacy of the right to speak freely did not mean that the members were encouraged to break away from the established churches. Historian Leroy Garrett has interpreted the behavior of Campbell and his father in that light:

From the outset the Campbells sought to avoid separatism. Their Washington Association was to be a society within the church working for peace and unity, its members remaining in their own churches . . . . Even when rejected by his own Presbyterian synod, Thomas [Campbell] sought in vain for ministerial status with another, and Alexander could comfortably refer to his "union with the Baptist denomination." 14

Nevertheless, to compromise the truth was a greater evil than was causing division. "It is . . . expedient to avoid divisions, and to maintain peace," wrote Campbell; "so long as it can be maintained without the sacrifice of the truth." 15

The individual-based need that Campbell stressed was that for autonomy to practice and freedom to believe the reforming doctrine. Exactly how he intervened in order to encourage the perception of such a need on the part of his readers may be seen clearly in the comprehensive introduction to his first monthly, the Christian Baptist. There, he described his ideal vision of the church, while, at the same time, contrasting it with the contemporary version of the church. For example, the original evangelists, he wrote, were unlike the modern ones in that they
look for no applause, for no stipend, no fixed salary, no lucrative office, no honorable title among men....

... Their churches were not fractured into missionary societies, bible societies, education societies; ... They knew nothing of the hobbies of modern times. ...

Having taken a cursory view of some of the leading features of the christian religion, exhibited in prospective, and in actual existence at its first institution, we shall in the last place advert to its present appearance. But alas! "how is the fine gold become dim!" Instead of the apostles' doctrine, ... we have got the sublime science of theology, ... Instead of the form of sound words given by the Spirit to be held fast, we have countless creeds,

Campbell, in these and other writings, abstracted the elements of the visible life of the early church community (as recorded in the New Testament and, to a lesser extent, church history) which seemed most significant to him--such elements as the baptism of adult believers by immersion, weekly observance of the communion service, the use of simple confessions of faith instead of developed theology or creeds. By giving presence to such elements as marks of the true church, Campbell mixed "metaphoric and metonymic codes to produce the appearance that the non-sensed (metaphor) is the sensed (metonymy), i.e., 'real.'" The idea that there had existed a primitive church that bore marks of divine authenticity and that could be reconstructed in modern times became so real that his readers desired to incarnate that church in the present world. Such reincorporation--a contemporary attempt to make the word flesh--would require individual reformation in order to conform to the ideal, and this
reform would take place within, or even in spite of, the established churches. For a person to see the church as revealed in the Scriptures was to become responsible for helping to make it visible. Such incarnation was both necessary and possible:

it only requires an intelligent mind and a willing heart. . . . The people must abandon the language, customs, and manners of Ashdod. For this purpose they will meet, and read, and examine the New Covenant writings [the New Testament]. They will also look to Heaven for wisdom and courage, and as soon as any item of the will of Heaven is distinctly apprehended, it will be brought into their practice. But, my dear sir, personal reformation, or individual conformity to the spirit, and temper, and morals of Christians, must be the basis of every attempt at a social or united representation and enjoyment of the christian religion. . . .

. . . all those desirous of knowing, enjoying and exhibiting the christian religion in its original purity and excellency, must individually, and in their public meetings, search and examine the apostles' doctrine, and pay no manner of respect to any opinions or practices which they have formerly regarded, except so far as they see, and learn, and know them to be the teachings of the Holy Spirit. . . . Why should we not, as soon as we discover any incongruity, deficiency, or aberration in our views or practices, immediately abandon them, and become followers of them who among the Jews and Gentiles, first turned to the Lord?18

Campbell thus made explicit the need for individuals' autonomy within churches and the need for freedom to grow beyond the boundaries of denominational constraints. As a result, collectivity-stressing needs, such as needs for tolerance, conformity, love, cooperation, and corporate identity, were relegated to the background.
The individually-based needs felt by Campbell's followers were advocated in a variety of ways. For example, they spoke in public at appropriate times, defended their beliefs at congregational trials, passed around Campbell's writings, and discussed reforming ideas at the hearthside. To advocate such needs was at the same time to engage in open-channel behavior—hoping for the best, and looking to see whether the call for reform was heard or whether the example of reform was followed. If approval was not forthcoming, then perhaps tolerance would be, from those who had the power to endorse and legitimize the claims of the reformers.

In spite of the apparent open-channel behavior that the followers of Campbell perceived as appropriate, Campbell himself seems to have impeded a needs-meeting response from those who did not share his reforming views. Whether such interference was intentional or not, he hindered responses from outsiders by his style of writing, by his religious presuppositions, and by his demands and expectations.

During the early years, especially from 1820-1830, Campbell's style of communication in print was often sarcastic. Such a tone did not encourage gentle replies, nor openness to his claims. Later, in 1831, he excused his earlier sarcasm—of the sort that abounds in the Christian Baptist—by claiming that it was only by writing in such
a way that he could gain a hearing from an indifferent religious world. Speaking of himself, he wrote that

his first volume of the "Christian Baptist," the "most uncharitable," the most severe, sarcastic, and ironical he ever wrote, was an experiment to ascertain whether society could be moved by fear or rage—whether it could be made [to] feel at all the decisive symptoms of the mortal malady which was consuming the last spark of moral life and motion . . . . It brought some hundreds to their senses: and as the morbid action began to yield and to be succeeded by more favorable symptoms, he gradually changed his course. . . . 19

We may conclude from this explanation that Campbell employed such a style because it was more effective at gaining attention than a style of restraint and "sweet reasonableness" would have been. He did admit, occasionally, that his sarcasm was perhaps too bitter:

My writings, I have learned from many sources, sometimes possess an asperity which is not at all indicative of my temperament of mind. I am, perhaps, in this sort of paradox—constitutionally mild and charitable; but, as a writer, tart and severe. Of this, however, I am not an impartial judge; but it is an apology which my acquaintances make for me. 20

Besides Campbell's tone, another reason why the appropriate needs-meeting response from the religious establishment was not likely to be offered was that Campbell's opponents had so little in common with him. In the first place, he avoided, both in speaking and writing, the florid, elevated style of prose that was common in the rhetoric of the times as it is apparent in the religious journals of the day. His editorial assistant, Robert Richardson, was a more typical stylist. In Campbell,
though, there was little of the "resonance" that Richard Weaver has called, "the spaciousness of old rhetoric," and which comes from a depth of shared assumptions and common values. There were few such commonalities between Campbell and his critics. His rationalistic approach to faith and his rejection of mysticism, even when the Holy Spirit was invoked, cut him off from the revivalists who might have otherwise welcomed him. The frustration of his opponents was exemplified by the exasperation of John Randolph of Roanoke, who, like Campbell, served as a representative to Virginia's Constitutional Convention in 1829. After repeated clashes, Randolph recalled that Campbell had just published his own revision of the New Testament. As one historian tells the story, Randolph

rose to his feet and shook his long fore-finger, that "javelin of rhetoric," in Campbell's face and cried out, "That man is never satisfied! God Almighty could not satisfy him with the Bible which He gave, and Mr. Campbell had to go and write a new Bible of his own."22

Campbell's approach to the interpretation of the Bible was, in fact, so different from the methods then in common use that it must have seemed to many like a new Bible when he explained it. Campbell recognized that his hermeneutics were unorthodox. In a private letter, he referred to some introductory essays he was writing for his edition of the New Testament.

I do think these prefaces will give a different turn to the course of reading now in use, and exhibit
the New Testament as another set of books than [they are] generally made by systems.  

By "systems," Campbell meant the common systems of theology then in use. Campbell's estimate of the novelty of his translation was confirmed by Edgar Goodspeed, who, in 1953, named it as the first of the "modern" versions printed in the United States.  

Besides Campbell's style and his lack of common presumptions shared with the mainstream religious world, a further impediment to receiving needs-meeting responses was the demand that was implicit in the ideology of the Movement, which was designed to restore the original gospel in all its purity, including attaining the goal of a united church. The upshot seemed to be that, if the unity and reformation advocated by the members of the Movement were to be realized in the Christian world as a whole, the only appropriate response from other churches was to abandon their own practices and heritages in order to come over wholeheartedly to the side of the reformers. This seems implied in Campbell's comments on the horror of division in the Church:  

But admissions are already so liberal on this head, that enough, and much more than enough, is conceded to warrant an appeal to all the friends of Jesus on the nature and extent of their obligations, not only to avoid all occasions of division in the family of God, but to abjure everything heretical in their views and schismatical in their operations; and not only this, but to adopt every measure and exert every influence which may gather into one the scattered flock, and terminate the most unhallowed
Campbell went on to explain that he did not expect to see perfect unity of opinions, nor did he hope for an organizational unity, but he felt that he had a right to demand rejection of individual creeds in favor of the universal adoption of the primitive beliefs expressed in the New Testament. Walter Scott was even clearer on this point. He rejected even the appearance of compromise when he expressed his idea of what constitutes the hoped-for Christian unity. In an article critical of an interdenominational unity meeting held in Lexington in 1841 (and attended by Campbell), Scott wrote,

"The late meeting for unity in Lexington has afforded our Editors a little fresh capital; and won­drous things are propounded. For ourself we are by no means enthusiastic on this subject. ... We thought then [when the Movement began] that union would only be effected by the universal spread of the true gospel. We think so still. ... The advocates of the primitive religion may hope to see union when by the uncorrupted gospel they conquer all perverted gospels and those that preach them: but not till then." 26

To advocate needs satisfaction in such a way is to limit acceptable responses from without to such a narrow range that, although there were many individual accessions to the Movement, positive responses from the organized churches were rare. As long as the members perceived themselves as reformers working within the organized churches, as long as reform was considered to be more important than
unity, and as long as the acceptable responses from the churches were so limited, there was a clear danger that the needs cycle within the Movement would fall into a vicious cycle.

Figure 13: Needs Cycle in the Early Stone-Campbell Movement

The input from the power cycle acted to disconfirm the individual-based needs-meeting advocacy. The need for autonomy was denied as church members were expected to conform, as part of an established body, not to reform. The lack of individual-based needs-meeting response exacerbated the salience of the felt needs and encouraged a vicious circle.

This chapter so far has provided an overall view of the early Movement as far as the needs cycle is
concerned. It is possible, though, to trace in more specific detail how the potentially critical situation illustrated above had been reached by about 1831.

As noted already, the earliest reformers worked from within their home churches in order to advocate their unique ideas and to criticize the conduct and belief of their hosts. The agitators were generally tolerated at first. Their proselytizing activity, though, showed no likelihood of dying out—in fact, it increased. Occasionally, whole churches were converted to the new Movement. Philip S. Fall, a young converted Baptist, brought into the Movement two Baptist churches for which he preached—one in Louisville sometime before 1825, and a second in Nashville in 1827.27

Such wholesale accessions constituted ideal needs-meeting behavior and, as such, also served to reify the needs that were then being advocated. Campbell received such information gladly. On April 30, 1825, he rejoiced in a letter, while making clear that he envisioned sweeping changes:

Some of the Baptist churches have politely voted the little [Baptist] confession of faith out of doors, and made their appeal to the holy twelve. But there are many adversaries of the truth, some within and many without our connexion.—28

That opposition of which he wrote was not surprising as, with whole congregations being won over, the new Movement was coming to be recognized as a genuine threat.
Proscriptive measures were taken, especially among the Baptists, in order to quell the growth of the new heresy. The measures were justified because, by the time the Disciples completely separated from the Baptists, "the Reformers had captured scores of Baptist churches and thousands of members."

Among the Disciples at this time, collectivity-stressing needs were placed in the background. Advocacy of needs that would require cooperation with other churches was too likely to appear as collaboration. For example, Campbell admitted that Christianity is a social religion, but he explained that it was not possible to cooperate with other churches in any sort of missionary activity until they reformed.

Nothing can be done worthy of admiration by the Christians of this age, with any reference to the conversion of the pagan nations, until the Christians separate themselves from all worldly combinations in which they are swallowed up, until they come out from amongst them that have a form of godliness, but deny the power of it; . . . until they form themselves into societies independent of hireling priests and ecclesiastical courts modelled after the forum, the parliament, or national conventions; . . . and until they keep the ordinances as delivered to them by the apostles.

Later, Campbell wrote an article that was otherwise remarkable for its liberality and expressed affection for all who claimed the name of Christian, regardless of their religious orthodoxy or heterodoxy. Nevertheless, he made clear that the individually-based need for freedom forbade
cooperation in benevolent organizations that served the purposes of the denominations.

... Even the Bible Society and the Sunday school system, two of the best projects, and the most powerful moral engines in the world, are so clogged with sectarian appendages, and are so completely subordinated, in many instances, to sectarian purposes, that I can scarcely obtain my own approbation of any of their movements.32

Campbell's opposition to such cooperation was an effective part of a current of anti-missionary sentiment then widespread in America.33 Historian W. W. Sweet attributed to Campbell (along with John Taylor, a Unitarian, and Daniel Parker, a Baptist) "a good share of the responsibility for the rise of this movement."34

When the parent churches appealed to the uncooperative reformers in their midst either to compromise or else to submit to ecclesiastical authority, the reformers refused to acknowledge the legitimacy of such oversight or authority. Social hierarchies are a mutually-negotiated phenomenon, and the members of the Movement would not recognize a share of power belonging to the church leaders when they made demands for orthodoxy.35 Essential to the holding of such a position was Campbell's allocation to all Christians--and thus to all members of the Movement--of the rights of the clergy.36

Such an allocation seemed especially acceptable to the people of the frontier. William Martin Smith has pointed out that people who lived on the frontier were
used to caring for all their own needs, including those that were medicinal. (It was not unusual to find occasional notices in the Harbinger about such subjects as, "Cure for Hydrophobia."

Presumably, "anyone could 'be' almost anything he wanted to be with little or no preparation." If the pioneers of the Movement perceived that their lonely need to blaze a trail "back to Jerusalem" was one they could best fulfill without the traditional clergy, then they could also do without their parent churches entirely. To some extent consequent to Campbell's de-mystification of the clergy (discussed in Chapter Five), one may see Campbell's needs intervention as, in part, a side-effect of the power intervention.

As opposition from the churches—especially the Baptists—increased, Campbell integrated this non-needs-meeting response into his vision of the Movement, reporting it in such a way as to increase the members' distrust of hierarchy. He pictured his followers as being in the same situation as Christ persecuted by the Pharisees; as parallel to the faithful remnant of the Jewish nation, the only faithful in a nation of reprobates; as suffering for the same reasons as the early Christians who were persecuted by some Jewish leaders, and then by the Roman authorities:

In Essex county, Virginia, several attempts of the "star chamber" stamp, have been recently made against a very intelligent and pious brother, who
has rendered himself obnoxious to some little high
priests in his vicinity, by his boldness in the faith
of the ancient gospel; but some of the more sagacious
ones began to see that their commands and threats
were likely to have the same effect with those of the
venerable Fathers of the Sanhedrin, who gave an
injunction to Peter and John in old times to speak
no more in their name, and they have desisted.\(^39\)

Two years later, again referring tacitly to the story of
Peter and John, he wrote,

But the Rubicon is passed. . . . [S]ix min-
isters of the first standing are excommunicated,
with more than the same number of churches, from the
Dover [Baptist] Association, because they choose to
obey God rather than men.\(^40\)

Again, calling to mind the famous Roman persecutions, he
wrote, "The greatest efforts are making to create divi-
sions and to blame them on us. Nero set Rome on fire, and
blamed the Christians for it."\(^41\) By identifying the
Disciples with the early Christians, Campbell also rein-
forced the individual-based need for faithfulness to God
in the face of corporate opposition and disapproval.

He further pictured his members as being presently
in the position that was once occupied by the great
Protestant reformers, such as Wycliffe and Luther, who
were opposed by the Catholic Church:

Numbers of our neighboring clergy read the
Christian Baptist, and having read it, as public
censors of the press, tell their people, on "the
Sabbath," that they ought not to read it: that it
is dangerous to families to admit it within their
walls. . . . On all occasions, when the craft has
been in danger, they have acted thus. The clergy
once obtained a decree that every man's goods should
be confiscated, who admitted into his house the
writings of a monk [Luther], who opposed the priest-
hood, and recommended the bible.\textsuperscript{42}

By calling to mind such antecedent reforming martyrs, Campbell was able to make sense of the opposition faced by his followers. Such opposition was sometimes mild and suasive, as in the gentle remonstrance of an unnamed Baptist leader who wrote that, in Campbell's reformation, "I find much to condemn, and many things to approve."\textsuperscript{43} On other occasions, though, the opposition was bitter and compelling, as in the case of one member of a Baptist congregation who was expelled from the congregation because he was guilty of reading the \textit{Millennial Harbinger}.\textsuperscript{44} By his references to the accounts of earlier reformers and martyrs, Campbell provided a metaphor that explained their own experience. This metaphor was accepted as reality, thus providing labels for both the in-group and the out-groups, and also serving tacitly to invoke God's blessings on the Movement at the time that it suggested an ultimate victory.\textsuperscript{45} For example, in reporting some acts of opposition from prominent Baptist ministers, Andrew Broaddus and Robert B. Semple, Campbell wrote,

I cannot but say that this caucus and these resolutions transcend anything I expected from that quarter; and hence I venture to predict that the reformation in Virginia is now about to march with greater velocity.\textsuperscript{46}

In this respect, the exclusion of the reformers from the churches became a metaphor, calling up the image
of the suffering servant. The persecution served as a sign of innocence, spiritual authenticity of message, and expected ultimate vindication. In turn, this image served to suggest how the reformers ought to act toward their persecutors. They must not rebel but rather should suffer patiently, as the host churches expel them. The initiative for the separation was to be that of their opponents. Thus, the originally felt need for freedom as individual pioneers, coupled with Campbell's interpretation of the meaning of their persecution, helped shape their perception of themselves and of their destiny.

This connection between present persecution and future glory is exemplified in Campbell's response when his Mahoning Association was "anathematized" and he was attacked as a heretic by several Baptist associations:

If there be a division, gentlemen, you will make it, not I; and the more you oppose us with the weight of your censure, like the palm tree we will grow the faster. I am for peace, for union, for harmony, for co-operation with all good men. But I fear you not; if you will fling firebrands, arrows and discords into the army of the faith, you will repent it, not we. We covet not persecution, but we disregard it.47

Campbell left no doubt in the minds of his readers where to place the guilt for the sin of division. In another article, he wrote,

Who makes divisions now? the man who sets up his private judgments as the standard of truth, and compels submission to them; or the man who will bear with a brother who thinks in some things differently from him? . . .
... As well might they blame the sun for its light and heat, as blame us for creating divisions. When we shall have cut off from the church any person or persons because of a difference of opinion, then may they say, with reason, we cause divisions. Till then it is gratuitous. They are the heretics, not we. Yes, they are the heresiarchs, and will be so regarded by all the intelligent on earth, and by all in heaven.48

Those closing words served to remind the reader that the experience of exclusion or persecution for the cause was not shameful but rather glorious in the sight of heaven and the enlightened earth. Three years later, he wrote in a similar vein,

All the world must see that we have been forced into a separate communion. We were driven out of doors, because we preferred the approbation of the Lord to the approbation of any sect in Christendom.49

In the face of such interpretation, continued persecution actually reinforced the image the reformers had of themselves, and thus became, in a strange way, needs-meeting behavior. If this seems perverse, one should remember that human needs originate in "persons' propensity to construe a connected world in a universe made problematic by the logical arbitrariness of symbol-making activity, itself."50 If one is a reformer, then, such treatment is only to be expected.

By 1823, the impending separation of the reformers from the Baptists was evident, although not yet complete. By this time, members of the Movement had their own paper, as well as some evangelists and a few church buildings.
They needed also a distinguishing name, and Campbell proposed and argued for the label of "Disciples." Other influential leaders of the Movement, including Barton W. Stone and the elder Campbell, preferred the name, "Christians," but Campbell rejected that label because it did not serve in a denominational and practical way adequately to distinguish the reformers from all other Christians in the world. (No doubt, he was also concerned that his movement not be confused with the followers of Stone, who called themselves simply, "Christians.") This need for a separate identity may be seen as one effect of a then-featured emphasis on personal doctrinal purity.

In the needs cycle illustrated on page 330, the appropriate needs-meeting response to which the early reformers were hopefully open, was for the churches to listen to their minority voice, to engage in dialogue, and to reform in doctrine and practice, as their errors were demonstrated. Ultimately, the ideal unity is a state that could be realized only when all other churches have joined the Movement. To enjoy a unity on any other basis would be to compromise. If one has recaptured the primitive faith, then to receive others on any other basis would be blasphemous. This vicious circle is especially imminent when the ideology of the Movement features the pursuit of purity of doctrine over the pursuit of unity.
For example, in 1830, the Mahoning Association (no longer Baptist) disbanded, even against Campbell's will, at a time when members were questioning the scriptural legitimacy of religious associations. This event also reminds us that intervenors influence but do not control the system in which they intervene.

The threat of a vicious circle was present while individual-based needs were emphasized because, in the attempt by members of the Movement to recapture a primitive, independent congregational form of church government, it was easy for them to view all inter-church cooperation as tainted, and to discard it as a relic of a worldly church. Such cooperation would appear to be the first step in rebuilding what they had so carefully just torn down. The significant felt needs were those that were based in the initiative of the individual, and the consequent virtues that were encouraged and praised by Campbell were those of personal and family piety, knowledge, and generosity. One reader exemplified the hostility that some felt toward those who would advocate group-stressing needs, such as cooperation in sending out evangelists. From Camden, New Jersey, he wrote,

We will not disguise the fact, however, that we are all as much opposed to hireling proclaimers as we are to hireling priests; and while we believe that they who publish the gospel should live of the gospel, we have no warrant for stipulated sums or salaries, and are sorry to see an itching for these Babylonish relics among the reformers.
An even more vehement example came from "A. B. G.," who, in an open letter, wrote,

... I see by the last Harbinger (No. 10, Vol. ii.) an association in embryo. It was from exactly such a beginning that the many-headed monster grew. There never was, and there never can be, any occasion for such a combination of "the churches" to build up the Redeemer's kingdom. His kingdom is built—is come.

In confirmation that such distrust of hierarchy and a concomitant reluctance to acknowledge collectivity-stressing needs was not an isolated attitude, an Ohio writer lamented that he found it difficult to get the reformers in Clinton and "Green" Counties to agree to share the responsibility of sending out an evangelist. The reason for the difficulty, he wrote, was that "they so much fear that we will fall into some of the old sectarian tracks, that they would prefer idleness to the doing of anything." This intra-congregational isolation had, as a side effect on power, the result of giving more influence to the editors of the Movement, as the shapers of ideology.

As perceived needs for individual expression, independence, and freedom continued to be felt, they shaped the interrelationship of individual members. There arose a distrust of leadership even within their own churches. Some essential roles seemed to require financial support for successful enactment, such as those of missionary, evangelist, and sometimes even local minister. Often,
this support was beyond the means of one congregation to provide. Unless cooperation was forthcoming, such enterprises as missionary activity and the building of churches were likely to suffer.

Robert Richardson noted, in 1831, that Campbell already was urging the churches to arrange themselves into districts in order to expedite cooperative ventures. But Richardson found among the churches that misapplication of his [Campbell's] remarks on 'hirelings' in the 'Christian Baptist,' and of his example in preaching without charge, still repressed the exercise of liberality needed to sustain an effective ministry. 58

As late as 1838, Scott complained that "there has been of late no additions to the evangelical corps; nor is there the least prospect of additions in the future." 59 Later in that year, Campbell relayed to his readers some information from Barton Stone--"that many, if not most of the preachers in that section around him [Illinois], have left the field of Christ and gone into the field of the world to make a living for their families." The reason for such defection was that

There is no co-operation; and there are few men who will go at their own charges, and devote learning and talent, neglect their families, forsake their wives and children, wear out their constitution and immolate themselves on the altar of disinterested benevolence, while their converts and brethren at home live at their ease, . . . 60

In the field of higher learning, the needs for cooperation were being felt as acutely as in the evangelistic field.
Scott complained that, while the first college in the Movement, Bacon College, had an excellent faculty and deserved support,

as regards things—a philosophical and chemical apparatus, collections, a library, and almost every thing which a scientific and literary education makes necessary, the college is in very great want. 61

It is clear that, soon after the split from the Baptists, there were no overtures made toward churches apart from those in the Movement. The growth and survival of the separate Movement demanded consolidation, not the dilution of its distinctiveness. Even within the congregation of reformers, the needs of the individual and of the individual congregation were deemed most important. Separation from the Baptists, then, did not in itself encourage any perception of collectivity-stressing needs, whether one considers the group to be all Christians or only those who were in the Movement. For example, in 1830, in a Harbinger article, Campbell protested against cooperation with a Bible society, and he published a criticism of missionary societies. Furthermore, Campbell was aloof toward a proposed union in 1830 and 1831 between his followers and those of Stone. This period was marked in the monthly journals by some testy correspondence between the two editors. By that time, though, other intervenors in the Movement had given presence to a need for unity, and there seemed to result from this intervention a pre-
eminent need among the members to demonstrate the truth of the claim of their Movement that their reformation was designed ultimately to unite Christians.62

After the union meetings began, they were cemented not by organizational ties, which would have been contrary to the genius of the Movement, but rather by teams of traveling evangelists, prominent preachers from both camps.63 The resulting drive in favor of evangelism, coupled with the exposure of the Disciples of Campbell to the Christians of Stone (who were more experienced in cooperation), encouraged further cooperation in response to the individually felt need for spreading the gospel.64 Even Campbell's scepticism about the value of this particular union soon vanished.

Campbell's Second Needs Intervention

Brown posits that "periodical reversals of trends toward either increased or decreased 'need' salience are necessary to prevent the demise of a rhetorical vision."65 Campbell eventually influenced a reversal of trends in the direction of group-stressing needs rather than individual-stressing ones within the system of his Movement. Such a reversal, though, was preceded by a change in Campbell's own perception of salient needs. Perhaps it was as a result of the successful split from the Baptist family that, to Campbell, needs based on a perception of the
reformers as a body became paramount. Such needs were made real to Campbell by correspondence from his readers and also by what he learned from his personal visits to various parts of the United States. According to Campbell's biographer, it was in 1831 that Campbell began to perceive the need for cooperation within the membership of the reformers in order to support traveling evangelists. Richardson noted this perception in his journal:

In May '31, [Campbell] begins essays on 'co-operation of churches.' [These essays were printed in the Harbinger.] [He] began to feel the necessity of conjoint effort to sustain the preaching of the gospel—Churches were now separated from the Baptists—66

Apparently, to Richardson's mind, there was a connection between the change in Campbell's thinking and the separation.

Actually, as early as January that year, Campbell had begun to hint in print at the usefulness of cooperative meetings.67 That need was a consequence of Campbell's growing awareness that there were opportunities for growth that could be best met by employing paid evangelists who could spend all their time preaching, without the necessity of farming or earning their living in some other way. Moreover, he believed that there were New Testament precedents for such a procedure. William Martin Smith has suggested that some of the reasons for this fresh perception on Campbell's part included the unexpectedly rapid growth of the
country, which provided surprising opportunities for spreading the message of the reformers; the union with the Stoneites, who never had been as virulent as Campbell in opposing the system of paid clergy; Campbell's "growing dissatisfaction" with uneducated preaching from the Baptists; and his awareness of the needs of preachers like Walter Scott, evangelists not gifted with Campbell's financial resources.68

At any rate, from Campbell's viewpoint, it was now apparent that a need for cooperation had to be made salient to the churches. He began to advocate the satisfaction of group-based needs rather than individual-based ones by featuring such needs and also by suggesting how those needs could be met.

Of the two strategies available for Campbell's needs-intervention, he acted to stress collectivity-related needs.69 The result of that emphasis was to increase the salience of those needs and to prompt appropriate needs-meeting behavior among the churches of the Movement.

One tactic that was available to Campbell, and which he found useful, was to attribute directly and to affirm a need for cooperative behavior.70 For example, he described the horror of division: "... but for division hell had never begun to be... . . . the first thrill which creation felt, when discord shook the universe,
struck it off from heaven: . . ." In the face of the tragedy of disunion, he urged the adoption of every expedient that would help to unify all Christians within the congregations, and also produce co-operation among congregations. He made an appeal
to all the friends of Jesus on the nature and extent of their obligations, not only to avoid all occasions of division in the family of God, but to abjure everything heretical in their views and schismatical in their operations; and not only this, but to adopt every measure and exert every influence which may gather into one the scattered flock, and terminate the most unhallowed warfare which ever disgraced any portion of the human race.\textsuperscript{71}

Such comments also illustrate the close connection that existed in Campbell's mind between dogmatism in matters of doctrine, and consequent disunion in the church.

One of his maneuvers for encouraging the perception of a new felt need for cooperative effort in supporting evangelists was to call attention in his monthly journal both to the physical needs of specific evangelists that were unmet, and also to the needs of specific congregations that were lacking in preachers. For example, a letter he published observed that there was a willingness to support evangelists in Georgetown, Kentucky, but

there is no system among the churches, or method of remunerating the laborers for their services. There are enough brethren in this section of the state to support six or eight Evangelists. They have but two, and they are barely supported. There must be a change in the state of things, or the cause will languish.\textsuperscript{72}
At another time, Campbell published a letter from a member of a church in Richmond, Virginia, who requested him specifically to encourage Peter Ainslie to travel through that area of Virginia as an evangelist. Campbell agreed that it seemed to be a wise idea, and then encouraged support by adding a hint that

the brethren, no doubt, will cheerfully contribute and co-operate through an agent in Richmond, for his support in the work; and there is none more fitting than William Bootwright, and I think none will more cheerfully attend to it. . . . For the wise, a single word is enough.73

Again, after criticizing those evangelists who had given up their preaching because they received inadequate support, he had a word for the church members who had let their evangelists down.

I will acknowledge before the world my want of logical discrimination, when any person proves to me that he would lay down his life for Christ or heaven, or that he possesses the faith which conquers the world, who cannot, while he has it in his power, lay down some of the good things of time and sense, either for the sake of the orphan, the widow, or the preacher of the gospel whom the Lord has specially fore-ordained to live by the gospel, temporally, as well as spiritually and eternally.74

Campbell suggested that failures in supporting evangelists demonstrated the inability of individual churches to do all that needed to be done in supporting such workers. The isolationist attitude, then, was an inadequate one and was crippling the church.

We want co-operation. Some of our brethren are afraid of its power; others complain of its inefficiency. . . . Some think that co-operative meetings
are too weak, too languid, too cold-hearted, too slow in their movements to do any good, and advise individuals not to wait on them, but trust to the Lord for help, and go-ahead. Well, a few may try this, and I have no doubt it will fare with them as it has fared with those who recommend it. . . .

The Lord will neither send ravens nor angels to feed them [the evangelists], so long as he has a people on earth who neglect their duty. . . . For this we need sometimes the co-operation of six or ten rich brethren to send out a preacher; sometimes the co-operation of a whole church, or of two or three churches, to send out one evangelist.75

Other maneuvers that Campbell used to encourage the perception of a need included reporting co-operative meetings in a positive light, and demonstrating a scriptural precedent for such plans of ministerial support.76

A second tactic (actually a combination of the remaining two discussed by Brown as available to the intervenor) was to encourage the advocacy of needs-meeting behavior, along with encouraging openness and attention toward those who were seen as having the ability to meet the felt needs.77 Examples of the enacting of these tactics include his recommendations of preacher-training meetings among the evangelists, encouragement of local and statewide conferences that could support peripatetic evangelists, and his urging of support for colleges--particularly, his own Bethany College--that would train the children of members in a non-sectarian way.78 Of the significance of Bethany College, he wrote:

It was in its conception, is now in its existence, and will ever be in its fortunes, identified with the cause of the Reformation, and essential to its prog-
ress and prosperity.\textsuperscript{79}

A different type of maneuver was the use of his own example. By fund-raising activity, such as urging members to contribute to a cause, Campbell confirmed that a need existed, prescribed an appropriate response, encouraged advocacy of the felt need, and personally helped to meet it. One example of this maneuver was his acceptance of the presidency of a cooperative venture centered in Wheeling.\textsuperscript{80} A little later, he accepted the presidency of the American Christian Missionary Society, a position he held for the first sixteen years of the organization's existence.\textsuperscript{81} Similar examples include Campbell's attendance at, and advertising of union meetings and preacher-training meetings among the churches.\textsuperscript{82} One of his glowing reports, printed in the \textit{Harbinger}, began,

The Disciples of Christ, in the county of Trumbull [Ohio], annually meet on the Friday preceding the last Lord's day [Sunday] in August, and continue their meeting for four days! This year the meeting was held at the new village on the canal, called Newton Falls. It was decidedly the largest and most orderly meeting we have ever seen on the Western Reserve; and, we might add, the most happy. It was attended from the first hour to the last word, by an intelligent and attentive auditory.\textsuperscript{83}

He added that the attendance was from "5 to 7000 persons."

Another frequently-used maneuver was his exposition of the rationality of supporting cooperative ventures, coupled with his demonstration of acceptable scriptural precedent for such a policy. Here, for example, is an
appeal to rationality coupled with a reference to apostolic precedent:

That we should be fearful of doing wrong by setting a bad example, is reasonable enough; but that Christians should do nothing for the conversion of the world beyond the immediate influence of their personal behaviour, must spring from a morbid sensibility, from a sort of mental or moral dyspepsia, of which they ought to be cured if possible; for to do nothing, is to set an example more injurious to society than any other of which I can conceive a Christian capable. . . .

Co-operation among Christian churches in all the affairs of the common salvation, is not only inscribed on every page of the apostolic history, but is itself of the very essence of the Christian institution.84

In some respects, Campbell's new emphasis on group-based needs, such as benevolence and organized evangelism, may be seen as a side-effect of a power intervention. That intervention encourages the viewing of other Christians within the Movement as co-workers in a cooperative enterprise, aiming not only at attaining personal salvation but also at performing moral and social good through the spreading of the gospel and the ideology of the Movement. Knowledge of the better way brings with it an obligation to share it and sometimes to contend for it.

This emphasis on cooperative labor in order to meet corporate needs resulted in definite growth. Leroy Garrett summarized early accomplishments that suggest Campbell's needs-intervention was not in vain:

In Indiana four churches cooperated in sending out an evangelist as early as 1833, and by 1839 representatives from 115 churches gathered for their first state convention. Churches in Eastern Virginia began cooperative meetings in the mid 1830's. A letter to
Campbell reveals that by 1839 they had "messengers and communications" from 20-25 congregations. . . . Even in Tennessee cooperative efforts began as early as 1842.85

Another Needs Intervention

At a period somewhat later than the second needs-intervention just described, Campbell attempted another intervention on a larger scale, in the direction of encouraging greater openness within the Movement toward churches of other denominations. For the most part, this attempted intervention was a more restrained one. As early as 1834, he suggested that those denominations which believed in baptism by immersion might cooperate in building a central baptistry in the community for all to share.86 From the beginning, an essential part of the plea of the reformers had been that unity was both possible and desirable—at least, when it is based on the acceptance of the gospel facts alone, apart from opinions and interpretations of them.87 Beginning in the latter years of the 1830's, though, union became a matter of more prominence in Campbell's writing, as he highlighted the need for tolerance and cooperation. For example, in 1836, Campbell quoted with severe disapproval Dr. John Thomas, who had referred to Methodists, Presbyterians, and other Protestants as "the synagogue of Satan."88 Such "hard and bitter" words did not, Campbell thought, reflect the true spirit of a reformer.
At the conclusion of the Harbinger for 1835, he presented a message to his fellow-editors encouraging them to join with him in manifesting an agreeable spirit in the coming year in the interests of harmony rather than debate.

We are very tired of controversy, and still more of that unkind, uncourteous, and proscriptive spirit which appears to be the genius of every sectarian establishment. I would, indeed, very gladly bestow one hundred volumes of the warmest religious controversy as a reward to that gentleman who would teach me how to contend for the doctrine of Christ without offending any person in the world. Offenses must come; yet I think it more than probable that we occasion many more than the Lord calls for; . . . Let us, then, brethren of the Press, all try to improve a little in our next volumes. I am willing to try.89

For the sake of consistency, such intervention is likely to be attended by an emphasis in the interpretive cycle on the value of unity over purity of doctrine. This emphasis was reflected clearly in Campbell's various replies and defenses in response to the Lunenburg letter, which have already been discussed, and which were published about this time in 1836.

Campbell enacted this strategy through what Brown labelled "collectivity-stressing needmaking."90 The stressing of collectivity-based needs implies an increased emphasis in Campbell's mind on his vision of the ultimate destiny of the Movement--the hoped-for goal of uniting the Christian world could not be achieved alone. In 1839, in one of eight articles he published on unity, he urged the advocacy of harmony, and the concomitant openness toward
other Christians:

It is indeed profitable to think, to talk, to write on the subject of union; . . . it will bring us to exchange a little more of the civilities and courtesies of the Christian profession, and perhaps tend a little to the cultivation of that Christian and catholic spirit that must precede the union of Christians.91

He followed this commendation of openness with a radical proposal that representatives of all Protestant parties—perhaps of the Catholic churches, too—should meet for the purpose of determining to unite upon the basis of only those principles and beliefs that all delegates could agree on.92

The fresh intervention by Campbell was an attempt to reverse the earlier emphasis on individual-stressing needs within the Movement. By this switch of emphasis, he helped to avoid a vicious circle that would have led to an isolated exclusivity among his followers.

The new intervention was made plausible by the fact that, in the course of time, Campbell had met with some approval from people outside his own movement. Especially was this true after his popular debates in which he supported the mainstream Protestant beliefs against those of the Catholics and the agnostics.93 Some of his positions on social issues also met with approval outside the ranks of his followers, such as his moderate stand on slavery and his advocacy of a program of universal education.94
That Campbell was perceived as "safer" in the later 1830's than he had been earlier is confirmed by such events as his invitation to speak at the meeting of the Cincinnati College of Teachers in 1836, and his welcome by various clergy that he met on his tours. Increased familiarity with his doctrines apparently made them seem less threatening than they had appeared at first; Campbell occasionally thought he saw some of his teachings adopted by other churches. As a result, by 1839, he estimated that his own reputation among the denominations had improved.

The most obnoxious volume I ever wrote was the 1st volume of the Christian Baptist, 1823. The universal sentiment or opinion among all parties is, that we are annually becoming more orthodox, and that one or two points excepted, all good Protestants could most cordially embrace us in the arms of their communion. I do not say that this is a just view of the present state of the controversy; but certainly it is now affirmed very generally through the length and breadth of the land to be a true statement of the matter.

Simultaneously with the enhancement of Campbell's reputation, the Movement grew and began to look more like a new denomination and less like a band of heretics who broke away from the Baptist church. It was around the end of 1834, Richardson believed, that many were led to discover that they had been mistaken in regard to Mr. Campbell's views and purposes. The Reformers, in consequence, began to receive frequent accessions from the Baptist churches in various places, and the community became more and more enlightened as to the real nature of the reform proposed.
At least in the eyes of Campbell and Richardson, then, the relationship between the reformers and other Protestants was coming to be seen as a more cooperative one. In the light of this change in power relationships, and in harmony with his view of the purpose of the Movement, Campbell apparently felt that it was time to call the attention of his readers to the need for Christian unity that extended beyond the bounds of their own group.

In order to enact the strategy already mentioned, that of stressing collectivity-based needs, Campbell labelled members of other churches (though not all of them) as "Christians," a naming that was essential to any form of unity. He did this most clearly and effectively in the responses to the Lunenburg letter, and in the series of articles that ensued, "Christians among the Sects."

Another of his maneuvers was exemplified in his later debates—that of identification of himself with the Protestant world at large, rather than with only his small portion of it. According to Garrison and DeGroot, in his 1829 debate with Robert Owen, the agnostic, Campbell's role was "to stand forth as the champion not only of Christianity but of the basic concepts of a religious view of the world as well." To Richardson, the result of Campbell's taking such a stand was to elevate
Mr. Campbell to a very high position in the estimation of the entire religious community. For a time, party feeling seemed to be held in abeyance, and all were disposed to acknowledge their obligations to the defender of the common faith.\textsuperscript{101}

A similar illustration of Campbell's identification with all Protestants is found in his 1837 debate with Bishop Robert Purcell of the Roman Catholic Church. In this debate, he insisted on wearing no more narrow name than that of "Protestant." He began the debate with that declaration:

I appear before you at this time, by the good providence of our Heavenly Father, in defence of the truth, and in explanation of the great redeeming, regenerating and ennobling principles of Protestantism, as opposed to the claims and pretensions of the Roman Catholic Church. I come not here to advocate the particular tenets of any sect, but to defend the great cardinal principles of Protestantism.\textsuperscript{102}

Later, Campbell explained that he had been pursuing a deliberate policy of advocating harmony and an enhanced openness toward other Protestants and that their separation had been forced upon them:

We have always been accused of aspiring to build up and head a party, while in truth we have always been forced to occupy the ground on which we stand. I have for one or two years past labored to annul this impression, . . . On this account I consented the more readily to defend Protestantism; and I have, in more ways than I shall now state, endeavored to show the Protestant public that it is with the greatest reluctance we are compelled to stand aloof from them--that they are the cause of this great "schism," as they call it, and not we.\textsuperscript{103}

Campbell's openness was being responded to by many Protestants, in Richardson's opinion. Speaking of that
increased acceptance from other denominations, Richardson wrote,

Inasmuch as advocates of ecumenical enterprise today frequently feature a need for members of various religions to learn from each other, it is important to observe that such a motive had no place in Campbell's ideology. He believed that no other church would survive as such when the Millennium arrived. As Tuveson commented about the Campbell-Owen debate, "Campbell could condemn most of mankind's religious history almost as vehemently as Owen; he proclaimed 'the incompatibility of any sectarian establishment, now known on earth, with the genius of the glorious age to come.'" Instead of engaging in a mutually helpful search for truth, to Campbell's mind, other denominations needed to learn from the Disciples' churches how to discard their own creeds so that union could be based on the Bible alone. "Every sectarian in the land," he wrote in 1834, "how honest and pious soever, ought to bury his sectarianism and all his other
sins of omission and commission in 'the bath of regeneration [baptism by immersion.'"]^{106}

There was here no hint of a doctrinal compromise. Nor was the openness that he advocated unlimited. He complained of undiscriminating liberality and the popular tendency of the nominally religious "to place the world in the church--to embrace in the bosom of Christian charity, every sincere Turk, Jew, Pagan, Infidel, Catholic, and Protestant in one charitable communion in the bonds of honest endeavoring sincerity."^{107} In 1837, he remarked that, far from being ready to compromise, his fourteen years as an editor and public advocate had thoroughly tested his principles; the fact that they were yet intact "certainly has emboldened us to defend with renewed zeal their divine authenticity, and to urge their acceptance upon our fellow-professors of all the sects into which Christendom at this hour is most unfortunately severed."^{108}

The reasons presented by Campbell as motivation for unity included the achievement of greater efficiency in mobilizing the resources of the Christian world as a whole for projects such as publishing Bibles and encouraging education. (In January 1837, he suggested to the Baptists of Kentucky that they should have cooperated with the Disciples in building Georgetown College for the good of all.)^{109} He also featured unity as an end to be
desired in itself, because the achievement of unity would fulfill the will of God for the church, and would be a testimony to the unchristian world of the harmonizing power of God's love.\textsuperscript{110}

Campbell's attempted intervention stirred up discussion, but it was not unanimously in agreement with him. In his monthly, the \textit{Evangelist}, Walter Scott published a number of articles on unity, often in criticism of Campbell's specific proposals for attaining it.

Campbell's attribution of a group-stressing need for cooperation in various projects was never accepted in the Movement as widely as had the earlier intervention, which contributed to the creation of the reforming community. Scott printed a discourse by a Brother F. W. Emmons which criticized cooperation with anyone other than reformers and Baptists, and which used language reminiscent of that of Campbell in the \textit{Christian Baptist} days.\textsuperscript{111} A little later, in the May issue of the \textit{Gospel Advocate}, Emmons accused Campbell of being inconsistent with himself in his recent stand on Christians among the sects.\textsuperscript{112}

Other of his followers saw in this attempted attribution of a need for harmony with all supposed Christians among the sects the danger of an impending vicious circle that would lead to the eventual abandonment of the position that earlier had made the Movement unique. For example, T. M. Henley, who was a close friend of Campbell,
was nevertheless suspicious of the very idea of cooperative meetings even when limited to the churches of the Movement:

it seems to me like a departure from the simplicity of the Christian institution to have co-operation meetings with Presidents and Secretaries, calling for the Messengers of churches, and laying off districts. This was nearly the principle upon which the Baptists began in Old Virginia. . . .

More critical was Dr. Thomas' ad hominem argument, when he reminded his readers that Campbell had been trained as a youth "in a University of Scotland, the land itself of ghosts and witches, in all the mysticism of that gloomy sect [the Presbyterian Church]." He added that, in his opinion, Campbell has not succeeded in emancipating himself from all his popular divinity; hence every now and then, but more frequently of late, you find him standing up as the champion of human tradition, without indeed knowing it. He seems to manifest an undue sympathy with the sects of the Antichristian World: so that I have reason to believe he is rising in their estimation— at least, in these parts.

Such members as Thomas sought in that way to delegitimize Campbell's need attribution. A further example of the denial of a need for unity is found in an article that Scott wrote as a response to an article by Cyrus Bosworth, who treated all Christians as though they are essentially one, regardless of denomination. Scott answered that unity could be realized only by converting the religious world to the truth.

In relation to the Unity of the Saints, I here most solemnly profess, that at the Restoration of the true gospel of Jesus Christ [for which Scott
considered himself responsible], in 1827, nothing except the conversion of the world was more before my mind then the union of Christians; and I absolutely thought the, as I think now, that the unity of the body of Christ would be effected by the diffusion of those principles and privileges which are inculcated and bestowed in the true gospel. I was both encouraged and confirmed in this belief by the fact of all kinds of partizans leaving their own sects. . . . I accord to Bro. Cyrus Bosworth that the reasons mentioned by him may be very cogent ones for forbearance, but they never can form a bond of union.115

Sometimes the unfavorable responses to Campbell's needs intervention took the form merely of featuring needs that were individual-based. In 1840, Scott wrote of the need for each congregation to be "progressive" in encouraging piety, better singing in the worship services, more regularity in celebrating the communion service, and more exercise of prayer. Failure in these duties was responsible for the occasional "languor and decay" seen in some congregations.116 Furthermore, Scott took pains to attend meetings arranged among the Disciples, and often reported on their accomplishments, thus tacitly emphasizing the independence and self-sufficiency of the churches.117 He was especially devoted to emphasizing the need for purity over that of unity. He saw potentially a unique purity in the Movement which could excite the admiration and attract the attention of the world:

To effect the union of the Church, some party must arise or must have arisen who shall be seen coming up out of this wilderness of parties leaning upon the Scriptures alone as the Spouse in the Canticles was seen coming up out of the wilderness leaning upon her beloved. This party resting upon the word of God
for its faith, must publically avow and particularly sustain original Christianity both in word and doctrine, in command and ordinance, in morals and discipline, in worship and order, in principle and privilege, in faith and hope, in love and union.  

Campbell's continued emphasis on cooperative adventures with the denominational world was embarrassing to some who found it easier to emend the power share they allotted to him than to accept this new needs attribution. Dr. Thomas' example has been mentioned above. A later instance is the example of David Lipscomb, an editor within the Movement. He decided that the reason for what was to him Campbell's inexplicable behavior in accepting the presidency of the American Christian Missionary Society in 1849 was that the leader's brief imprisonment and illness in Europe in 1847, coupled with the simultaneous death of his favorite son, had affected Campbell's mental balance.

In contrast to Campbell's intervention into the power system of his Movement, and his repeated balancing of extremes in the interpretive cycle, he never reversed this latter intervention into the needs cycle, either in the decade of 1830-1840, or later. There were, though, some interdenominational projects that he considered not worthy of participating in, such as societies in favor of abolition of slavery, and temperance societies.

Campbell's latter attempt at needs intervention was less effective than the earlier one, and has had less
influence on the shaping of the Movement's ideology since Campbell's day. In fact, as Leroy Garrett traced the history of the Movement into the middle of the twentieth century, he found the causes of modern division among the reformers are not to be found as much in differences of opinions over issues, as simply in the lack of any strong desire for unity. There seems to be little evidence of a perception of collectivity-stressing needs. Hence, rare appeals for unity have found no audience. Garrett wrote, "Neither the conservative nor the liberal elements showed any real interest in preserving their unity heritage, even when appealed to in a dramatic and forceful manner by their own respected leaders." As further evidence, he reported that, in the 1960's,

there was a series of internal unity forums between some leaders of [two of the groups into which the Movement has split], but the old-timers that attended them report that they were of such little consequence that "they were not worth mentioning."122

In closing, we should recall the close interrelationship that exists between the needs cycle and the interpretive cycle. Whenever and wherever members of the Movement see themselves as the faithful remnant, tending to engage in purging behavior, the thought of associating with others outside the Movement is a threatening one; therefore, to avoid pollution, there will be little perception of community needs based on interdependence. When this trend is reversed, and narrowness is replaced by
openness rooted in a vision of the body as an accepting and eventually victorious church, the need for harmony and cooperation impels the members to transcend barriers. When these trends alternate, being switched at strategic times or among strategic people, the rhetorical vision flourishes. If intervention aiming at switching extremes is ineffective, then the Movement will tend to spin off some members whose primary goal is reform, and who will vie with each other in being more strict and narrow in their beliefs. Other members will aim primarily at unity, and they will build an ever-broader platform, abandoning the reformation part of their heritage in order to achieve the unifying dream.
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CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

In David L. Swanson's earlier article about rhetorical criticism, he explained that criticism is impossible without a theoretical underpinning:

Epistemologically, all rhetorical criticism is best understood as an interpretive activity involving the application of representational/constitutive schemas to rhetorical phenomena and, hence, no criticism is "theory" (representation or interpretation) free.¹

This being the case, in the process of carrying out rhetorical criticism, the critic must hold either the theory or else the rhetorical event as open to doubt. In this study, I have taken what Swanson calls "the mundane stance" toward the theory or interpretive system, which is Brown's model of social intervention. Such a stance assumes, at least for the time being, that the theory does not need proof, but rather is a given tool that may be found useful in explicating human behavior. The merit of such a study, if any, is to be found in the faithfulness of the application of the interpretive system.² This present study is an attempt to apply Brown's model carefully, both in broad outline and in specific detail, to a significant communication event.
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The two possible epistemic outcomes of such an investigation are, according to Swanson, the illumination of rhetorical theory and the illuminating of rhetorical acts. The first possibility, one which is realized in this study, does not mean that the theory is confirmed by the research, but that it is explicated more thoroughly by it.

Presumably, the more applications of a theory through criticism, the better we may understand subtle nuances and non-obvious implications of the theory. One who pursues this end seeks no confirmation of the theory; rather, he seeks a better understanding of the theory's expectations about and concrete implications for specific rhetorical phenomena. Although a study of this nature does not confirm the theory, Swanson made clear that the results could possibly be of use in later discussions by meta-critics of the merits of the theory.

The second possible epistemic outcome is that of illuminating the rhetorical act under discussion. This has been the more prominent goal of this study. I have applied the model to a careful examination of historical artifacts in order to determine, with the perspective provided by the theory, how Alexander Campbell, the primary intervenor or change-agent, helped to shape the Stone-Campbell Movement through his journals, debates, and interpersonal communication in such a way that division within the Movement was avoided, especially during the years of 1830-1840.
The theory does not suggest that an intervenor purposely attempt to shape each of the cycles, but I have shown that, at different times in the early history of the Movement, Campbell did exactly that. First, between 1820 and 1830, he invited to himself the allocation of a power-share among local congregations, his audiences, and the readers of his monthly. He further encouraged perceptions of competitive relationships between the clergy of the Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian Churches and their laity. He demystified the role of the clergy and invited the perception of himself as a prophet-like messenger. During the next decade, he attempted to encourage a cooperative relationship between the clergy and the laity within his Movement.

In Chapter VI, I showed that this reforming Movement was torn between tendencies to adhere to a separatist view of themselves that emphasized purity of membership and doctrine at the expense of devotion to Christian unity on one hand, and, on the other, a view of themselves that emphasized tolerance of diversity (including the Thomas heresy and the Mormons) at the expense of doctrinal integrity. Campbell intervened among his followers to impede a switch to either of these paradigms by his strategic acts of counter-balancing.

Finally, the need for individual autonomy and freedom to live out the reforms the members perceived as
important—a need that was essential to the early survival of the Movement—became threatening to its growth after the Movement attained independence. As an intervenor, Campbell acted by attributing a need for cooperation among local churches and, to a lesser degree, cooperation with other denominations for the sake of accomplishing shared goals.

Brown's theory and the accompanying model have proved useful for interpreting the events that were the subject of this case study. The resultant continuity and change experienced within the Movement have been explained essentially through symbolic interaction within the context of the historical situation. Campbell's intervention took the form of strategic switches between alternative paradigms, or else of the discouragement of such switches. The model provides for a consistent account of Campbell's communication. It allows the attribution of a consistency to Campbell's work, which otherwise must appear contradictory or else opportunistic. In addition, Brown's model makes clear how Campbell's intervention operated to preserve unity among extremes within the Movement, a question that has previously been unanswered.

For the student of social movements, Brown's model serves as an effective explanation of non-linear processes in a complex social organization. Its usefulness in this case study ought to recommend it to other students of
movements.

One of the intriguing areas of examination in this study is that of interrelationships among processes. For example, there is the relationship between power and attention-switches. In order to make or to impede an attention-switch, it is necessary to receive an attribution of power. This Campbell received, but no one else enjoyed that distinction to the same extent either during his lifetime or after him. The study of such interrelationships among the cycles seems to be both promising and relevant. For example, a recent news article reports that the earth's ozone layer seems to be eroding much more quickly than expected, according to evidence derived from a hole in the layer over the Antarctic. The article points out in passing, a failed attention-switch associated with an inadequate power-share:

The initial report of the hole by British scientists in March 1985 caused little excitement partly because the British team in Antarctica was not well known among atmospheric scientists. . . . But later last year, scientists at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration produced satellite data confirming the British findings. . . . \(^5\)

The creation of power through symbolic interaction, which is a study at least as old as Aristotle, is one that is not yet exhausted. In a classic piece, Lloyd Bitzer tried to isolate and define what are rhetorical situations. They are marked, he thought, by the presence of a rhetor who sees an exigence, an audience which can
respond, and constraints that modify and shape their response and to which the rhetor must adapt. His article provoked a large number of responses.\textsuperscript{6} Jamieson called attention to the effect of genre in shaping the rhetor's response.\textsuperscript{7} Patton rightly called attention to the role of perception in determining what are exigencies and constraints, both internal and external.\textsuperscript{8} He does not address the question of how the rhetor is perceived by the audience to be a rhetor. This is a problem of influence or power. It is also one into which Brown gives us access by his emphasis on the symbolic origin of power and his model of the power cycle.

The breadth of Brown's theory coupled with his lack of emphasis on maneuvers tempts the student by inviting him or her to fill in the gaps by fitting in, on the level of maneuvers, the traditional rhetorical topics. In fact, further work should consider the extent of its paradigmatic nature in the field of rhetoric.

Other implications for further study include:

(1) A study of other intervenors who were contemporary with Campbell, particularly editor-bishops Stone and Scott, should illuminate the relationships between their interventions and those of Campbell;

(2) Campbell's activity as a change agent should be studied through the 1850's, when his public influence faded, perhaps with an eye as to how further interventions
succeeded or failed to respond to changing exigencies; and

(3) The possible similarity of parallel interventions is evident in other religious movements, especially in the days of their inception and their growth into denominationhood.

In conclusion, this study has made clear a picture of Campbell that is startling to the modern student of church history who thinks of Campbell as an iconoclastic ideologue best known for his unswerving championship of a particular doctrine of baptism. In fact, he appears much more of a moderate whose main occupation was the avoiding of extremes. His most trying struggles were against extremists within his own group who bear a strong resemblance to those who today trace their ancestry to his Movement.

Such heirs of the Stone-Campbell Movement are largely ignorant of Campbell's ideas. In a fairly wide acquaintance with ministers and members of all three major modern divisions, I have found no more than two who have read any of his writings, although many think that they know what he taught. His desire for unity has been forgotten by the more conservative heirs, and his passion for purity has been neglected by his liberal heirs. Both extremes existed during Campbell's own time; the difference is that there is today no intervenor who has both the
commitment and the power-share that Campbell had. There are intervenors with the spirit that Scott sometimes showed—that true unity means the conversion of everyone else to the Stone-Campbell camp.

If a truly "Campbellite" intervenor were to arise today, he or she would have to share the attitude that Campbell possessed—that of the tolerant advocate. On one hand, he believed that he possessed, to the best of his apperception, a good measure of truth, some of which, he thought, had been neglected for centuries. His assurance was such that he employed his most vigorous arguments in defense of his position. On the other hand, his recognition of the limitations of human knowledge and the variety of what he would call mental faculties was such that he usually tolerated those who differed from him, as long as they shared essential commitment to the Christian religion.

This view of Campbell, which has been shown to be faithful both to his writings and his actions, seems to me a fit one to exhibit to a Movement that has been fractured by forgetting its origin. Furthermore, that tolerant advocacy of Campbell is a worthwhile legacy from the nineteenth century Movement to a twentieth century complex of churches that dwell in an ecumenical age. Beyond a particular view of baptism, such a legacy may be the most useful gift that the Stone-Campbell Movement could make to the Christian world at large.
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