Culture, Power, and Security

Culture, Power, and Security: New Directions in the History of National and International Security

Edited by

Mary Kathryn Barbier and Richard V. Damms

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS
PUBLISHING

Culture, Power, and Security:
New Directions in the History of National and International Security,
Edited by Mary Kathryn Barbier and Richard V. Damms

This book first published 2012

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-4107-2, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-4107-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Illustrations vii

List of Tables viii

Preface ix

Introduction xi

Part I: Religion, Politics, and the Perils of Denominationalism

Chapter One 2
"All Things Respecting Us Are Loudly Alarming": The French and Indian War and the Origin of Presbyterian Interdenominationalism
William Harrison Taylor

Chapter Two 12
The Liberal Party and the Politics of "Conscience" in Leeds, 1845-1857
Michael Markus

Part II: National Security against Enemies Domestic and Foreign

Chapter Three 26
AWPD/1 and American Strategic Bombing in Europe during World War II
Daniel Simonsen

Chapter Four 47
Neutrality, but for the British: Irish Politics and the Irish Republican Army 1939-45
L.B. Wilson, III

Chapter Five 59
The Critical Link: US Navy Corpsmen in Combined Action Platoons
John Southard

Chapter Six 82
"Knights Riding the Border": The Ku Klux Klan and Security along the US-Mexico Border during the 1970s
Jensen E. Branscombe

Chapter Seven..... 99
An Inevitable Conflict: The United States, Saddam Hussein, and the Conflict Over Weapons of Mass Destruction
Kenneth V. Anthony

Chapter Eight..... 118
The Third Age of War: Faces of Battle from 1945 to the Present
Dennis Showalter

Part III: Total Cold War, Not Total War

Chapter Nine..... 132
Waging a Limited War: Harry Truman, Dean Acheson, and the Korean War, 1950-1953
Michael Hopkins

Chapter Ten 146
A Lesson in Capitalism: Dwight Eisenhower's Use of Psychological Warfare during the Khrushchev Visit
Kayla Hester

Chapter Eleven 159
A Cold War Turning Point: The Berlin Diplomatic Campaigns, 1959-1962
Richard Williamson

Editors and Contributors..... 172

Index..... 175

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Chapter Two

Figure 1: As this *Punch* illustration of May, 1847 demonstrates, Edward Baines, Jr. was the recognized national spokesman for educational voluntaryism.

Chapter Three

Figure 1: Boeing B-17 “Flying Fortress”

Figure 2: Consolidated B-24 “Liberator”

Chapter Six

Figure 1: Members of the Ku Klux Klan use a telescopic listening device and binoculars near the California-Mexico border in their search for undocumented immigrants entering the country in Dulzura on Tuesday, Oct. 26, 1977. Dennis Campbell, center, holds the listening instrument as Jim Shea, left, scans the hilltops for movement in the bright moonlight. The man at right refused to be identified.

Figure 2: Ku Klux Klan leader David Duke arrives at a roadside rendezvous with newsmen in Dulzura, Calif. to detail how Klansmen are dispersed along the border looking for illegal aliens entering the country, Oct. 26, 1977.

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter Three

Table 1: AWPD/1 Air Missions
Table 2: AWPD/1 Target Sets
Table 3: Analysis of Three Broad Target Categories Flown Under AWPD/1 Auspices (August 17, 1942 – June 10, 1943)
Table 4: Intermediate Objective (Luftwaffe) Targets Flown Under AWPD/1 Auspices (August 17, 1942 – June 10, 1943)
Table 5: Diversionary/non-AWPD/1 Prioritized Bombing Missions (August 17, 1942 – June 10, 1943)

PREFACE

In 2007, the Department of History at Mississippi State University hosted the first regional International Security/Internal Safety (IS/IS) Conference. Our purpose was to engage academics–both faculty and students–in a conversation about international and national security issues from an historical perspective. Major General Harold Cross, Adjutant General of the Mississippi Army and Air Force National Guard, gave the opening address. The presentations covered a range of topics, including the role of NATO in the twenty-first century, issues related to Cuba over the past century, the Global War on Terrorism Oral History project, Cold War diplomatic challenges, and security concerns of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Professor Randall B. Woods gave the closing address. A diverse group of faculty and students participated in the first meeting and enthusiastically embraced the possibility of an annual IS/IS Conference.

Following this successful meeting, the conveners encouraged other institutions of higher learning to host the annual regional conference. The conversation that began at Mississippi State University continued in 2008 at Northwestern State University of Louisiana in Natchitoches and in 2009 at the University of Southern Mississippi, where the keynote speaker was Professor Lee Hamilton, the Deputy Director of the Gregg Centre for the Study of War and Society at the University of New Brunswick. In 2010 the University of New Orleans hosted the fourth regional conference at the National World War II Museum where distinguished military historian and professor, Allan R. Millett, gave the keynote address.

In 2011 the fifth anniversary IS/IS Conference returned to the Mississippi State University campus. The truly international program included presenters from the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom, with leading military historians, Professors Dennis Showalter and Robert Citino, delivering the keynote addresses. This meeting was an overwhelming success. The scholarship presented, as had been the case at each IS/IS conference, was of the highest quality and contributed to the historiography of military, diplomatic, and national security studies broadly conceived. Consequently, we invited the contributors to this volume to expand their original conference papers. Taken together, the eleven chapters in this volume reflect current research on culture, power, and security, particularly in terms of national and international security,

and make an important contribution to the ongoing dialogue in which historians are engaged.

Mary Kathryn Barbier
Richard V. Damms
July 2012

INTRODUCTION

MARY KATHRYN BARBIER
AND RICHARD V. DAMMS

The field of national and international security is an exciting one, particularly in view of recent worldwide events, including natural and man-made disasters, popular revolutionary movements, the travails of failing states, mounting concerns about the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and international and home-grown terrorism. Historians, political scientists, sociologists, and other academics are investigating new topics and asking new questions about old ones, and they challenge their audiences to engage in conversations about important security issues. In recent years, numerous scholars have contributed cutting-edge monographs and anthologies that address the themes of culture, power, and security relative to internal and external affairs. In *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*, for example, Roger Z. George and Harvey Rishkof have presented an evaluation of government agencies engaged in national security issues, analyzing the ways in which these agencies interact and the roles of Congress and the private sector in the policy process. Their volume provides an extensive examination of the national security enterprise, focusing on culture and history, and argues that bureaucratic politics and institutional rivalries shape natural security. Although comprehensive in coverage, the study suggests the need for additional research into the national security complex.

One of the contributors to *The National Security Enterprise*, Thomas Fingar independently published *Reducing Uncertainty: Intelligence, Analysis, and National Security*. Fingar examines the Intelligence Community (IC)– what they do, how they do it, and "the political context that shapes, uses, and sometimes abuses their output".[1] He takes the Intelligence Community to task for not approaching the objective of "reducing uncertainty" more effectively. He suggests that the IC expends more resources "on problems and perils than on opportunities to shape events." Doing so, Fingar argues, "obscures one of the most important functions of the Intelligence Community and causes both analysts and agencies to devote too little attention to potential opportunities to move developments in a more

favorable way".[2] He ultimately contends that major problems related to safety and security remain unsolved. In his view, the work of IC analysts and, by extension, historians has not ended. Consequently, "intelligence" is a component of several of the essays included in this volume.

In their recent overview of the intellectual history of international security studies (ISS), Barry Buzan and Lene Hansen have emphasized the importance of employing an historical approach to the field. Following World War II, they note, international security studies became an increasingly important subfield of international relations, branching out from the previous emphasis on "war studies" and "geopolitics" to include the broader study of "security", including such aspects as "societal cohesion" and "both military and non-military threats and vulnerabilities". Since the 1970s, and especially after the end of the Cold War, the field's initial focus on questions of nuclear weapons and deterrence shifted to embrace notions of economic, environmental, societal and food security, among others. In this emerging literature, the importance of ideas and culture moved to the fore while the concept of the state received less emphasis. The authors note that an historical perspective is particularly valuable for ISS scholars not only because it can provide a fuller understanding of what actually took place but also because it allows practitioners to acquire a more critical and nuanced understanding of the evolution of their own discipline.[3] The contributors to this volume underscore this growing diversity of approaches to the historical treatment of "security", with essays addressing such matters as denominational identity and party political unity in addition to more traditional national and international security subjects like strategic bombing, psychological warfare and great power diplomacy.

Among historians examining national and international security affairs, none figures more prominently than John Lewis Gaddis, who has focused his scholarship on Cold War security issues. He has assessed and reassessed the origins of the Cold War, assigned culpability, and analyzed arguably the most dangerous era in the twentieth century. Two of his more recent books are of particular note here. In *The Cold War: A New History*, Gaddis explains the interconnectedness of politics and ideology and the impact of concepts of morality on the actions of political leaders, and argues that the ideological struggle between the Soviet Union and the United States predated World War II. Even more recently Gaddis has investigated the man who, perhaps more than any other, put his mark on United States Cold War policy. His research culminated in the publication of his Pulitzer Prize-winning biography of George F. Kennan. Kennan's influence extended beyond the development of American Cold War

policy. As an architect of the Marshall Plan, Kennan also had an impact on the internal and external security affairs of the major Western European nations in the post-World War II and early Cold War periods. Moreover, Gaddis is the general editor for The New Cold War History series, published by the University of North Carolina Press. The goal of the series is to reassess the Cold War from a post-Cold War perspective. The authors use sources not previously available to scholars and are setting the standards for revision of previous interpretations of the period. Three essays in this volume, those by Williamson, Hester, and Hopkins, partly reflect this new post-Cold War perspective.

From yet another perspective, that of both a scholar and a practitioner of international security affairs, Charles Hill has recently written about internal and external security issues by examining the leaders who address them and the factors that influence their strategies. In *Grand Strategies: Literature, Statecraft, and World Order*, Hill analyzes the intersection between literature and statecraft. He argues, "The international world of states and their modern system is a literary realm. It is where the greatest issues of the human condition are played out."[4] Although his analysis spans the classical period to the present, Hill demonstrates that literature and the past have both made a mark on the present and that the humanities are important when determining policies that are germane to statecraft and world order. Hill, in effect, challenges scholars to shape statecraft through literature's lens and opens the door to new "histories" of national and international security.

The scholarship presented here reflects some of these new directions in the history of national and international security and thus makes an important contribution to the field. An eclectic group of scholars provides a variety of approaches to the notion of security. Their chapters cover a broad range of fields, such as religious, political, intelligence, military, and foreign relations history, but they are all centered around some conception of security, whether internal, external, or both. The authors, ranging from senior scholars, including an award-winning military historian, to relative newcomers, combine to provide a unique collection of perspectives on the history of national and international security.

As the title of Part I, "Religion, Politics, and the Perils of Denominationalism," suggests, the early chapters address the historically contentious issues of religion, politics, and internal and external security. The authors take to heart the recent admonition of Andrew Preston to bridge the gap between international history and the history of religion, fields that historically have talked past each other or ignored each other entirely.[5] In "'All things respecting us are loudly alarming': The French

and Indian War and the Origin of Presbyterian Interdenominationalism," Harrison Taylor argues that the Presbyterian Church undertook an interdenominational journey beginning with the French and Indian War. Unlike historians who have examined late eighteenth-century American religion in terms of conflict and schism and have privileged political or temporal factors, Taylor restores religious ideology to the narrative and argues that the origin of later interdenominational cooperation can be found in a particular armed conflict. In "The Liberal Party and the Politics of 'Conscience' in Leeds, 1845-1857," Michael Markus takes the opposite tack and focuses on the potential divisiveness of denominational distinctions in matters of politics. While noting that the division between Anglicans and Nonconformists largely defined the Conservative and Liberal parties and their agendas in Britain between the Reform Acts of 1832 and 1867, Markus examines how one Liberal faction's opposition to state-supported education as a matter of "conscience" threatened to shatter the unity of the Liberal Party in much the same way that agricultural protectionism ruptured the Tories. Ultimately, when faced with the prospect of dividing their own party and having their agenda marginalized, the "conscience" faction set aside their religious convictions and returned to the pragmatic tradition of intra-party compromise.

The chapters in Part II, "National Security against Enemies Domestic and Foreign," focus on the intersection between armed conflict and national and international security during the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Despite the already extensive literature and the availability of resources-both primary and secondary-World War II, the Vietnam conflict, and the Cold War continue to garner attention. The increasing accessibility of archives since the end of the Cold War has facilitated a reassessment of these and other conflicts from a new post-Cold War perspective. In addition, topics such as the Gulf Wars and border control issues attract an increasing number of scholars. The result is cutting-edge scholarship, as is evidenced in the essays included in this section.

The first two chapters in this section address different aspects of the Second World War, a conflict that has been heavily researched and hotly debated for decades. While some scholarship addresses airpower, including airpower doctrine, few historians provide an extensive analysis of specific strategic plans and their implementation. Daniel Simonsen undertakes such a study in "Air War Plans Division 1: The United States' First Airpower Plan and the Strategic Bombing of Europe, 1941-1943" and concludes that actual practice differed markedly from the planners' intent. In "Wars Beneath Wars: The IRA and the Battle for Intelligence in World War II," L.B. Wilson, III addresses another aspect of the same

conflict–the complicated nature of the intelligence war. Although historians have written about intelligence organizations, deception operations, internal security, and spies, most scholarship has focused on Britain, Germany, and the United States. To date, the intelligence war in Ireland, and the Irish Republican Army in particular, have received little attention. Wilson argues that British perceptions and misconceptions about the villainy and presence of the IRA in Britain characterized the national conversation on Irish republicanism. In the third chapter in this section, the focus shifts to one of the most contentious conflicts in American history, the Vietnam War. John Southard's "The Critical Link: US Navy Corpsmen in Combined Action Platoons" examines the work of these corpsmen with the South Vietnamese militia groups. Telling a different "hearts and minds" story, he focuses on a group of men who served as liaisons between US marines and the local militia. Southard ultimately concludes that the corpsmen made real inroads in forging a working relationship between the two groups, resulting in many of the Americans in the affected villages acquiring greater respect and understanding for the Vietnamese people and their culture and contributing to the effectiveness of counter-insurgency efforts.

The next two chapters in this section provide insight into the intersection of internal and external security, particularly with regard to immigrants and perceived terrorist threats. Jensen Branscombe brings an interesting dynamic to this section with her chapter entitled "Knights Riding the Border: Ku Klux Klan and Security along the US-Mexico Border during the 1970s." Demonstrating that concern about the porous borders with Mexico has become prevalent at different times in American history, Branscombe argues that opposition to Klan involvement in border security shows that, although United States citizens had some worries about illegal immigration, they also recognized the dangers of resorting to radical vigilante actions to ensure their own security. In addition, she suggests that these Americans were perhaps less outraged about the alien influx than the political discourse and news coverage at the time indicated. In "An Inevitable Conflict: The United States, Saddam Hussein, and Conflict Over Weapons of Mass Destruction," Kenneth Anthony shifts focus to an ongoing conflict that has sparked contentious debate within the United States and among Allied partners. He argues that the 9/11 attacks interrupted an overriding American national security concern, particularly with regard to Iraq, that dated back to 1991. In addition, Anthony contends that closer examination reveals a consistent American policy with regard to Iraq. Finally, distinguished military historian Dennis Showalter provides an overview of conflict during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries in

"The Third Age of War: Faces of Battle from 1945 to the Present." He pessimistically contends that the "Third Age of War" is an age of protean conflict, global in scope, comprehensive in scale, and kaleidoscopic in conduct.

The final section, "Total Cold War, Not Total War," examines three confrontations at the height of the Cold War as world leaders grappled with the realities of a long-term ideological struggle, the proliferation of nuclear weapons, rival alliances and the transformation of the international system as new nations emerged and the superpowers competed for their allegiance. Michael Hopkins re-examines American policy in the Korean War crisis, focusing on Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson, the subject of his forthcoming book, and analyzes the difficulties encountered by the Harry S Truman administration in waging a limited war to deter further aggression while also avoiding escalation. Ultimately, Truman and Acheson were largely successful in navigating between the rocky shoals of partisan politics, conflicting military advice and the anxieties of nervous allies. Kayla Hester, meanwhile, examines a somewhat neglected episode in Cold War summitry, Nikita Khrushchev's 1959 visit to the United States. With the Cold War essentially frozen in place, she notes how both American and Soviet policymakers increasingly moved to new arenas of competition, embracing propaganda, psychological warfare and cultural diplomacy to tout the merits of their respective systems, cement alliances and court new adherents. As President Dwight D. Eisenhower remarked in 1958, a new era of "total Cold War" had dawned. For Eisenhower, the Khrushchev visit became another front in the Cold War struggle for hearts and minds. Finally, Richard D. Williamson hones in on one of the most dangerous Cold War crises, the struggle over Berlin, variously described by Khrushchev as "a bone in my throat," and, more prosaically, "the testicles of the West."[6] Moving beyond the usual discussion of threats of force and hints at a wider war, however, Williamson argues that the Berlin imbroglio revealed to both the Soviets and the Americans the difficulties of alliance management. Neither sought a global war over Berlin, and the superpowers increasingly turned to bilateral discussions at various levels to avoid misunderstanding and bypass troublesome allies. Indeed, in an argument more fully elaborated in his recent book, Williamson sees in these bilateral negotiations a precursor to the great power détente of the 1970s.[7]

Notes

[1] Thomas Fingar, *Reducing Uncertainty: Intelligence, Analysis, and National Security* (Stanford: Stanford Security Studies, 2011), back cover.
[2] Ibid., 1.
[3] Barry Buzan and Lene Hansen, *The Evolution of International Security Studies* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 1-2, 4-5.
[4] Charles Hill, *Grand Strategies: Literature, Statecraft, and World Order* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), dust jacket .
[5] Andrew Preston, "Bridging the Gap between the Sacred and the Secular in the History of American Foreign Relations", *Diplomatic History* 30 (November 2006): 783-812, especially 786.
[6] John Lewis Gaddis, *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 140.
[7] Richard D. Williamson, *First Steps toward Détente: American Diplomacy in the Berlin Crisis, 1958-1963* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2012).

PART I:

RELIGION, POLITICS AND THE PERILS OF DENOMINATIONALISM

CHAPTER ONE

"ALL THINGS RESPECTING US ARE LOUDLY ALARMING": THE FRENCH AND INDIAN WAR AND THE ORIGIN OF PRESBYTERIAN INTERDENOMINATIONALISM

WILLIAM HARRISON TAYLOR

In life, the Presbyterian minister Samuel Davies championed Christian unity, but it was not until after his death that most of his work, collectively titled *Sermons on important subjects,* was introduced (in 1765) to the colonial American reading public.[1] In this collection, which spans three volumes and over a thousand pages, there is a persistent theme of catholic Christianity. The theme is clearest in Davies' sermon "The Sacred Import of the Christian Name." Here he stated, "To lay more stress upon the name of a presbyterian or a church-man than on the sacred name of christian . . . to make it the object of my zeal to gain proselytes to some other than the christian name . . . these are the things which deserve universal condemnation from God and man."[2] Lamenting the rise of "bigotry and faction" in Christ's kingdom, Davies commented that they were "directly opposite to the generous catholic spirit of christianity, and subversive of it." He continued with a caution: "My brethren, I would now warn you against this wretched mischievous spirit of party . . . Let this congregation be that of a christian society, and I little care what other name it wears. Let it be a little Antioch, where the followers of Christ shall be distinguished by their old catholic name, Christians."[3] The welfare of Christ's earthly kingdom was of utmost importance to the Virginia minister, and his belief motivated him to promote charity and forbearance among the different Christian denominations.

This interdenominational spirit was not confined to the reverend Samuel Davies alone. His wish to cooperate with Christians from other

denominations in order to heal divisions and edify the universal church from within was not uncommon among his contemporary Presbyterians. Beginning in 1758, in the midst of the French and Indian War, the Presbyterian Church began a self-imposed interdenominational transformation. In this year church leaders humbled themselves before a God they believed to be disciplining them for their sin.[4] Their transgression, they knew, was a schism that had plagued the church since the 1740s. Divided, the universal church was unable to attend properly to the "Great Commission," Christ's last command.[5] To make amends and guard themselves against a reoccurring offense, the denomination reunited, repented publicly, and revealed that their renewed efforts to fulfill the "Great Commission" would be interdenominational in nature.[6] Interdenominationalism afforded the Presbyterians both a way to protect the colonies from divine retribution as well as to strengthen Christendom.

The history of religion during the eighteenth century is, fortunately, a well-developed and researched field. Despite the strides taken, however, little has been written on denominational attempts at Christian unity. Historians have instead focused on the multitude of conflicts, both social and religious, that marked the period and preoccupied churchgoers. Although this perspective is indispensable for any understanding of the eighteenth century, it is incomplete. The current portrayal of the late colonial religious scene as one of violently opposed denominations presents the well-known instances of denominational unity, such as the bishopric crisis, the constitutional crisis, the War for Independence, and the founding of the republic, as products of political or temporal motivations. Overlooked are the religiously motivated attempts between churches to cooperate, such as the interdenominational journey begun by the Presbyterian Church during the French and Indian War. By examining the efforts of the Presbyterians to establish a more solid bond between Christian denominations in spiritual terms, the current understanding of church participation in the pivotal events of the eighteenth century can be reconsidered. This Presbyterian venture, initiated by a war, illustrates not only that interdenominational unity was pursued in an era defined by conflict, but that these unions could also be motivated by religious rather than solely political ideology.[7]

The schism that troubled the Presbyterians in 1758 began in 1741 amidst the excitement of the Great Awakening. At this time the Presbyterian Church was led by a three-tiered government. The uppermost was the Synod of Philadelphia (which met annually), comprising representatives from every church under its care. Directly below the synod were the presbyteries, which also consisted of representatives from all the

member churches. Finally there was the individual church, overseen by the minister and congregationally-elected elders. During the period generally termed the Great Awakening, a debate arose concerning the requirement that prior to ordination ministerial candidates show evidence of experimental religion.[8] The ordination of ministers was the responsibility and privilege of the presbyteries, which, in the 1730s, were largely controlled by Old Lights who disapproved of such subjective ordination requirements and favored instead the objectivity of a strong academic grounding. Outnumbered and outvoted in the regional presbyteries, the New Light ministers—those favoring evidence of experimental religion and the revivals—petitioned the synod to form a new presbytery. In 1738, the synod granted their request, and the newly-formed New Brunswick Presbytery immediately made experimental religion mandatory for future ministers within its bounds.[9] Troubled by this development, the Old Lights mustered their strength in the synod and stamped out this New Light initiative by granting the synod the final determination in the ordination of ministers. The New Brunswick Presbytery protested this encroachment on their authority and continued to ordain their own ministers in spite of the ruling body. Rankled by the lack of deference, the synod passed the *Protestation*, which, in its denunciation of the upstart presbytery, questioned rhetorically, "is not continuance of union absurd with those who would arrogate to themselves a right and power to palm and obtrude members on our Synod, contrary to the minds and judgment of the body?"[10] Neatly and quickly, the Old Light Synod drove out the insubordinate New Brunswick churches. The exiled presbytery, however, was not without its friends and supporters. Soon they were joined by other New Light churches, primarily from the New York Presbytery, and together they formed the Synod of New York.[11]

Little thought was given to reconciliation until the mid-1750s when it appeared to the Presbyterians that God was punishing the churches for their divisive indiscretion. The divine retribution did not come in the form of slacking membership. In fact, in terms of congregational membership, the schism of the Presbyterian Church had little adverse effect. Both the Old Light Synod of Philadelphia and the New Light Synod of New York increased their membership during the years of separation, although the New Lights far outgained the Old Lights. Rather, war was viewed as being the righteous judgment chosen for the Presbyterians.[12] In 1754, fighting resumed between the British and French in North America, and, by 1756, the conflict had officially become a war—the French and Indian War. Early in the contest, western Pennsylvania, Virginia and Maryland, largely home to Scots-Irish Presbyterians[13], were devastated by France's

Indian allies, resulting in the death or imprisonment of seven hundred colonists.[14] Confronted with the violence, bloodshed and loss that accompanied the war, both the Old Light and New Light Presbyterians looked to their recent rift as the cause of their misfortune. Reunion was no longer an unimaginable prospect.

Shortly before the two synods began negotiating the terms for reunion, the Synod of New York, the New Light contingent, issued a pastoral letter to the congregations under its care. On behalf of the synod,Richard Treat wrote that, in addition to the usual causes for God's displeasure, "the divided state of these colonies" and "the evident suspension of spiritual influences from the Church", prompted "the dangerous situation of the public . . . by means of a potent, prevailing, and cruel enemy". Continuing, he implored, "We have been warned and chastised, first more gently, then more terribly; but not returning to him that smites us, his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still. Judgment yet proceeds, the prospect becomes darker and darker, and all things respecting us are loudly alarming".[15] Immediate change was needed. Driven by fear of a wrathful God, the estranged Presbyterians agreed to meet in Philadelphia to negotiate in May 1758. A few days before their efforts came to fruition that May, two ministers—representing the conciliatory groups within the Old Light and New Light camps—spoke to the two ruling bodies assembled.[16] The orations of Francis Alison and David Bostwick reveal more than the desire of the synods to renew the bonds of fellowship; they also illustrate the hopes many Presbyterians had for this reunion in terms of aiding the universal church.

Speaking before the joint meeting of the Synods on May 24, Francis Alison recommended "Peace and union". However, the peace and unity Alison proposed was not to be limited to his fellow Presbyterians; it was to be offered to all Christians. The Old Light minister's evidence was secured from Ephesians 4: 1-7, from which he borrowed the Apostle Paul's encouragement to early Christians "to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."[17] "GOD, is the God of PEACE," Alison stated, "Christ Jesus is the prince of PEACE . . . and to follow PEACE, and to love one another, is the distinguishing characteristic of his disciples." Hitherto, Alison lamented, Christians had "notoriously failed in this main point."[18] He called his fellow Presbyterians to remedy the situation. "We have all one father," he said. We are of "the same family" and "to bite and devour one another, is indecent and unbecoming." The Christian union Alison promoted was not to be used to stifle the liberty of their brethren. There was to be freedom in "the lesser matters of religion" so that their agreement on the fundamental principles and the subsequent cooperation

would "promote the honor of God; the good of mankind, and the pure and holy religion of our lord and master."[19] Alison concluded his address by reminding his audience, "THERE IS ONE BODY AND ONE SPIRIT . . . christians are represented as one august body, whereof CHRIST is the HEAD. And this consideration must be a powerful motive to union, love and concord."[20]

Following Alison's lead, David Bostwick's sermon the next day also promoted a Christian union based on the fundamental principles of the faith.[21] Bostwick believed that the primary stumbling block was mankind's innate love of "SELF," and that this was what "men live for."[22] As Christians they were to renounce their "Self," but Bostwick assured his listeners that this call did "not imply a total disregard to our reputation and character among men, for on this, the success of our ministry, and consequently the advancement of the REDEEMER's kingdom, may, in some measure, depend." A proper Christian made "JESUS CHRIST . . . the SUBJECT MATTER" of his life, and it was this fundamental principle that any union needed.[23] "Let us ever remember," Bostwick concluded, "'we are not our own,' and therefore have no business to live to ourselves, or regard our interest or reputation, any further than the honor of CHRIST, and the interest of religion is concerned."[24] The Presbyterians, who were very much included in Bostwick's discussion of mankind, had for too long neglected the Body of Christ in favor of their "Self." Strengthening and extending the Body of Christ was the goal and the Presbyterians had to get out of their own way to accomplish it.

Four days after Alison and Bostwick addressed the ruling bodies with their hopes for the proposed reunion, the Old Lights and New Lights put aside their differences and reunited the church on May 29, 1758. The newly formed Synod of New York and Philadelphia published an account of their reunion with the hopes that the end of their sinful schism would somewhat appease an angry God who had visited upon them the French and Indian War, and bolster the spirits of their fellow colonists.[25] Given the stature of Dr. Alison and Reverend Bostwick, the resulting document largely reflected their sentiments and those of the conciliatory parties from both camps. Fittingly, this account was penned by Alexander McDowell, a minister who had taken part in the separation and was, therefore, fully aware of the damage done to Christendom through the Presbyterian schism.[26] Through McDowell's hand, the synod explained that it had been convicted of its sin against God and his Church by "the present divided State of the *Presbyterian Church* in this Land." The ruling body realized "that the Division of the Church tends to weaken it's [*sic*] Interests, to dishonour Religion, and consequently it's [*sic*] glorious Author," and so

they pledged "to endeavor the Healing of that Breach . . . so it's [*sic*] hurtful Consequences may not extend to Posterity."[27] As their sin had such an impact on the universal church, the Presbyterians made their apology a public one. Conscious of how the church was perceived and how that perception affected Christianity, the synod recognized a publicized reunion as necessary to counteract the dishonor it had already caused their "glorious Author." In this penitent act, the Presbyterians were motivated by the welfare of all Christians, living and unborn; it was the "Establishment and Edification of his [God's] People" that compelled them.[28]

This reunion account, however, was more than an act of contrition. The Presbyterian Synod also outlined how it intended to "carry on the great Designs of Religion" through "the Advancement of the Mediator's Kingdom."[29] To this end the ruling body made four promises: to "*study the Things that make for Peace*"; to "*take heed to ourselves*, that our Hearts be upright, our Discourse edifying, and our Lives exemplary;" to "take heed *to our Doctrine*, that it be not only orthodox, but evangelical and spiritual, tending to awaken the Secure to a suitable Concern for their Salvation and to instruct and encourage sincere Christians;" and finally to commend "*ourselves to every Man's Conscience in the Sight of God*."[30] It is true that these measures were first to be employed to heal the Old Light/New Light wounds, but this fact should not overshadow the denomination's intentions toward the rest of Christendom. The synod had made it clear that the ultimate "Design of our Union is the Advancement of the Mediator's Kingdom." As the Presbyterians promised to "cultivate Peace and Harmony among ourselves," they also vowed to consider themselves and their actions as a part of the body of Christ, as Dr. Alison had reminded them.[31] The Presbyterians were submitting themselves to their fellow believers. As Christians they were equals and dependent on one another for success.

As formal interdenominationalism was largely unexplored territory for the Presbyterians, the Synod of New York and Philadelphia, shortly after its inception in 1758, created a Committee of Correspondence to guide their efforts. Taking this aspect of the reunion seriously, the ruling body charged the committee with the task of opening the lines of communication with like-minded churches "in Britain and Ireland, and in these colonies and elsewhere."[32] Although the scope of the committee's interdenominational efforts appears to have been limited initially to reformed churches, it was a step toward more inclusive cooperation.[33] Another indication of the importance placed upon interdenominationalism by the Presbyterians was the men called to serve on this committee.

Gilbert Tennent, Robert Cross, Richard Treat, and Dr. Francis Alison, who were among the best and brightest the church had to offer, took the helm of the committee and did their part to guide the church in these uncharted waters.[34] By earnestly approaching the interdenominational aspect of the reunion, the Presbyterians were off to a promising start with the Committee of Correspondence serving as the first illustration of the church moving from rhetoric to reality.

When the Presbyterians reunited in 1758 to alleviate their divine affliction, they declared to the world that they would strive to promote Christian unity both internally and externally. Pursuing this spirit of cooperation during the following decades, the Presbyterian Church made considerable gains by engaging in joint missionary efforts, contributing to nondenominational religious journals, founding religious liberty organizations, and crafting formal acts of union with the varying Congregationalist churches and the Dutch Reformed Church. This vibrant interdenominational spirit calls into question the common historical focus on contests, both social and religious, during the mid-to-late eighteenth century. Such emphasis portrays colonial denominations religiously divided beyond reconciliation and leaves documented unions between churches during the Revolutionary and early Republican periods as the products of political ideology. While the story of the origin of Presbyterian interdenominationalism does not negate the significance of political beliefs to these unions, it does illustrate that there were unions during this formative period in American history motivated by religious beliefs.

Notes

[1] James Smylie, "Samuel Davies: Preacher, Teacher, and Pastor" in Donald Fortson III, ed, *Colonial Presbyterianism: Old Faith in a New Land* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2007), 190-91.

[2] Samuel Davies, *Sermons on important subjects, by the late Reverend and pious Samuel Davies, sometime president of the college in New-Jersey. In three volumes* (New York: n.p., 1792), 317.

[3] Davies, *Sermons on important subjects,* 318-19.

[4] Presbyterian General Assembly, *Records of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1706-1788* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1904), 276.

[5] Matthew 28:18-20 (New International Version). According to Matthew, on a mountain near Galilee following his Resurrection, Jesus Christ met his remaining disciples and gave them their final instructions. Christ told them, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Therefore go and make disciples of all

nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you."

[6] Synod of New York and Philadelphia, "The plan of union between the Synods of New-York and Philadelphia. Agreed upon May 29th, 1758" (Philadelphia: W. Dunlap, 1758).

[7] That conflict has largely defined the eighteenth century can be seen in sample of general and Presbyterian specific religious histories: Thomas S. Kidd, *God of Liberty: A Religious History of the American Revolution* (New York: Basic Books, 2010); Fortson III, *Colonial Presbyterianism* (2007); Patricia Bonomi, *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society, and Politics in Colonial America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003); Mark A. Noll, *The Rise of Evangelicalism: The Age of Edwards, Whitefield and the Wesleys* (Downer's Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2003); James H. Smylie, *A Brief History of the Presbyterians* (Louisville, Kentucky: Geneva Press, 1996); J. C. D. Clark, *The Language of Liberty, 1660-1832; Political discourse and social dynamics in the Anglo-American world* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Randall Balmer and John Fitzmier, *The Presbyterians* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1994); Fred Hood, *Reformed America: The Middle and Southern States, 1783-1837*, (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1980); William G. McLoughlin, *Revivals, Awakenings, and Reform: An Essay on Religion and Social Change in America, 1607-1977* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978); Nathan Hatch, *The Sacred Cause of Liberty: Republican Thought and the Millennium in Revolutionary New England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977); Leonard J. Trinterud, *The Forming of an American Tradition: A Re-examination of Colonial Presbyterianism* (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1970); Alan Heimert, *Religion and the American Mind: From the Great Awakening to the American Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966); Carl Bridenbaugh, *Mitre and Sceptre: Transatlantic Faiths, Ideas, Personalities, and Politics, 1689-1775* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962).

[8] This is described by the Apostle Paul as working "out your own salvation with fear and trembling." Philippians 2:12 (New International Version). Experimental religion is sometimes called experimental piety or even experiential piety. The renowned Gilbert Tennent required a three step process: "conviction of sin under the divine law; an experience of spiritual rebirth; and a reformed life that gave evidence of the work of the spirit in practical piety." Whereas this is a specific example, generally the ministerial exam required merely a demonstrable sign of salvation. Balmer and Fitzmier, *The Presbyterians*, 24, 26 and 27; and Noll, *The Rise of Evangelicalism*, 72.

[9] General Assembly, *Records of the Presbyterian Church, 1706-1788,*138.

[10] General Assembly, *Records of the Presbyterian Church, 1706-1788,*159.

[11] Balmer and Fitzmier, *The Presbyterians*, 30; and Smylie, *A Brief History of the Presbyterians*, 48-49.

[12] By 1776 the Presbyterian Church comprised roughly 40,000 members making it second only to the Congregationalist in terms of colonial American membership. For more information see: Roger Finke and Rodney Stark, *The Churching of*

America, 1776-1990; Winners and Losers in Our Religious Economy (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1992), 26 and 55; and Edwin Scott Gaustad and Philip L. Barlow, *New Historical Atlas of Religion in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 374.

[13] David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 606-610 and 615-617.

[14] John Ferling, *Struggle for a Continent: The Wars of Early America* (Arlington Heights, Illinois: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1993), 165. For another excellent treatment of the French and Indian War see: Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (New York: Vintage Books, 2001).

[15] General Assembly, *Records of the Presbyterian Church, 1706-1788*, 276.

[16] Balmer and Fitzmier, *The Presbyterians*, 31-32; and Smylie, *A Brief History of the Presbyterians*, 54-56.

[17] Francis Alison, "Peace and union recommended" in "Peace and union recommended; and Self disclaim'd, and Christ exalted: in two sermons, preached at Philadelphia, before the Reverend Synods of New-York and Philadelphia: the first, on the 24th of May, 1758, by Francis Alison, D.D. vice-provost of the college, and rector of the academy, in Philadelphia. And, the second, May 25, 1758, by David Bostwick, A.M. Minister of the Presbyterian-Church, in New-York. Both publish'd at the joint request of the Reverend synods" (Philadelphia, 1758), 11.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid., 12 and 17.

[20] Ibid., 39.

[21] Gilbert Tennent wrote the preface to the published version of Bostwick's sermon. In the same spirit of interdenominational reunion he wrote, "O! Sirs, should we not either love our poor brethren, with a pure heart, fervently; or disclaim all relation to the God of peace and love! I am, your willing and sincere servant, for Christ's sake," Gilbert Tennet, "Preface" in "Peace and union recommended; and Self disclaim'd, and Christ exalted: in two sermons," xi.

[22]David Bostwick, "Self disclaim'd, and Christ exalted" in "Peace and union recommended; and Self disclaim'd, and Christ exalted: in two sermons," 15.

[23] Ibid., 18 and 31.

[24] Ibid., 43.

[25] Presbyterian General Assembly, *Records of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, 1706-1788* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1904), 276; and Synod of New York and Philadelphia, "The plan of union between the Synods of New-York and Philadelphia," 3.

[26] General Assembly, *Records of the Presbyterian Church, 1706-1788*, 288.

[27] Ibid., 3 and 4.

[28] Ibid., 4.

[29] Ibid., 4 and 12.

[30] Ibid., 4, 12 and 13.

[31] Ibid., 13.

[32] Ibid., 290.

[33] By Reformed Churches I mean the churches or denominations that stemmed from John Calvin and his interpretation of Christianity, known as Reformed Theology. Although they did not specify, looking at future correspondence, the Synod probably meant the Dutch Reformed Church, English Congregationalists, Scottish Presbyterians, Irish Presbyterians as well as their colonial counterparts.

[34] For more on these men see: Mark A. Noll, *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1992), 111; Milton J. Coalter, *Gilbert Tennent, Son of Thunder: A Case Study of Continental Pietism's Impact on the First Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1986); Kidd, *God of Liberty*, 79-84; Noll, Rise of Evangelicalism, 14-15, 74-92, 101-106, 130-33; *Whitfield Jenks Bell, Patriot-improvers: Biographical Sketches of Members of the American Philosophical Society* (Darby, PA: Diane Publishing, 1997), 149-158; Elizabeth I. Nybakken, *The Centinel, Warnings of a Revolution: Warnings of a Revolution* (University of Delaware Press, 1979), 19-23; Jon Butler, *Becoming America: The Revolution Before 1776 (*Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 201; Edward D. Neill, "Matthew Wilson, D. D., of Lewes, Delaware" in *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Volume 8 (1884), 45. Richard Treat and Robert Cross are overshadowed by the scholarship written concerning Gilbert Tennent and Francis Alison but their importance to the church is seen through their activities within the Synod.

CHAPTER TWO

THE LIBERAL PARTY AND THE POLITICS OF "CONSCIENCE" IN LEEDS, 1845-1852

MICHAEL MARKUS

The extent to which the Great Reform Act of 1832 altered the nature of the British political system continues to be a topic of lively historical debate.[1] Lively, too, are disagreements about the nature of the changes which were introduced by that Act. Most historians now agree that in the aftermath of the 1832 Reform Act a distinct—which is not to say "rigid"—"two party system" developed very rapidly in Parliament, both in the Lords and the Commons.[2] This development was strongly abetted by the existence, after 1832, of a number of extremely divisive political issues of national import—issues involving religion, commercial policy, and the question of further constitutional reforms. But if historians are now generally in agreement about the crucial role played by party at the parliamentary level during the decades after 1832, the same cannot be said with regard to the role played by party at the constituency level. Indeed, a number of historians have suggested that the parliamentary parties had no meaningful corollaries in the constituencies.[3] This belief is generally accompanied by the assertion that electoral politics—that is, the politics of parliamentary elections—were dominated by "local" issues and concerns rather than political issues of national scope.[4]

My research into the electoral politics of a number of constituencies in Yorkshire during the thirty-five years following the Great Reform Act suggests that, on the contrary, local political parties oriented towards Westminster politics were generally a central feature of constituency politics. One reason that the importance of—and often the very existence of—local parties is frequently overlooked is that such parties were not, as they later were to become, defined by rigid structures or permanent institutions. In fact, during the period between the Great Reform Act and the Second Reform Act of 1867, political parties were, at both the Parliamentary *and* the constituency level, little more than voluntary