

RHETORICAL STRATEGIES ANALYZED BY SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY
AS APPLIED TO CONFLICT WITHIN THE RESTORATION MOVEMENT

A Thesis
Presented to
the faculty of the Department of Speech
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Flavil R. Yeakley, Jr.

May 1972

620826

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study results from an interest in historical movement studies generated by William A. Linsley who directed this thesis. Members of the thesis committee provided guidance and inspiration. Edward G. Holley, the member of the committee most familiar with the Restoration Movement, continued to serve--beyond the call of duty--after moving to the University of North Carolina as Dean of the School of Library Science.

The librarians at Abilene Christian College, Lincoln Christian College, and the Disciples of Christ Historical Society provided valuable assistance. Flavil R. Yeakley, Sr. made available his extensive collection of Restoration Movement literature for use in this study.

The elders of the Seventh Street Church of Christ in Texas City, Texas, and of the Four Seasons Road Church of Christ in Bloomington, Illinois, gave encouragement and support to make this work possible. Earl West, of the Harding Graduate School of Religion, offered valuable counsel in the early stages of this study. Enos Dowling, Dean of Lincoln Christian College, provided background information on the Independent Christian Church. Kenneth A. Retzer, an elder of the Church of Christ in Bloomington and a professor at Illinois State University in Normal, Illinois, offered useful criticism and help in the final writing of this study.

To all the above, the writer is deeply indebted.

RHETORICAL STRATEGIES ANALYZED BY SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY
AS APPLIED TO CONFLICT WITHIN THE RESTORATION MOVEMENT

An Abstract of a Thesis

Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Speech
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Flavil R. Yeakley, Jr.

May 1972

ABSTRACT

RHETORICAL STRATEGIES ANALYZED BY SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY AS APPLIED TO CONFLICT WITHIN THE RESTORATION MOVEMENT

This thesis uses the rhetorical requirements for social movement leadership outlined in Herbert W. Simons' theory of persuasion for social movements as a guide for the analysis of rhetorical strategies utilized by leaders of various segments of the Restoration Movement. Simons' theory is elaborated for purposes of this study by reference to the general social movement theory which he used--particularly the writings of Herbert Blumer, Carl Dawson and Warner Gettys, Rudolf Heberle, Eric Hoffer, and Richard Niebuhr. Special concern is given to the rhetorical requirements for leadership of a faction within a larger movement. Simons' theory as elaborated provides rhetorical requirements which leaders must fulfill in order to form a faction within a movement:

- 1) Leaders must polarize the thinking of the larger movement;
- 2) Leaders must provide their developing faction with a sense of group identification;
- 3) Leaders must separate their developing faction from the rest of the movement; and,
- 4) Leaders must maintain the isolation of their faction from the rest of the movement.

The present study examines the way in which the above list of rhetorical requirements has been fulfilled by the rhetorical strategies

utilized by leaders of various segments of America's largest indigenous religious movement--the Restoration Movement of the Church of Christ, Independent Christian Church, and Christian Church (Disciples of Christ). Non-verbal elements of polarization, identification, separation, and isolation are viewed. The nature of issues, prestige of leaders, and availability of communication channels are non-verbal elements which previous investigators have used to explain the fragmentation of the Restoration Movement. This study goes beyond these non-verbal elements to focus on the verbal element in the rhetorical strategies. The conclusion is that the verbal element in these rhetorical strategies for polarization, identification, separation, and isolation has had a significant influence on the formation of factions within the Restoration Movement. When movement leaders used rhetorical strategies which fulfilled these rhetorical requirements, the Restoration Movement divided into factions. When the rhetorical strategies employed by movement leaders failed to fulfill these rhetorical requirements, the Restoration Movement experienced doctrinal diversity without any division into separate factions.

An outline of factors emerges to consider when determining whether the Restoration Movement is likely to divide into factions over a given issue. This outline stresses the role of rhetorical strategies--a factor previously ignored by students of the Restoration Movement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION TO AN APPROACH FOR THE STUDY OF FACTION RHETORIC . .	1
Introductory Statement	1
Limits of the Study	2
Definitions	3
Rationale for a Study of Faction Development	4
Sources	5
Thesis Statement	6
General Background	6
The Problem of Why Movements Divide: A Possible Solution . . .	7
Simons' Theory Applied to Movement Fragmentation	12
The Restoration Movement	18
The Quest for Unity	18
Division over the Missionary Society and Instrumental Music	19
Divisions within the Church of Christ	21
The Independent-Disciples Division	22
Divisions within the Independent and Disciples Groups . . .	25
Differences without Division	26
Preview	28
II. STRATEGIES FOR POLARIZATION	30
Introduction	30

CHAPTER	PAGE
A Psychological Explanation of Polarization	32
The Assimilation-Contrast Effect	34
The Role of Ego-Involvement	36
Rhetorical Strategies Which Increase Ego-Involvement and Thus Contribute to Polarization	40
A Heritage of Divisive Rhetorical Strategies	40
Personal Attack	42
Attack on Personal Consistency	53
Guilt by Association	55
Appeal to the Pioneers	56
The Strategy of Projection	58
The Relation of Unrelated Issues	60
The Impact of the Civil War	60
Socio-Economic Factors	62
Appeal to Different Personality Types	66
Concern for Different Audiences	67
The Nature of Issues as a Factor in Polarization	68
Extreme Positions	68
Unpopular Positions	70
The Inherent Divisiveness of Issues	72
The Leadership Role in Polarization	74
Prestige and the Assimilation Effect	74
The Role of Opponents	78
The Role of Communication Channels in Polarization	80
Summary	81

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. STRATEGIES FOR IDENTIFICATION	83
Verbal Elements of Identification	88
Emphasis on Points of Difference	88
Points of Agreement Minimized	92
Importance of Issues Exaggerated	93
"We-They" Language	96
Labels	97
Slogans	101
Non-Verbal Elements of Identification	102
The Nature of Issues	102
Leadership Prestige	104
Communication Channels	105
Summary	108
IV. STRATEGIES FOR SEPARATION	109
The Strategy of Modification	112
The Strategy of Infiltration and Subversion	113
Imposed Separation	119
The Strategy of Preservation	122
Specific Rhetorical Strategies Which Produce Separation	123
Change of Audience	123
Insistence on Conformity	126
Denial of Brotherhood	126
Summary	127

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. STRATEGIES FOR ISOLATION	129
Justifying the Division	132
Blame-Fixing	133
Re-Definition of the Issue	136
Re-Definition of Division	137
Closing the Lines of Communication	138
Separate Institutions	141
Punishment	142
Language As an Insulator Rather Than a Transmitter	145
Summary	147
VI. CONCLUSION	149
Establishment of the Thesis	151
Evaluation of Simons' Theory	158
How to Determine Whether or Not the Restoration Movement Is Likely to Divide over a Given Issue	160
Limitations of Simons' Theory	163
Suggestions for Additional Research	164
BIBLIOGRAPHY	166
Books	166
Background in Rhetorical Theory	166
Background in Social Movement Theory	166
Psychological Works	167
The Restoration Movement	168
Biographical Works on Restoration Movement Leaders	172
Books Which Exemplify Rhetorical Strategies Used in the Restoration Movement	174

CHAPTER	PAGE
Theses	178
Periodicals	179
Articles on Rhetorical Theory	179
Psychological Works	180
The Restoration Movement	180
Articles Which Exemplify Rhetorical Strategies Used in the Restoration Movement	181
Pamphlets	184
Manuscript	184

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO AN APPROACH FOR THE STUDY OF FACTION RHETORIC

Introductory Statement

This study is concerned with rhetorical strategies and their role in the fragmentation of a movement--the Restoration Movement which resulted in the establishment of the Church of Christ, the Independent Christian Church, and the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ). The basic problem underlying this study is that the Restoration Movement, as is the case with many social movements, has divided over several issues although it has experienced, without division, a wide diversity of opinions on other issues of seemingly equal importance. The purposes of this study are:

1. To describe the different rhetorical requirements for the leadership of a faction at the various stages of faction development;
2. To isolate and identify the rhetorical strategies which fulfill these rhetorical requirements; and,
3. To determine the role of these rhetorical strategies--that is, to show how the rhetorical strategies fulfill the rhetorical requirements.

Herbert W. Simons' theory of persuasion for social movements¹ provides the theoretical framework for this study.

¹"Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56 (February, 1970), 1-11.

Limits of the Study

This is not a history of the Restoration Movement. The Restoration Movement simply provides the specific case in point for the study of rhetorical strategies and their role in the fragmentation of a movement. This study is not concerned with the rhetoric of the Restoration Movement vis-a-vis other religious groups in Christendom, except as that external rhetoric helps illuminate factors involved in the internal rhetoric. The concern of this study is with internal, not external issues. The question in this study is not why or how the Restoration Movement divided from the rest of Christendom, but rather why and how the Restoration Movement itself divided into several separate fellowships. This is not a theological study of issues, but a study of rhetorical strategies employed by movement leaders as they discussed the issues. No value judgements are made regarding the divisions of the Restoration Movement or the rhetorical strategies involved. This is not an effort to build a theory of faction development, but simply an application of an existing theory to the study of rhetorical strategies and their role in the formation of factions in the Restoration Movement.

The purposes of this study are: 1) to apply Simons' theory about the requirements which rhetoric must fulfill in a social movement in such a way that the different rhetorical requirements at various stages of faction development will be clear; 2) to identify the rhetorical strategies which fulfill these rhetorical requirements; and, 3) to show how these rhetorical strategies fulfill these rhetorical requirements. The aim of this study is not just to identify the rhetorical strategies which have contributed to the division of the Restoration Movement, but to show why these rhetorical

strategies have been divisive. A related purpose of this study is to see whether or not Simons' theory provides a workable framework of analysis to help rhetorical critics evaluate the rhetorical output of Restoration Movement leaders involved in factional splits.

Definitions

Rhetoric is viewed in this study as being the art of persuasion, not just the art of public speaking. Persuasion in a social movement includes written as well as spoken communications and in the Restoration Movement written communications have played an especially important role. Persuasion in social movements includes non-verbal factors as well as verbal.² In the Restoration Movement such non-verbal factors as the nature of issues, the prestige of leaders, and the channels of communication, have been especially important.

The term "rhetorical requirements" refers to the results which must be achieved through the persuasive techniques of movement leaders.³ The term "rhetorical strategies" refers to the specific persuasive techniques employed by movement leaders--techniques which fulfill the rhetorical requirements.⁴

No segment of the Restoration Movement thinks of itself as being a faction. But as defined for purposes of this study, the term "faction" is not intended to imply any value judgement. Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary defines a faction as "a party, combination, or clique within a state, party, or the like . . . a set or class of persons."⁵ As used in

²Carl A. Dawson and Warner E. Gettys, An Introduction to Sociology (Revised Edition; New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1935), p. 724.

³Simons, 2.

⁴Ibid.

⁵11th ed., 1959.

this study, the term "faction" simply means a segment of a movement--specifically a segment of the Restoration Movement. Since this study focuses on rhetorical strategies involved in the process of faction development, it is necessary to make a distinction between a developing faction and a fully developed faction. To make this distinction as clear as possible, this study employs the operational definition of a fully developed faction used by Dawson and Gettys. According to this definition, a fully developed faction is a separate identifiable group of people within a movement who share a common ideology and who are set apart from the rest of the movement by their shared beliefs which differ from the beliefs of others in the movement.⁶ According to this definition, a movement is not divided until two or more recognizable groups have become isolated from each other because of differences in their beliefs. But by this definition, the Restoration Movement has been divided for over a century and all the segments of the Restoration Movement are factions.

Rationale for a Study of Faction Development

Factionalism is deplored by all segments of the Restoration Movement. Probably no movement leader ever set out to establish a faction and no present movement leader would likely be interested in learning how to establish his own faction. However, factions have been formed and continue to be formed in the Restoration Movement. If leaders of the Restoration Movement are to avoid further fragmentation of the movement, they need to understand the process of faction formation. Specifically they need to understand the relationship between rhetorical strategies and faction development. Only when movement

⁶Dawson and Gettys, pp. 725-726.

leaders know what rhetorical strategies to avoid and why, can they hope to avoid further fragmentation of the Restoration Movement.

Let me make it clear that in trying to present an objective view of some unpleasant aspects of Restoration Movement history, I am not trying to encourage a cynical attitude toward the Restoration Movement. As a minister of the Church of Christ for over twenty years, I am fully committed to the restoration principle and recognize a deep indebtedness to the Restoration Movement heritage. In presenting a discussion of the rhetorical requirements for faction leadership, it is not my aim to instruct would-be faction builders. It is rather my hope that the present study may offer some small contribution to those who need to recognize potential faction building strategies and avoid them and who would like to know how to recognize potential faction builders and how to counteract their divisive efforts.

Sources

The primary source of examples of rhetorical strategies used in this study are the many religious periodicals of the Restoration Movement. It is generally acknowledged that few religious movements have spawned as many periodicals as the Restoration Movement. These journals have been the main channel of communication within the movement. Debates between members of Restoration Movement factions, books of sermons, and lectureship books also furnish source material for this study of rhetorical strategies. Biographies of movement leaders, personal papers, and personal interviews with movement leaders have all provided useful background material. General histories of the Restoration Movement have also contributed background material. The four main histories of the Restoration Movement used in this study are:

smaller identifiable movements within the larger movement--is one important element in the study of movements which needs additional investigation.¹²

Many scholars have tried to explain the fragmentation of social, political, and religious movements. Historians, political scientists, sociologists, cultural anthropologists, social psychologists, and theologians have offered possible explanations. Their explanations, however, have generally raised more questions than they have answered.¹³ One of the most intriguing questions in the study of movements is why a movement often divides over one issue and not over another which appears to be equally important. This study will not attempt to formulate a theory explaining why movements fragment. However, this thesis is intended as a type of historical movement study which should help provide some additional understanding of this phenomenon of movement fragmentation--at least in regard to the role of rhetorical strategies in the fragmentation of the Restoration Movement.

The Problem of Why Movements Divide: A Possible Solution

Herbert W. Simons, Associate Professor of Speech at Temple University, has suggested a possible approach to the study of movements.¹⁴ He suggested that movements could best be studied by a leader-centered approach which

¹²The President's Research Committee on Social Trends, "A Review of the Findings," in Recent Social Trends (2 vols.; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1933), I, xi. See also: Mayer N. Zald and Roberta Ash, "Social Movement Organization: Growth, Decay, and Change," in Protest, Reform, and Revolt, ed. by Joseph R. Gusfield (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970), p. 531.

¹³C. Luther Fry, "Changes in Religious Organizations," in Recent Social Trends (2 vols.; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1933), II, 1009.

¹⁴Simons, 1-11.

The Disciples of Christ: A History, by W. E. Garrison and A. T. DeGroot,⁷ representing the view of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ); Christians Only, by James DeForest Murch,⁸ representing the view of the Independent Christian Church; Quest for a Christian America, by David Edwin Harrell, Jr.,⁹ and The Search for the Ancient Order, by Earl Irvin West,¹⁰ representing the view of the Church of Christ.

Thesis Statement

The Restoration Movement has divided over particular issues when the leadership has employed rhetorical strategies which have fulfilled the conditions described in Herbert W. Simons' theory of persuasion for social movements.

General Background

Movements are an important part of our history. Social, political, and religious movements have played and continue to play an important role in the development of society. Movements do not develop in isolation. Generally a movement develops as a reaction to and in the context of some larger movement.¹¹ The tendency of movements to divide into separate groups--

⁷(St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1964).

⁸(Cincinnati, Ohio: Standard Publishing Company, 1967).

⁹(Nashville, Tenn.: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1966).

¹⁰Vol. I (Nashville, Tenn.: Gospel Advocate Company, 1949).
Vol. II (Indianapolis, Indiana: Religious Book Service, 1950).

¹¹Dawson and Gettys, p. 724.

investigates the rhetorical strategies of movement leaders in the light of the rhetorical requirements and the rhetorical problems inherent in the movement and the controversial issue around which the movement is built. Simons said that the rhetoric of a movement must follow, in a general way from the very nature of social movements. His definition of a social movement was broad enough to include many different kinds of movements: "an uninstitutionalized collectivity that mobilizes for action to implement a program for the reconstitution of social norms."¹⁵

Simons argued that social movements have to fulfill the same functional requirements as more formal organizations.

A social movement is not a formal social structure but it nevertheless is obligated to fulfill parallel functions. Like the heads of private corporations or government agencies, the leaders of social movements must meet a number of rhetorical requirements.¹⁶

According to Simons, there are three basic rhetorical requirements which must be fulfilled by the leaders of a movement if they are to be successful.

1. They must attract, maintain, and mold their followers into an efficiently organized unit.
2. They must secure the adoption of their ideology by the larger structure (i.e., the external system, the established order).
3. They must react to resistance generated by the larger structure.

These imperatives constitute rhetorical requirements for the leadership of a movement. Conflicts among requirements create rhetorical problems which in turn affect decisions on rhetorical strategies. The primary 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.¹⁷

Simons also identified the principle leadership problem in social movements.

¹⁵ Simons, 3.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid., 2-4.

The leaders of social movements can expect minimal internal control and maximal external resistance. . . . Shorn of the controls that characterize formal organizations, yet required to perform the same internal functions, the leader of a social movement must constantly balance inherently conflicting demands on his position and on the movement he represents.¹⁸

Simons' outline of the development of movements is especially relevant to the study of why movements change and divide as they so often do.

The disintegration of a movement may be traced to its failure to meet one or more of the demands incumbent upon it. To deal with pressures from the external system, the movement may lose sight of its ideological values and become preoccupied with power for its own sake. Careful, by contrast, to remain consistent with its values, the movement may forsake those strategies and tactics that are necessary to implement its program. To attract membership support from persons with dissimilar views, the movement may dilute its ideology, become bogged down with peripheral issues, or abandon all substantive concerns and exist solely to provide membership satisfaction.¹⁹

Social movement theory in general and Simons' theory of persuasion for social movements in particular help explain why and how movements get started. The same principles should be applicable to the study of movement fragmentation. The division of a movement can be considered as the establishment of one or more new movements. One can view society as a whole as the larger structure within which a movement is established. But one can also view a movement itself as being the larger structure within which factions develop. If it is possible to understand what it takes to establish a movement in society, it should be possible to apply the same principles so as to understand what it takes to establish a faction within a movement. It is not the purpose of this study to formulate a theory of faction development. Rather, in this study, Simons' theory and social movement theory in general are viewed as a sufficient explanation of what it takes to form a faction.

¹⁸ Ibid., 4.

¹⁹ Ibid., 5.

Perhaps the greatest contribution that Simons had made in his theory of persuasion for social movements is his focus on persuasion. Persuasion is the key factor in the establishment of social movements since such movements are, by definition, voluntary associations. People join movements because they are persuaded to do so. In the same way, people join factions within a movement because they are persuaded to do so. This focus on persuasion is especially important in the study of religious movements. Kenneth Burke has suggested that religion is fundamentally a rhetorical enterprise in the sense that rhetoric is the art of persuasion, and it is the goal of religious groups to persuade men to certain attitudes and acts consistent with their doctrines.²⁰

A second way in which Simons has contributed to the study of movements is that he has provided a theoretical framework of analysis for the study of movement rhetoric. Concerning the value of theory, Simons said,

Professor [Leland M.] Griffin has prescribed a relativistic and essentially clinical process for identifying and evaluating "the pattern of public discussion, the configuration of discourse, the physiognomy of persuasion peculiar to a movement." Yet the analyst could probably fulfill and even go beyond Griffin's definition of his task if only he could draw more heavily on theory. No theory of persuasion in social movement can as yet be applied predictively to particular cases or tested rigorously through an analysis of such cases. But theory can nevertheless be illuminative. In addition to suggesting categories for descriptive analysis (a skeletal typology of stages, leaders, media, audiences, etc., has already been provided by Griffin), it can indicate--admittedly in general terms--the requirements that rhetoric must fulfill in social movements, the means available to accomplish these requirements, and the kinds of problems that impede accomplishment. By enumerating rhetorical requirements, theory identifies the ends in light of which rhetorical strategies and tactics may be evaluated. By suggesting parameters and directions to the rhetorical critic, theory places him in a better position to bring his own sensitivity and imagination to bear on analysis of particular movements.²¹

²⁰ Kenneth Burke, *The Rhetoric of Religion* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1961), p. v.

²¹ Simons, 2.

In a footnote comment, Simons stressed the need for a theoretical framework.

Griffin has suggested that the development of theory must await further research. Yet there is reason to believe, here as elsewhere, that theory and research must develop apace of each other. As Black has argued . . . the researcher can do little without a framework of analysis.²²

Simons' theory of persuasion for social movements grew out of his study of civil rights and anti-Vietnam war protest groups. Simons suggested, however, that the same theory could be applied to other movements including religious movements.

Although geared to specific social movements (and especially to contemporary cases), the theory is applicable with somewhat less consistency to general and expressive movements . . . such as secessionist movements and movements aimed at the restoration or protection of laws, rules, and/or agencies.²³

Simons further suggested that religious cults are a prototype of the "expressive social movements" to which his theory could be applied.²⁴ The terminology in Simons' article is specific to the protest movements he was studying. However, two of the works to which Simons referred as background for his study are specific to the study of religious movements. The work by Dawson and Gettys, which Simons cited as the "classic typology of stages" in the development of movements, was written about the specific case of the Methodist Church and its establishment as a faction within the Church of England.²⁵ The study by King, which Simons noted for its discussion of "structural imperatives," used the Christian Science movement as one of three

²²Simons, 2. See also: Edwin Black, Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method (New York, 1965), pp. 22-23; and Leland M Griffin, "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 38 (April, 1952), 184-188.

²³Simons, 3.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Dawson and Gettys, pp. 708-732.

examples of American social movements.²⁶ In his summary, Simons discussed the phenomenon of movement fragmentation, implying that this is an area of investigation in which his theory should have useful application.²⁷ It should be evident, therefore, that Simons' theory and the general social movement theory on which he built can be applied to the study of faction formation in such a movement as the Restoration Movement.

Simons' Theory Applied to Movement Fragmentation

Simons said that there are three basic rhetorical requirements for leadership in a social movement: leaders must attract, maintain, and mold their followers into an efficiently organized unit; they must secure the adoption of their ideology by the larger structure; and they must react to resistance generated by the larger structure. Since Simons expressed his theory in terminology specifically adapted to the protest movements he was studying, it is necessary to elaborate on Simons' three basic requirements in order to apply them to the study of faction formation in the Restoration Movement. It is also essential to note something that Simons mentioned but did not fully develop: that as a faction within a movement goes through various stages of development, the rhetorical requirements change. Since Simons cited the Dawson and Gettys typology of stages without addition or correction, it may be assumed that he accepted their general framework of social movement theory as a foundation for his own theory. Therefore, in this study, the Dawson and Gettys theory will be viewed as a part of Simons' theory and parts of Simons' theory will be expressed in the Dawson and Gettys

²⁶C. Wendell King, Social Movements in the United States (New York: Random House, 1969).

²⁷Simons, 11.

terminology which is specifically applicable to the study of factions in a religious movement.

The first rhetorical requirement that Simons listed in his theory of persuasion for social movements is that leaders must attract followers. There are several ways in which leaders might attract followers. It is self-evident, however, that for a faction to form within a movement, faction leaders must attract followers in such a way that there is a polarization of the movement into conflicting camps. This is what Dawson and Gettys called "the stage of unrest" and polarization is what they set forth as the rhetorical requirement at this stage of development.²⁸ The polarization of the Dawson and Gettys theory is not a different requirement from Simons' requirement that leaders attract followers. Polarization is simply the way followers are attracted in the case of faction formation. Therefore, the first rhetorical requirement to be considered in this study is the requirement that faction leaders must attract followers by polarizing the thinking of the movement. Non-verbal factors are involved in polarization.²⁹ Such factors as the nature of the issue, the prestige of leaders, and the availability of channels of communication for addressing the movement will be considered. But the primary task of this study at this point will be to isolate and identify rhetorical strategies which contribute to polarization and show how they work.

Simons continued his list of rhetorical requirements with the point that leaders must maintain their followers and mold them into an efficiently organized unit. This is what Dawson and Gettys called the "popular stage" of faction development in which leaders must provide a sense of group identity for their developing faction.³⁰

²⁸ Dawson and Gettys, pp. 712-713. ²⁹ Ibid., p. 724. ³⁰ Ibid., p. 720.

There is no conflict between the Dawson and Gettys requirement of identification and Simons' requirement that leaders maintain their followers and mold them into an efficiently organized unit. Providing a sense of group-identification is simply the specific way in which faction leaders maintain and mold their followers according to Dawson and Gettys.³¹ A faction, as defined in this present study according to the operational definition of Dawson and Gettys, is an identifiable group.³² Unless leaders provide a sense of group-identity so that the developing faction is recognizable to others and so that faction members develop a group self-consciousness, then the faction never fully develops as a faction. Therefore, the second rhetorical requirement to be considered in this study will be the requirement of identification: faction leaders must maintain their followers and mold them into an efficiently organized unit by providing a sense of group identification for their faction.

Three non-verbal factors already mentioned as a part of polarization carry over and are a vital part of the identification process. The nature of the issues, the prestige of leaders, and the channels of communication play a role in identification just as they do in polarization. These factors will be considered, but the primary task of this study at this point will be to isolate and identify the rhetorical strategies which contribute to self-conscious group identification and to show how these strategies work.

The next point in Simons' list of rhetorical requirements is that leaders of a social movement must secure the adoption by the larger structure of the movement's ideology. Simons discussed this requirement in terms of selling the

³¹ Ibid., pp. 719-721.

³² Ibid., pp. 725-726.

"product" of the movement--the "product" being the movement's ideology, especially its program for change.³³ Dawson and Gettys call this the "formal organization" stage of development and stress the point that this is the stage of faction development when separation must take place.³⁴ In the civil rights and anti-Vietnam war protest movements studied in Simons' article, securing the adoption of the movement's program for change does not always involve changing the beliefs of the larger structure. Some of the leaders Simons discussed use power, violence, and threat of violence to secure the adoption of their program for change. They do not rely on persuasion to influence the larger structure. But in the case of factions developing within a movement the situation is different. In the Dawson and Gettys study, the larger structure was the Church of England and the Methodist Church was the faction developing within the larger structure. In the present study the Restoration Movement is the larger structure in which factions develop. In both cases, the task of a faction leader is to appeal to individuals in the larger structure to adopt the faction's ideology. One becomes a member of a faction in the Restoration Movement simply by adopting the faction's ideology. Faction membership in the Restoration Movement is defined in terms of shared beliefs, not in organizational terms.

A movement leader could use any one of several different methods for persuading others in the movement to adopt the ideology of his faction. A leader could change the thinking of the whole movement in such a way that

³³ Simons, 4.

³⁴ Dawson and Gettys, pp. 721-724.

no division would occur. But in the case of faction development, there must come a time when one group separates from the rest of the movement.³⁵ Without separation there are no factions.

Separation may not come at once. Leaders may employ a strategy of infiltration and subversion. Dawson and Gettys said that the Methodists tried to use this strategy in the early days of their development in the Church of England.³⁶ In the strategy of infiltration and subversion, leaders work to take over existing institutions, take control of the movement's channels of communication, and build up a power base before calling for an open confrontation to expell the opposition.

Separation may be imposed by majority leaders as a response to a minority's strategy of infiltration and subversion. Dawson and Gettys said that the leaders of the Church of England imposed such a separation on the Methodists.³⁷ If the majority imposes the separation soon enough, the expelled minority will tend to be rather small.

Relatively minor division may also result if the leaders of a faction make little effort to recruit followers. They may adopt a largely defensive posture from the very first and employ a strategy of preservation--the preservation of their remnant. But separation must come for a faction to be formed. First the leaders polarize the thinking of the movement, next they identify with themselves as large a faction as possible, and then they separate that faction from the rest of the movement.³⁸ The task of the present study at this point will be to isolate and identify the rhetorical strategies used in the Restoration Movement to fulfill the rhetorical requirement of separation and to see how they work.

35Ibid.

36

Ibid., p. 722.

37

Ibid.

38

Ibid., pp. 710-724.

The last rhetorical requirement for leadership in a social movement listed in Simons' theory is that the leaders must react to resistance generated by the larger structure. Simons' last rhetorical requirement corresponds to what Dawson and Gettys called the last stage of movement development--the "institutional stage." Dawson and Gettys stressed the point that a movement in this last stage will be stable and relatively permanent and that it will remain so until the time when fresh social contacts and accelerated interactions result in a new state of unrest. In the specific case of factions developing within a movement, the rhetorical requirement at this point is that leaders must isolate their faction in order to defend their followers against the attacks from other factions within the movement.³⁹ The task of the present study at this point will be to identify rhetorical strategies which contribute to the isolation of a faction and show how these strategies have worked in the Restoration Movement.

Simons said leaders of social movements must attract followers, maintain and mold their followers into an efficiently organized unit, secure the adoption of their ideology by the larger structure, and react to resistance generated by the larger structure. Dawson and Gettys talked about the four stages of movement development: the stage of unrest, the popular stage, the stage of formal organization, and the institutional stage. Dawson and Gettys also suggest the rhetorical requirements at each stage: polarization, identification, separation, and isolation. Polarization, identification, separation, and isolation are Simons' rhetorical requirements as applied to the specific case of faction development.

³⁹ Dawson and Gettys, pp. 725-726.

The Restoration Movement

In this study, Simons' theory of persuasion for social movements is adapted to the analysis of movement fragmentation and applied to the study of rhetorical strategies and their role in the formation of factions in the Restoration Movement. It is necessary at this point to include a brief outline of the history of the Restoration Movement as background for the reader who is interested in rhetorical strategies but not familiar with the Restoration Movement.

The Quest for Unity

The Restoration Movement, the largest indigenous religious movement in America, began in the early nineteenth century as an effort to achieve religious unity by going "back to the Bible" to restore the non-denominational Christianity of the New Testament. Several independent movements, dating from as early as 1794, coming largely from Presbyterian, Baptist, and Methodist backgrounds, merged by 1832 into what has been known since as the Restoration Movement. Local congregations of the Restoration Movement were known in various places as Disciples of Christ, Christian Church, or Church of Christ.

By 1850 this group was the fourth largest religious fellowship in America and in the decade of the 1850's it was the fastest growing religious group in the nation. If all the heirs of the Restoration Movement were to be counted together today, they would constitute the third largest religious body in the nation behind the Catholics and the Baptists.

The leaders of the Restoration Movement felt that they had found the formula for uniting Christendom. Furthermore, they believed that they had found the way to prevent division within their own ranks. They had no formal

written creed which could be used as a "test of fellowship." They had no denominational machinery which could be used to exclude anyone. There have been many important issues on which leaders of the Restoration Movement have differed without division.

The Disciples of Christ--the most common term for the movement in its brief period of unity--escaped the division that came to almost every other American religious group during the Civil War years. Because of this lack of division--at least a lack of open division--over the issues of slavery and the Civil War, Moses E. Lard boasted in 1866, "We can never divide!"⁴⁰ But as one of the most capable historians of the movement said,

Disciples cannot divide through the exclusion of one element by another in control of denominational machinery, because there is no such machinery with power of exclusion. But it is possible to divide by voluntary withdrawal. If there is no power to put any church out, there is none to keep it in if it wants to get out. This is what happened.⁴¹

Division over the Missionary Society and Instrumental Music

The first major division of the Restoration Movement came over the related issues of the missionary society and the use of instrumental music in worship. Actually the missionary society came first, but it was not generally accepted until after instrumental music came to be accepted in a large number of congregations. The relation between these two seemingly unrelated items is that the argument which justifies the use of instrumental music in worship opened the door for general acceptance of the missionary society.

⁴⁰ "Can We Divide?" Lard's Quarterly, III, No. 3 (April, 1866), 336.

⁴¹ Winifred Ernest Garrison, An American Religious Movement (St. Louis, The Bethany Press, 1945), p. 118.

The leaders in the early days of the Restoration Movement took the position that what is done in religion must be authorized by command, precept, or example from the Bible. For those early leaders, it was not enough that the Bible did not expressly condemn a given practice, they insisted that every religious practice must be authorized by Scripture. The advocates of instrumental music in worship defended its use on the ground that the Scriptures do not expressly forbid the use of instrumental music in worship. They denied that it is necessary to have Scriptural authorization for every religious practice. But many of these same people had opposed the missionary society on the grounds that it is not authorized in the Bible. And when they changed their position on the need to have Bible authority for everything in religion in order to justify instrumental music in worship, they were left with no basis for objecting to the missionary society.

In its early days the Restoration Movement was strictly congregational in organization. Alexander Campbell's writings in the Christian Baptist, 1823-1830, were violently opposed to any church organization above the level of the local congregation. However, in the Millennial Harbinger, which Campbell edited from 1830 until his death in 1865, Campbell began to argue for some kind of a national organization. Alexander Campbell was the first President of the American Christian Missionary Society which was organized in 1849. The first International Convention of the Christian Church was held in 1856. The Christian Women's Board of Missions was organized in 1874 and the Foreign Christian Missionary Society was organized in 1875. The proliferation of these denomination-wide societies continued, but many local congregations never supported any of them. A conservative element

within the Restoration Movement regarded these societies as dangerous departures from the New Testament pattern which they were striving to restore. They feared that these societies would grow to become a full-fledged denominational structure with power over local churches.

The Restoration Movement was influenced greatly by the controversy over the societies. On the local level, however, the issue which proved to be most divisive was the instrumental music question. Generally the leaders who favored the instrumental music also favored the societies. There were a few prominent leaders who took an anti-instrumental music, pro-society stand, but they never attracted enough followers to form a faction along those lines. The group that was both anti-instrumental music and anti-society became the group now known as the Church of Christ. The federal government officially recognized the Church of Christ as a denomination separate from the Disciples in the 1906 religious census, but the actual division came earlier. This conservative group is today the largest segment of the Restoration Movement with around 2,500,000 members in the United States and with its greatest strength in the South and Southwest.

Divisions within the Church of Christ

The great majority of congregations in the Church of Christ have continued as one religious fellowship. There have, however, been a number of factions which have developed within the Church of Christ. One of the first factions to be isolated from the rest of the Church of Christ was an anti-college, anti-minister group. They regarded Christian Colleges as being human institutions set up to do the work of the church and thus parallel to the missionary society rejected by the Church of Christ. They were also opposed to the practice of having a full-time paid minister to work with

congregations once those congregations were organized with elders and deacons. They insisted, instead, on a "mutual ministry."

Another faction that developed within the Church of Christ opposed having Bible classes, women teachers, any religious literature other than the Bible, and other things connected with the traditional Sunday School method of Bible teaching. Another division came over the insistence of some that there must be only one cup used in the Lord's Supper. Millennial views are the subject of yet another controversy. For many years a wide range of millennial views were tolerated in the Restoration Movement. But within the Church of Christ in the past fifty years, a separate Premillennial group has been isolated.

Within the last twenty years the Church of Christ has experienced the development of what has been called an "anti-cooperation" faction. A large majority in the Church of Christ favors congregational cooperation in mission and benevolent works. This cooperation is involved in such things as the support of orphans homes, homes for the aged, foreign mission works, and a nation-wide radio-TV program. Those congregations which oppose the cooperative efforts have no fellowship with those who support such efforts. Around eighty per cent of the members of the Church of Christ are in the "main-stream" group, around ten per cent are in the anti-cooperation group, and the other ten per cent is scattered through the minor factions such as the anti-Sunday School, "one-cup," premillennial, or anti-college groups.

The Independent-Disciples Division

Changes in organization and practice had led to the first liberal-conservative split when the Church of Christ separated from the rest of the movement in the late nineteenth century. Further changes in organization and

practice led to a second liberal-conservative split in the first half of the twentieth century. The Independent Christian Church, with local congregations in various places still known either as Christian Church or Church of Christ, is the conservative group to emerge from that division. They have around 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 members with most of their strength in the Midwest. This leaves the Disciples of Christ, the more liberal group, with around 2,000,000 members and with their greatest strength in the North. In opposition to the International Convention of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), the Independents work through the North American Christian Convention. In opposition to the United Christian Missionary Society, controlled by the Disciples, the Independents do their mission work through the Christian Missionary Fellowship or through direct congregational support.

One of the first issues which led to the eventual split between the Disciples and Independents was the "open membership" question. Independents taught the traditional Restoration Movement view that baptism is immersion and that only the immersed can be accepted into church membership. Disciples still practice immersion, but have come to accept the validity of other forms of baptism. Thus a person who is a member of some denomination that does not practice immersion can transfer membership to a Disciples congregation and be accepted into church membership with no requirement of immersion. Independents object to this practice. They also object to what they believe to be the liberal theology taught by many leaders of the Disciples: the denial of the verbal inspiration and the authority of the Bible, rejection of the miracles in the Bible, the denial of the virgin birth of Jesus, and the abandonment of the restoration principle.

From the beginning of the Restoration Movement, there has been a serious difference within the movement as to the purpose of the movement. Some have seen the restoration of primitive Christianity as the goal and religious unity as a possible by-product of that restoration. This is the thinking represented by the Church of Christ and more recently by the Independent Christian Church. Others have seen religious unity as the goal and the restoration principle as one possible way of achieving that goal. This is the view that is represented by the Disciples of Christ.

When the restoration principle failed to achieve religious unity, the leaders of the Disciples began to abandon the restoration principle in favor of ecumenism. Instead of trying to achieve religious unity by persuading individuals to accept a fixed New Testament pattern for the Church, they sought religious union through an organizational merger of denominations. The Disciples of Christ have been among the leaders of the ecumenical movement. They helped found the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, later the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches.

The Disciples, however, were in a difficult position as they sought to lead an effort to merge denominational organizations, because they could not speak with any authority for their own denomination. The Disciples had never fully developed a genuine denominational structure with centralized control and power over local churches. So the more liberal element in the Disciples began advocating a "Restructure" of their denomination. The congregations which decided to go along with this reorganization surrendered a significant amount of power to the central denominational organization. The controversy over "restructure" was one of the contributing factors leading to the withdrawal of the Independents.

Issues within the Independent and Disciples Groups

There has not been enough time since the split between the Independents and Disciples for any further faction development to proceed very far. However, the beginnings of faction development can be detected in both groups. In the Independent fellowship there is a controversy over the question of how mission work should be supported. One group favors working through the Christian Missionary Fellowship, an inter-congregational coordinating board. Another group favors the direct support plan. The Independents are also divided over the question of whether the colleges supported by this group should be liberal arts colleges for the general public or Bible colleges for the training of their ministers.

Some congregations of the Independent group are very conservative--more conservative than most of the congregations in the Church of Christ. One branch of the Independent group, with its leadership in Ottumwa, Iowa, opposes make-up, movies, television, and the like. While this liberal-conservative polarization has not yet divided the Independent group, there is a kind of de facto division of the Independent fellowship along these lines.

Within the Disciples, there is very little faction formation in progress, probably because their more highly structured organization with stronger centralized control does not lend itself to faction formation as much as is the case with the less structured groups, the Independents and the Church of Christ. However, even within the Disciples there is a noticable polarization along two lines which could eventually lead to division. Some in the Disciples group are still essentially conservative in theology and others have become very liberal. But perhaps the greatest potential for further fragmentation within the Disciples is over the question

of support for the ecumenical movement. Disciples are not at all agreed on how much they should compromise in order to achieve ecumenical union with other denominations.

The Restoration Movement has not achieved the religious unifaction that its founders hoped it would achieve. The conservative elements within the movement would contend that it did achieve or is achieving the restoration of primitive Christianity. However, instead of achieving the religious unity which its founders anticipated, the Restoration Movement has, itself, divided into three main groups and a dozen or so smaller factions.

Differences without Division

The greatest paradox of the Restoration Movement is that in spite of the many divisions listed above, there have also been many issues on which leaders of the Restoration Movement have differed without division. In spite of wide discussion and some polarization, these issues have never resulted in faction formation.

There has been a wide range of eschatological doctrine taught by leaders of the Restoration Movement without any major division other than the premillennial-amillennial split in the Church of Christ in this century. In the nineteenth century, millennial views did not divide the Restoration Movement and among the Independents and the Disciples there is still no division in spite of diversity on this issue. Slavery and the Civil War were issues which divided the nation but did not openly divide the Restoration Movement, although bitter feelings on these issues certainly contributed to later division on other issues.

The Christian's relation to civil government is another issue on which leaders of the Restoration Movement have differed without division. David Lipscomb, a pioneer in the Church of Christ branch of the movement, taught that civil government is evil, Christians should not vote, Christians should not hold public office, they should have no involvement with civil government except to pay their taxes and obey the law.

Related to the civil government issue is the question of how best to approach the problem of alcohol. Many leaders of the Restoration Movement have taken a strong stand in favor of legal prohibition. Carry Nation was a member of the Christian Church and quite a heroine to certain elements of the Restoration Movement. But others argued that moral persuasion is the best way to work on the problem. The persuasion v. prohibition issue has at times been quite hot, but no faction ever developed around either of these positions.

Another issue debated at length in the Restoration Movement is the issue of conscientious objection. Many leaders of each branch of the Restoration Movement have been conscientious objectors and have taught that this doctrine is an essential of the Christian faith. Others have been just as strong in teaching against the conscientious objector position.

The movement has experienced serious controversy over questions about marriage, divorce, and re-marriage, but no division of the movement has ever developed over these issues.

There is currently a controversy within the Church of Christ as to whether or not an orphans home must be under the direct supervision of a local church eldership. Some take the position that it must. Others take the position that this is not strictly an eldership function and that any board

of directors over such a home would be acceptable. There has been controversy over many questions about the eldership--their qualifications, tenure, and authority--but no division over these issues. Some local congregations in various branches of the Restoration Movement practice and defend racial segregation. Most practice but do not defend de facto segregation. Some are active in promoting integration. But the movement has not divided over this issue.

It is obvious from the above that the Restoration Movement is old enough and large enough to have experienced all stages of faction development in the case of several issue-centered factions. It has also experienced differences over some issues with no resulting faction development. For these reasons, the Restoration Movement furnishes an excellent example for the study of faction development within a movement.

The course of the Restoration Movement has been shaped by the persuaders in the movement--the speakers and writers. The founders of the Restoration Movement accepted a rationalistic philosophy. This rationalism contributed to an emphasis on argumentation and debate. For these reasons the Restoration Movement is especially well suited as the subject for the study of rhetorical strategies and their role in the development of factions within a movement.

Preview

In the following chapters the Restoration Movement provides the material for the analysis of rhetorical strategies and their role in the fragmentation of a movement. Chapter Two deals with the rhetorical requirement of polarization and the rhetorical strategies which produce polarization. Chapter Three takes up the rhetorical requirement of identification and the rhetorical strategies which give a faction a sense

of group-consciousness. Chapter Four deals with the rhetorical requirement of separation and considers the strategies which leaders employ to separate a group of followers who share their beliefs. Four basic approaches are considered: the strategy of modification, the strategy of infiltration and subversion, the strategy of preservation, and the strategy of imposed separation. In addition to the consideration of these four basic approaches, Chapter Four takes up the specific rhetorical strategies which result in faction separation. Chapter Five considers the rhetorical requirement of isolation and the rhetorical strategies used in this last stage of faction development. Chapter Six concludes with an evaluation of Simons' theory, its applicability to the study of faction development, its contribution to the understanding of the Restoration Movement, and finally some suggestions for additional research.

CHAPTER TWO

STRATEGIES FOR POLARIZATION

Introduction

The first rhetorical requirement for leadership in a social movement that is listed in Herbert W. Simons' theory of persuasion for social movements is the requirement that leaders must attract followers.¹ In the case of social movements in general, leaders might attract followers in any one of several ways.² This study, however, is concerned with a special kind of movement: the faction, which is viewed in this study as a movement that develops within a movement. Specifically, this study is concerned with the kind of leadership which results in faction formation. In this case, it is still necessary that leaders attract followers, but the requirement is more specific: leaders must attract followers in such a way that a faction is formed.

Simons did not discuss faction formation in his article on his theory of persuasion for social movements. But he did use the general social movement theory of Dawson and Gettys³ as a foundation for his theory and

¹"Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56 (February, 1970), 3.

²Ibid., 4-7.

³Carl A. Dawson and Warner E. Gettys, An Introduction to Sociology (Revised Edition; New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1935), pp. 708-729.

Dawson and Gettys illustrated their study with the specific example of the Methodist Church and its formation as a faction within the Church of England. Dawson and Gettys discussed the particular way leaders must attract followers in order to form a faction. They called this first stage of faction formation the "stage of social unrest" and they stressed the importance of polarizing the thinking of the movement that is to be divided into factions. Their particular concern was with the polarization in English society and especially in the Church of England.⁴ It is self-evident that a movement must be polarized into conflicting schools of thought if followers are to be attracted in such a way as to divide the movement into factions. As Simons' theory of persuasion is adapted to the study of factions, his general requirement that leaders must attract followers becomes the specific requirement that leaders must attract followers by polarizing the thinking of the movement which is to be divided into factions.

Polarization as a rhetorical requirement is a legitimate adaptation of Simons' theory. This fact becomes especially clear when one examines an earlier version of Simons' article which is being used as the basis of the present study. Simons' 1970 article in The Quarterly Journal of Speech was a revision of an earlier article⁵ in which Simons discussed polarization and its importance. In both articles, Simons was writing about various civil rights groups and not about faction development within a religious movement.

⁴
Ibid., pp. 713-721.

⁵
"Patterns of Persuasion in the Civil Rights Struggle," Today's Speech, 15 (February, 1967), 25-27, (Hereinafter referred to as "Patterns of Persuasion," while Simons' article in The Quarterly Journal of Speech, which is the basis of the present study will be referred to simply by the author's name).

But if one views the United States as the larger structure and the civil rights movement as a faction within the larger structure, then the situation is analogous to the Restoration Movement and factions within it.

In Simons' earlier article, he talked about the "polarization between the races" and the "racial schism" in the United States.⁶ And he used the racial polarization to explain militant black rhetoric.

The reason some Negro leaders have risked a backlash is that in order to wrest change from whites in public positions they have had to build a sizeable power base among Negro masses. And in order to secure massive Negro support, they have at least had to strike militant poses. In the face of Negro impatience and hostility, a segment of the leadership is convinced that psychological proximity to whites is political suicide.⁷

Thus it is clear that although Simons did not discuss the specific requirement of polarization in his article on his theory of persuasion for social movements, polarization as a rhetorical requirement for faction leadership fits Simons' theoretical framework and the general social movement theory on which Simons built. Polarization is the specific way of attracting followers that is an essential part of the process of faction formation. Therefore the purposes of this chapter will be to examine the history of the Restoration Movement as the specific case in point for the present study so as to isolate and identify rhetorical strategies which have contributed to polarization in the Restoration Movement and show how they have worked.

A Psychological Explanation of Polarization

The term "polarization" in the social sciences reflects its original meaning in the physical sciences. A body which is polarized exhibits opposite or contrasted properties in opposite or contrasted directions. Polarization

⁶ Ibid., 25.

⁷ Ibid., 26.

in social movements refers to the alignment of membership support toward opposite poles of influence within the movement.⁸

The term "polarization" as used in this study does not refer to the changing of attitudes, opinions, or positions on issues. Strategies for producing attitude change within a movement are discussed in chapter four. Polarization comes before attitude change. It is related to the present attitudes of people within a movement and to their perception of the attitudes expressed by others within the movement.⁹ Polarization is what occurs when a small nucleus of followers who share a leader's ideas and enthusiasm become aware of existing differences within a movement and begin to exaggerate those differences.¹⁰

For purposes of illustrating the specific way the term "polarization" is used in this study, assume that in a particular movement there exists on a given issue a diversity of opinions from one extreme to the opposite extreme. Just having this diversity of opinions does not mean that there is any polarization. But then suppose that something happens to cause people to notice the differences, care about them, and exaggerate the differences between their own position and the positions expressed by others. Suppose that people perceive the differences between their own position and the positions of others as being greater than they really are. If this happens,

⁸ Herbert Blumer, "Social Movements," in New Outline of the Principles of Sociology, ed. A. M. Lee (New York: Barnes & Nobel, Inc., 1955), p. 199.

⁹ Dawson and Gettys, pp. 710-712.

¹⁰ C. Wendell King, Social Movements in the United States (New York: Random House, 1969), p. 42.

people of differing views will be pushed further and further apart. This is polarization. But if people do not notice existing differences, do not care about them, or minimize them, then polarization does not occur.

The Assimilation-Contrast Effect

Various social psychologists have explained the minimizing or exaggerating of differences between one's own position and the positions expressed by others in terms of the assimilation-contrast effect.¹¹ The concept of the assimilation-contrast effect grew out of psychophysical studies of perception in the judgement of weights.

In the weight perception studies the question was how a person's judgements of a series of weights might be distorted by the influence of a single weight used as a standard. These studies found that when people judge a series of weights, the first weight that they judge tends to distort their judgement of the rest of the weights in the series. This distortion has been called the "anchor effect." If the first weight is much lighter than the other weights, then the entire series is perceived as heavier than it actually is. If the first weight is much heavier than the other weights, then the entire series is perceived as lighter than it actually is. In this case, the "anchor"--the first weight judged--exerts a contrast effect on the judgements of the series. That is, the perception of weights in the series is displaced away from the anchor and from their true position. However, when the first weight presented is within the range of the other weights--

¹¹M. Sherif and C. I. Hovland, Social Judgement: Assimilation and Contrast Effects in Reaction to Communication (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961). For a review of this type of research, see: Vernon L. Allen, "1966 Review: Attitude and Attitude Change," American Sociological Review 31 (1966), 283-284.

then the weights near the "anchor" will appear more similar to it than they actually are. Weights slightly lighter than the anchor will appear heavier while slightly heavier weights will appear lighter. This "attraction" exerted by the anchor on the other weight judgements is called an assimilation effect.¹²

Later researchers have applied the assimilation-contrast effect to the study of communication and attitude change. To make the basic model relevant to the study of communication and attitude change, the study by Hovland, Harvey, and Sherif simply used the individual's own position on an issue as the reference anchor. Instead of judging weights, they had their experimental subjects judge the "distance" between their own position and other positions in a series of statements on the issue.

To make their model testable, Hovland, Harvey, and Sherif devised a way to measure the verbal structure of an attitude. They prepared a series of statements on an issue ranging from one extreme to the opposite extreme and representing the various possible positions in between. Then they asked the subjects to pick the statement which most nearly corresponded to their own. They also asked the subjects to indicate other statements which they found acceptable. The most preferred statement and the other acceptable statements formed what Hovland, Harvey, and Sherif called the latitude of acceptance. Next they asked the subjects to indicate the statements which they found to be objectionable. All of the objectional statements taken together formed what they called the latitude of rejection. Statements which the subjects did

¹² Phillip Zimbardo and Ebbe B. Ebbesen, Influencing Attitudes and Changing Behavior (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969), p. 51.

not indicate to be either acceptable or objectionable formed what they called the latitude of non-commitment.

When they asked the subjects to judge the distance between their own position and other positions on the scale, they found that subjects tended to minimize the differences between their own position and other positions within their latitude of acceptance. Thus they found that the assimilation effect works in judging the positions of statements on issues. They also found that the subjects tended to exaggerate the differences between their own position and the positions in their latitude of rejection. Thus they demonstrated that the contrast effect works in judging the position of statements on issues.¹³

The assimilation-contrast model is useful in the study of faction formation within a movement and particularly useful in the study of polarization. The contrast effect is what Simons was talking about when he discussed the militant black leaders who "have elected to increase their psychological distance from whites."¹⁴ When the assimilation effect is in operation, people minimize existing differences within a movement and polarization does not take place. But when the contrast effect is working, people exaggerate the differences within a movement and that produces polarization.

The Role of Ego-Involvement

Later studies using the assimilation-contrast model have explained how the assimilation effect is reduced and the contrast effect increased.

¹³C. I. Hovland, O. J. Harvey, and M. Sherif, "Assimilation and Contrast Effects in Reaction to Communication and Attitude Change," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55 (1957), 244-252.

¹⁴Simons, "Patterns of Persuasion. . .", 27.

Ego-involvement is the key factor. Psychologists since the time of William James have stressed that a person's attitudes on various issues are constituents of that person's self-image.¹⁵ As Sherif and Sherif expressed it, "the formation of attitudes is integral to the process of forming a self-concept. In fact, through the establishment of a constellation of subject-object relationships, the self-concept is delineated."¹⁶ The relation between attitudes and a person's self-concept is expressed succinctly by Sherif, Sherif, and Nebergall, "changing [a person's] attitudes means changing him as a person, changing a part of himself as he has come to know himself relative to his social world."¹⁷

Various researchers have found that when ego-involvement is increased the latitude of rejection is increased and therefore the contrast effect is increased. With increased ego-involvement there is also a decrease in the latitude of non-commitment. With high ego-involvement the latitude of acceptance is also narrowed. As a result, when ego-involvement is increased, the assimilation effect is decreased.¹⁸

¹⁵ Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif, "Attitude as the Individual's Own Categories: The Social Judgement-Involvement Approach to Attitude and Attitude Change," in Attitude, Ego-Involvement, and Change, ed. by Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968), p. 106.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 113.

¹⁷ Carolyn W. Sherif, Muzafer Sherif, and Roger E. Nebergall, Attitude and Attitude Change (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1965), p. 29.

¹⁸ Sherif and Sherif, pp. 118-119. See also: Alice H. Eagley and M. Manis, "Evaluation of Message and Communication as a Function of Involvement," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3 (1966), 483-485; M. Sherif and H. Cantril, The Psychology of Ego-Involvement (New York: Wiley, 1966).

The implications of this research for the study of polarization within a movement such as the Restoration Movement are that when people become more ego-involved with an issue, they will exaggerate differences rather than minimizing them. This exaggeration of differences will push people and groups further and further apart. Increased ego-involvement, therefore, is the key to polarization in a movement. The polarizing results of increased ego-involvement are clearly outlined by Sherif, Sherif, and Nebergall,

In highly ego-involved issues . . . the individual's entrenched position overrides situational concerns to be tolerant of contrary opinions or to be agreeable. The felt discrepancy in these highly involving issues is never resolved by moving toward the advocated position. The advocated position is invariably felt as an outrage, a violation of what is sacred, as a travesty of human decency.¹⁹

Wagner and Sherwood commented that "attitudes based on ego-defenses are by far the most elusive and the most resistant to change."²⁰

A few historians of the Restoration Movement have mentioned the role of ego-involvement. Whitley commented, for example, that behind the attacks on the missionary society "lay the fact that a certain way of viewing the Christian gospel had become a vested interest, with which personalities and prestige were involved."²¹ However, neither Whitley nor any other historian of the Restoration Movement has really developed this point.

¹⁹P. 228.

²⁰Richard V. Wagner and John J. Sherwood, The Study of Attitude Change (Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1969), p. 40.

²¹Oliver Read Whitley, Trumpet Call of Reformation (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1959), p. 127.

No historian of the Restoration Movement has used the assimilation-contrast model to explain polarization in the Restoration Movement. But the historians of the movement have clearly demonstrated the effect, particularly the contrast effect. The views of two writers in regard to J. H. Garrison, editor of the Christian-Evangelist, provide a good illustration of the contrast effect.

Charles Clayton Morrison, the editor of the Christian Century, saw J. H. Garrison as a conservative trouble-maker because of their differences over the open membership controversy in the Christian Church. Garrison opposed accepting into membership anyone who had not been immersed. As Morrison saw him, J. H. Garrison was almost in the conservative camp along with the Church of Christ.²² But Earl West, historian from the Church of Christ branch of the Restoration Movement, saw J. H. Garrison as a dangerous liberal. West blamed Garrison for surrendering the traditional position on baptism²³--the very thing that Morrison blamed Garrison for not doing. It is evident that because of the "anchor" effect of their own positions, Morrison judged J. H. Garrison to be more conservative than he really was while West judged Garrison to be more liberal than he really was. And as will be demonstrated later in this chapter, this contrast effect has operated on the leaders as well as the historians of the Restoration Movement and has contributed to the polarization and eventual division of the movement.

²² James DeForest Murch, Christians Only (Cincinnati, Ohio: Standard Publishing Company, 1962), p. 238.

²³ Earl Irvin West, The Search for the Ancient Order (2 vols.; Indianapolis, Indiana: Religious Book Service, 1950), II, 250-281.

Rhetorical Strategies Which Increase Ego-Involvement
and Thus Contribute to Polarization

Several rhetorical strategies increase ego-involvement and thus contribute to polarization. These strategies are a part of the verbal element in the communicative process of faction formation and they will be discussed in the following section. Non-verbal elements such as the nature of issues, prestige of leaders, and channels of communication, and the role of these non-verbal elements in polarization will be discussed later in this chapter.

A Heritage of Divisive Rhetorical Strategies

The early leaders of the Restoration Movement used rhetorical strategies which successfully separated the Restoration Movement from the rest of Christendom. As their followers continued to employ the same strategies, the Restoration Movement itself divided into several factions. As George Owen said, "With all the values and appreciation that we attach to Alexander Campbell, we still have to say that he had sown to the whirlwind with his sharp, categorical debates and writings and now the seeds of dissension were appearing in the form of many ugly controversies and divisions."²⁴ William Tucker pointed out that Alexander Campbell's "ruthless attacks on societies in the Christian Baptist prompted William W. Sweet to cite Campbell as one of the three most significant leaders of anti-missionism in the United States."²⁵ Campbell was harsh in his early opposition to missionary societies.

²⁴Lecture delivered at the Missouri Christian Ministers Institute, February 20, 1963, [Manuscript in the archives of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society, Nashville, Tennessee].

²⁵J. H. Garrison and Disciples of Christ (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1964); see also: William W. Sweet, The Story of Religion in America (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1950), p. 256.

The subsequent history of the Restoration Movement reveals that a part of the movement followed Campbell's early opposition to missionary societies and that almost all of the movement followed the example of Campbell's early rhetoric.

The value placed on following the example of Campbell's rhetoric is seen in this comment of Frederick Kershner concerning C. C. Morrison, "There is nothing of the mollycoddle about him. On the contrary, he employs the cold-steel technique after the most approved fashion of Alexander Campbell himself."²⁶ This was said concerning one of the most progressive leaders of the Disciples. The anti-missionary society group was not the only part of the Restoration Movement which followed the example of Campbell's early rhetoric. Some leaders, however, saw the danger of divisive rhetorical strategies. J. H. Garrison said,

I presume to say that it has not escaped the notice of the careful reader of our religious periodicals, that there is, among our brethren, an increasing tendency to mercilessly criticise each other for any supposed error that they may harbor. It is against this tendency that I wish to raise a warning voice. Our religious papers are full of such controversies. One brother sets forth his views upon a certain subject, in all good conscience. Another objects to the reasoning and proof, and severely flogs him for advocating an absurd position. The first brother, finding his logic assailed, and even his motives sometimes impugned, is incensed and replies accordingly. "Like begets like," and so the controversy continues, increasing in virulence, abounding in sarcastic thrusts and personal allusions, until the "brother" is lost sight of in the "antagonist." But little attention is paid now to the ORIGINAL matter of difference, but the greater portion of the replies are occupied in discussing "false issues," "exposing fallacies," "exposing non sequiturs," correcting "false impressions," etc. To such an extent is this carried that a brother now declares that the English language fails to furnish him an epithet that would convey his appreciation of another brother, or of his article! That such controversies occur, who will deny? That they are right, who will affirm?²⁷

²⁶ "Stars," Christian Standard, LXXV, 32 (August 10, 1940), 771.

²⁷ "Another Sin," Gospel Echo, June, 1869, pp. 228-229.

The kind of divisive rhetorical strategies that J. H. Garrison talked about are the subject of the following sections in this chapter. Keep in mind that the rhetorical requirement in Simons' theory that is being applied in this chapter is that leaders must attract followers. As stated in the Dawson and Gettys theory which is the foundation of Simons' theory, the requirement is that leaders must attract followers by polarizing the thinking of movement that is to be divided into the factions. The assimilation-contrast effect explains how polarization works and polarization is increased by increasing the ego-involvement. Therefore, in order to isolate and identify the rhetorical strategies which fulfill the first rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory, it is necessary to find rhetorical strategies which increase ego involvement.

Personal Attack

A personal attack is more ego-involving than an objective attack on the merits of a position held by a person.²⁸ While this observation comes from a source somewhat remote to the present study--a marriage counseling text book--it does state what has come to be accepted as a psychological truism. This principle about controversy between husband and wife can be applied to controversy between religious brethren in the Restoration Movement. To say "I do not agree with what you teach," is not as threatening to a person's ego as to say, "You are a fool for teaching what you teach." In the history of the Restoration Movement there are many examples of the strategy of personal attack being used and of that strategy increasing ego-involvement, thus increasing polarization, and thereby contributing to division.

28

Judson T. Landis and Mary G. Landis, Building a Successful Marriage (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968), pp. 237-293.

The Wallace-Ketcherside debate on the anti-paid minister, anti-college issue provides a good example of personal attack. Wallace brought Ketcherside's Dun and Bradstreet report to the debate platform and threatened to read it to the audience. He never did, but he did suggest that Ketcherside had made a lot of money from his preaching and thus was in a poor position to criticize other preachers for being supported financially.

Ketcherside complained about Wallace's personal attacks. Wallace defended the practice of personal attack, first by a reference to Paul's statement in Galatians 2:11,12 about withstanding Peter to the face. Then Wallace quoted from one of Ketcherside's own articles in the Mission Messenger, "One could wish that such investigations might be carried on without personalities. But ideas are born in the minds of men, systems grow up and are promoted by men. One cannot be divorced from the other."²⁹ After quoting from Ketcherside's own article, Wallace continued,

So even according to brother Ketcherside, I can't separate him from the issue. So I'll go right ahead. I have the law on my side as Paul said for me to do it. And Ketcherside said you couldn't do otherwise, so don't complain brother Ketcherside, just take it like a man. Because I've got your permission and orders from Paul to do it.³⁰

The personal attack strategy of Wallace and Ketcherside did not bring these men or the groups they led any closer together. In a second debate a year later, these men and their groups were even further apart.³¹

²⁹ G. K. Wallace and W. Carl Ketcherside, Wallace-Ketcherside Debate (Longview, Washington: A. G. Hobbes, 1953), pp. 60-61.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 61.

³¹ The first debate between Wallace and Ketcherside was held in Paragould, Arkansas, June 30--July 4, 1952. The second debate was held in St. Louis, Missouri, October 26-30, 1953.

Another example of how personal attack increases ego-involvement and

thus contributes to polarization involved another Wallace--Cled Wallace.

In the late 1940's, a faction was developing in the Church of Christ over the issue of the "sponsoring church method" of cooperation in mission and benevolent work. Several large congregations had taken the lead in sponsoring missionaries and in sponsoring major projects to help the needy. These large congregations invited other congregations to cooperate with them in the support of the various mission and benevolent projects. The Gospel Guardian was the principle religious periodical opposing this method of cooperation. Leaders of this anti-cooperation group saw the sponsoring church method of cooperation as a parallel to the missionary society which the Church of Christ has rejected a century earlier in its separation from the Christian Church.

At that time, one of the most publicized mission projects of the Church of Christ was a work in Italy. The Church of Christ in Brownwood, Texas, sponsored some of the leading missionaries. Nation-wide publicity was given to this mission project early in January of 1950 when a mob of irate Italian Catholics, led by local priests, protested against an evangelistic campaign conducted by the missionaries from Texas, broke up the meeting, threw rocks at the missionaries, and bombed a jeep used by one of the missionaries. The Italian police threw the missionaries in jail, halted their missionary activity, and threatened to deport them.

When news of the Italian trouble reached the United States, leaders of the Church of Christ organized several mass protest meetings. Through these meetings they directed a political pressure campaign in an effort to get the United States government to intervene on behalf of the American missionaries. The incident created a great wave of excitement in the Church of Christ in the

United States. Dozens of articles appeared in the religious periodicals as well as in the general newspapers. American Catholics protested the action of the missionaries and defended the action of the Italians (the American missionaries were preaching just outside the Pope's summer residence).

Writers in the Church of Christ countered with articles against the stand taken by the American Catholics on the incident. Soon it appeared that one was either on the side of the missionaries or on the side of the Catholics.

Actually only a few congregations were involved in the support of these missionaries. However, most members of the Church of Christ in America were soon identified emotionally with the missionaries in Italy. The anti-cooperation group, however, found it difficult to identify with these missionaries. The leaders of the anti-cooperation faction were bitterly opposed to the sponsoring church method of cooperation used to send these missionaries to Italy. They seemed to feel that the great wave of sympathy for the missionaries was a serious threat to their own position.

It was in this setting that Cled E. Wallace wrote an editorial in the Gospel Guardian in which he ridiculed the missionaries and the hysteria in this country over their troubles.³² An overwhelming response of bitter opposition and personal attack followed the publication of the Wallace editorial. The original issue in the conflict was the sponsoring church method of cooperation. The article by Cled Wallace was a personal attack on the missionaries in Italy and their supporters in the United States. The

³²

"That Rock Fight in Italy," Gospel Guardian, I, No. 36 (January 19, 1950), 1.

response was a personal attack on Cled Wallace. Soon even the issues raised in Wallace's editorial were buried in an avalanche of clarifications, objections to tactics, and more personal attacks by Wallace and against Wallace.

Wallace had clearly made a tactical blunder. Most of the other leaders of the anti-cooperation group regretted that Wallace had ever written the article. The anti-cooperation faction was regarded by many people in the Church of Christ as taking sides with the Catholics. Up until this time, the anti-cooperation journals had published very few anti-Catholic articles. It is interesting to note that in the next seven months, the Gospel Guardian published nine major anti-Catholic articles. This is not to suggest that it is possible to determine the motive for this sudden emphasis on anti-Catholic propaganda. But it would appear to be a useful strategy for correcting the impression that the anti-cooperation group was pro-Catholic.³³

In the continuing discussion of the problems faced by the missionaries in Italy, the Gospel Advocate published an editorial comment from the Baptist Standard indicating support for the missionaries of the Church of Christ. Wallace's response to the Baptist editorial in the Gospel Advocate indicated that his own high level of ego-involvement in the matter would not allow him to accept gracefully the statement of concern from the Baptists.

³³Luther Blackman, "Catholic Authority and Infallibility," Gospel Guardian I, No. 38 (February 2, 1950), 2,6; Cled E. Wallace, "What Shall We Be?" Gospel Guardian, I, No. 39 (February 9, 1950), 1; W. Wallace Layton, "The Pope's Claim to Authority, No. I," Gospel Guardian, I, No. 39 (February 9, 1950), 2,7; W. Wallace Layton, "The Pope's Claim to Authority, No. II," Gospel Guardian, I, No. 43 (March 9, 1950), 1,3; "The Catholic Church in Action," Gospel Guardian I, No. 43 (March 9, 1950), 7; "Wheat and Cotton King Embraces the Church," Gospel Guardian, I, No. 43 (March 9, 1950), 7; W. Wallace Layton, "The Pope's Claim to Authority, No. III," Gospel Guardian, I, No. 43 (April 13, 1950), 4; Leonard Mullins, "Why Shouldn't I Marry a Roman Catholic?" Gospel Guardian, II, No. 17 (August 31, 1950), 2.

The Gospel Advocate has caught a new beau in the engaging person of the Baptist Standard. A beautiful courtship is spreading out before us all over the editorial pages of the Advocate. They are making eyes and holding hands right out in public and the Advocate editor's smiles at the Baptist Standard are interrupted only when he turns around and sticks his tongue out at us. Brother Goodpasture [editor of the Gospel Advocate] so much appreciates the "understanding, sympathy, and support" of the Baptist Standard, and it looks like they might get married right on the spot, if the Standard would agree to it, just to spite us. "Let not the marriage of true minds admit impediments." I will have to admit that the Standard editor is about the best thing I have seen on the editorial pages of the Gospel Advocate for some time. Possibly it would improve the paper for the Standard to become a regular contributor. At least the Baptist Standard has an editor who can do something with a pen besides tying a tail to somebody else's kite.³⁴

Wallace then quoted David Lipscomb, a previous editor of the Gospel Advocate, indicating that Lipscomb was on Wallace's side of the anti-cooperation fight. Wallace then concluded with an observation about the apparant contrast between Lipscomb and Goodpasture, "This [quotation from Lipscomb] does not sound like the present editor of the Gospel Advocate, who snuggles up to the Baptists and purrs contentedly over their 'sympathy, understanding, and support.'"³⁵

Jack Meyer wrote in the Firm Foundation that the brotherhood had been "filled with disgust and even revulsion" over what Wallace had written in the Gospel Guardian.³⁶ Wallace's reply to Meyer reveals the extent to which the personal attacks in the controversy had increased ego-involvement on the part of Wallace and thus contributed to polarization which eventually led to the separation of Wallace and his followers from the rest of the Church of Christ.

³⁴"That Disgusted Brotherhood," Gospel Guardian, I, No. 47 (April 6, 1950), 2,4.

³⁵Ibid., 4.

³⁶"The Gospel in Italy," Firm Foundation, LXVII, No. 2 (March 21, 1950), 8.

Who is this "brotherhood" which "has been filled with disgust and even revulsion" over what has appeared in the Gospel Guardian, which obviously meets with the hearty approval of both Brother Meyer and the Firm Foundation? It surely isn't a local congregation. It is not the body of Christ consisting of all Christians, for a considerable number of them are with us in this fight and are not hesitant to say so.³⁷

Notice that Wallace was already beginning to identify with himself a separate group which rejected the rest of the "brotherhood."

Wallace and his followers did eventually separate from the rest of the Church of Christ. Both sides in the cooperation controversy used personal attack strategies. The above example is not intended to establish any cause-effect relationship, but it does illustrate how personal attack can increase ego-involvement. According to the research findings already mentioned, ego-involvement increases polarization. According to the social movement theory already discussed, polarization is the first step in faction formation.

A much earlier example of increased ego-involvement as a result of personal attack is seen in the case of Isaac Errett and the title "Reverend." Errett had not originally claimed the title "Reverend" for himself. The whole argument arose over a silver name-plate which someone gave to Errett to put on his door. The name-plate read, "Reverend Isaac Errett." The use of the title was not important to Errett at first. But the more he was subjected to bitter personal attack on the matter, the more he became committed to the defense of the title.³⁸ Harrison commented concerning Errett,

³⁷ Cled Wallace, "That Disgusted Brotherhood," 4.

³⁸ William Oliver Harrison, "Isaac Errett and the Missionary Controversy Among the Disciples," (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Chicago, 1936), p. 31.

This belligerent spirit marked the beginning of a period when heresy hunting was on the increase. The Disciples began to disagree on these questions of minor importance and argument ensued. Argument was followed by contention, contention was followed by bitterness, alienation and reaction which eventually led to the serious internal controversy.³⁹

Name-calling is one form of the personal attack strategy. An example of this strategy is seen in the article by G. C. Brewer in the Firm Foundation in which Brewer presented several arguments for congregational cooperation.⁴⁰

Along with his arguments, Brewer included some name-calling. He called the anti-cooperation leaders "traitors," accused them of going over to the "Sommerite faction," compared them to Chamberlain and his Munich deal with Hitler, and concluded with the "Remember the Alamo" slogan used to suggest that the anti-cooperation leaders were failing to remember the pioneer preachers who had resisted various heresies in the past--heresies which Brewer argued the anti-cooperation group had adopted.

The effect of Brewer's article is seen in the reply of R. L. Whiteside in the Gospel Guardian.⁴¹ The important thing is what Whiteside noticed and what he did not notice in Brewer's article. Whiteside did not even mention Brewer's arguments. Rather, he focused on the name-calling strategy used by Brewer. It is evident that Brewer's name-calling strategy had aroused the anger of the anti-cooperation leader. The angry reaction to name-calling indicates the increased level of ego-involvement and thus increased polarization resulting from the name-calling strategy.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 32.

⁴⁰ "A Sop to Cerebus," Firm Foundation, LXVII, No. 30 (July 25, 1950), 4-5.

⁴¹ "Brewer's Benedict Arnolds," Gospel Guardian, I, No. 20 (September 21, 1950), 2.

Harsh, abusive rhetoric has not been confined to the conservative branch of the Restoration Movement. In one of the controversies within the Christian Church, there was a long and bitter exchange between J. B. Briney, editor of the Christian Standard, and J. H. Garrison, editor of the Christian-Evangelist.⁴² Name-calling was one of the strategies used often by both sides in the Disciples-Independent split.⁴³ In the many controversies within the Restoration Movement, people have responded to name-calling strategies directed against them by becoming more ego-involved with the issues for which they have been attacked. This increased ego-involvement has led to polarization and the polarization has led to eventual division.

J. B. Briney is an excellent example of another kind of personal attack strategy: ridicule. A letter from W. E. Garrison, noted historian of the Disciples, contains this description of Briney's rhetorical strategies,

His weapons of debate were an utter and uncompromising devotion to his cause, perfect clarity in his own convictions and the reasons for them, a biting irony, and an acrid humor which could often get a laugh at the expense of the opposition.⁴⁴

According to Katz, derogatory remarks and ridicule increase ego-involvement.⁴⁵

⁴² See the Christian Standard, February 3, 1912, and May 11, 1912, and the Christian-Evangelist, April 25, 1912, for examples.

⁴³ See Stephen J. Corey, Fifty Years of Attack and Controversy (Des Moines: Committee on Publication of the Corey Manuscript, 1953) and Edwin V. Hayden, Fifty Years of Digression and Disturbance (Joplin, Mo.: Hunter Printing Company, n.d.).

⁴⁴ Millard L. Riley, "The Life and Work of J. B. Briney," (unpublished B.D. thesis, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, 1946), pp. 76-77.

⁴⁵ Daniel Katz, "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes," in The Study of Attitude Change, ed. by Richard V. Wagner and John J. Sherwood (Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1969), p. 24.

If it can be granted that people do not like to be laughed at⁴⁶ then it should also be granted that a strategy of ridicule tends to increase ego-involvement for the one ridiculed.

Another example of ridicule as a rhetorical strategy is found in the writings of one of the most progressive leaders of the Disciples of Christ. A. T. DeGroot wrote,

It is a common thing for sophisticated Christians to make more or less polite fun of the basic argument by which the Churches of Christ support their rejection of instrumental music in worship. That argument runs as follows: the Old Testament is full of references to instrumental music in worship, but really God did not like it; He permitted it only because under the rule of the patriarchs and Moses men were still in the childhood of the race. When God was ready to make His full revelation through Jesus Christ, He decided to test men, and instead of saying specifically that He did not like instrumental music He simply kept silent on the subject--the object being to see with what care men would pay attention to His silence. It would have been simple to give a direct command; silence was the key to the whole subject and to our situation in the Divine order. We sophisticated Christians insist that if God didn't like instrumental music in worship He would have said so, very very clearly.⁴⁷

In the above quotation, DeGroot admits the use of ridicule as a rhetorical strategy and demonstrates the use of another strategy: misrepresentation. The anti-instrumental music branch of the movement would not accept DeGroot's representation of their position. Throughout the history of the Restoration Movement, when people have been thus misrepresented and ridiculed, they have become defensive and more ego-involved.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Carl Frankenstein, The Roots of the Ego (Baltimore, Md.: The Williams and Wilkins Company, 1960), p. 105.

⁴⁷ Restructure Problems (Fort Worth, Texas: by the author, 1969), p. 23.

⁴⁸ For a discussion of the effects of ridicule, see: John B. Geisel, Personality Problems (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, Co., 1949), pp. 140-141.

Misrepresentation as a rhetorical strategy is seen in a much older example from the Restoration Movement. In the Millennial Harbinger of 1858 there is this attack on the anti-missionary society group, "There are brethren who claim to be pro-missionary, but anti-missionary society! This is hair-splitting; a word-trick of the sophistical intellect to silence a valid demur of the conscience."⁴⁹ Whitley commented on this position taken by the pro-missionary society advocates, "the question was beginning to narrow to the proposition that if you believed in evangelistic and missionary activities you must believe in the only means of getting them carried through efficiently, namely, cooperation, and some centralization."⁵⁰ But the anti-missionary society group has never accepted the charge that they are anti-missionary. In point of fact, it is now generally acknowledged that the anti-missionary society group is doing as much mission work as the pro-missionary society group.

Misrepresentation did not stop with the withdrawal of the Church of Christ from the supporters of the missionary society. When the anti-cooperation group arose in the Church of Christ in the 1950's, the descendants of those who had objected to being called "anti-missionary" did not hesitate to brand the people who opposed the sponsoring church method of cooperation as being "anti-foreign evangelism."⁵¹

It is evident that an objective discussion of issues does not increase ego-involvement as much as misrepresentation of a person's beliefs.⁵² The relative merits of positions can be discussed in non-personal terms. But

⁴⁹ P. 222.

⁵⁰ Whitley, p. 73.

⁵¹ Meyer, 8.

⁵² Landis and Landis, pp. 290-291.

misrepresentation immediately brings in the personal element, "You misrepresented my position." Notice that what was previously a position to be discussed on its merits now becomes my position. I am now more ego-involved than I was before. Misrepresentation increases ego-involvement and thus increases polarization. The misrepresentations involved in the missionary society controversy contributed to the eventual division over this issue.

Attack on Personal Consistency

One of the most frequently used rhetorical strategies in all branches of the Restoration Movement has been the attack on personal consistency. In this strategy no argument is made against the merits of an opponent's position. Instead, the argument is that the opponent's position on the issue being discussed is not consistent with his position on some other issue.

The ego-involving potential of this strategy is obvious. People like to think of themselves as being consistent.⁵³ An argument directed against their personal consistency is therefore much more likely to be ego-threatening and ego-involving than an argument directed against the merits of some position they hold on some issue. The strategy is even more potent as an ego-involving device when the person attacked is highly ego-involved with the related issue.

People in the Church of Christ generally have as a part of their religious self-image the identification of being anti-missionary society. When the anti-cooperation leaders attacked the sponsoring church method of cooperation as being "just like the missionary society," this attack was a threat to the

53

Morris Rosenberg, "Psychological Selectivity in Self-Esteme Formation," in Attitude, Ego-Involvement, and Change, ed. by M. Sherif and C. Sherif (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967), p. 38. See also: G. W. Allport, Patterns and Growth in Personality (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961), p. 23.

self-image of the people who favored the sponsoring church method of cooperation but opposed the missionary society. This attack on their personal consistency threatened their self-image much more than would have been the case had the anti-cooperation leaders simply adapted the old anti-missionary society arguments for use against the sponsoring church method of cooperation without the charge of personal inconsistency. If the sponsoring church method of cooperation was, indeed, "just like the missionary society," then the arguments used against the missionary society would have worked just as well against the sponsoring church method of cooperation and the strategy of charging personal inconsistency would not have been needed.⁵⁴

But the leaders who favored the sponsoring church method of cooperation used this strategy of charging personal inconsistency just as much as did the anti-cooperation leaders. One of the most notable examples of this strategy is Cecil N. Wright's attack on Roy Cogdill.⁵⁵ Cogdill was one of the editors of the Gospel Guardian and a powerful foe of the sponsoring church method of cooperation. Wright based his argument on Cogdill's use of the sponsoring church method of cooperation in the arrangement of two city-wide evangelistic campaigns in Houston.⁵⁶ The church where

⁵⁴For examples of this strategy used by anti-cooperation leaders, see: A. N. Trice, "Law and Expediency," Gospel Advocate, March 19, 1931, pp. 314-317; and James R. Cope, Voice in the Wilderness (Temple Terrace, Fla.: by the author, n.d.).

⁵⁵"Cooperation as a Scriptural Basis," Firm Foundation, LXVII, No. 30 (July 25, 1950), 3.

⁵⁶Foy E. Wallace, Jr. was the speaker in the 1945 and 1946 "Houston Music Hall Meetings." See Wallace's God's Prophetic Word (Oklahoma City: by the author, 1946) and Bulwarks of Faith (Oklahoma City: by the author, 1951).

Cogdill preached was the sponsor of those meetings and other congregations in Houston cooperated with them in the effort. Leaders of the pro-cooperation group never let Cogdill forget that he had once practiced what he now preached against. But this strategy did not persuade Cogdill either to give up his opposition to the sponsoring church method of cooperation or to admit that he had erred in the arrangement of the Houston meeting.⁵⁷

Attacking an opponent's personal consistency increases his ego-involvement and thus increases polarization. In this way the rhetorical strategy of attacking an opponent's personal consistency fulfills the first rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory.

Guilt by Association

A rhetorical strategy closely related to the strategy of attack on personal consistency is the strategy of charging guilt by association. In this strategy, instead of arguing the merits of the issue, the opponent is charged with being just like some group that he does not want to be just like. Since negative as well as positive reference groups contribute to a person's self-image⁵⁸ the strategy of charging guilt by association is threatening to a person's self-image and therefore ego-involving.

Leaders of various groups in the Restoration Movement have used the rhetorical strategy of charging guilt by association. Anti-cooperation leaders in the Church of Christ used this strategy when they charged that the pro-

57

For a recent presentation of Roy Cogdill's views on the cooperation issue, see his main speeches and rebuttal speeches in The Arlington Meeting, Cecil Willis, comp., (Orlando, Fla.: Cogdill Foundation, 1968).

58

Sherif and Sherif, p. 114.

cooperation group was just like the Christian Church with its missionary society. Pro-cooperation leaders used the same strategy when they charged that the anti-cooperation group was just like the anti-Sunday School faction.

The strategy of charging guilt by association was used in the Disciples-Independents split. A. T. DeGroot, a leader of the Disciples of Christ, wrote the first history of the Independent Christian Church. However, DeGroot did not call them the Independent Christian Church. He titled his history of the Independents, Church of Christ Number Two.⁵⁹ For the Independents, the Church of Christ constitutes a negative reference group. They did not take kindly to DeGroot's identification of them with the more conservative group. But when DeGroot revised his history of the Independent movement, in 1963, things had cooled down and DeGroot was interested in encouraging a possible re-unification of the Disciples and Independents. So he changed his guilt-by-association title in the 1963 revision to New Possibilities for Disciples and Independents,⁶⁰ a title much more acceptable to the Independents.

The rhetorical strategy of charging guilt by association increases ego-involvement and thus contributes to polarization. The above examples from the history of the Restoration Movement show how this strategy has been used and how it has fulfilled the first rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory.

Appeal to the Pioneers

The opposite of the guilt by association strategy is the strategy of appealing to the example of the pioneers. This strategy, instead of arguing

⁵⁹(Birmingham: by the author, 1956).

⁶⁰(St. Louis, Mo.: The Bethany Press, 1963).

the merits of a position, simply argues that this is the position held by the pioneers of the Restoration Movement. People like to think of themselves as being like their heroes.⁶¹ Identification with the pioneers of the Restoration Movement is an important part of the religious self-image of all factions of the Restoration Movement. Alexander Campbell has been quoted on almost all sides of the many issues which have divided the Restoration Movement. Being charged with disloyalty to the positions advocated by the pioneers is a direct threat to the self-image of people who identify themselves with the pioneers.

The strategy of appealing to the example of the pioneers was employed by both sides in the cooperation controversy in the Church of Christ. Cled Wallace's article, "Voices from the Past,"⁶² is typical of the argument used by non-cooperation leaders. Wallace attempted to prove that the sponsoring church method of cooperation is a departure from the traditional position of the Church of Christ. The pro-cooperation leaders went back to the pioneers to prove that congregational cooperation was the very alternative that the pioneers had suggested to the missionary society.

The rhetorical strategy of appealing to the pioneers was used by Isaac Errett in defending W. T. Moore's right to use the open membership

61

Katz, p. 29; see also: Sherif and Sherif, p. 113; Sigmund Freud, The Psychopathology of Everyday Life (London: Ernest Beam, Ltd., 1948), pp. 73-75; Anna Freud, The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense (London: Hogarth Press, 1937), pp. 3-9; and John B. Giesel, Personality Problems (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1949), pp. 159-160.

62

Gospel Guardian, I, No. 40 (February 16, 1950), 1,5. See also: James R. Cope, "When Does Cooperation Become Centralization," Perceptor, III, No. 5 (March, 1954), 6,7; Bill J. Humble, "The Church is Drifting," Perceptor, III, No. 4 (February 1954), 76-77; H. B. Frank, "Life of Elder John Smith," Perceptor, III, No. 2 (December, 1953), 18-21.

practice in Great Britain, arguing that it was justified on the basis of Alexander Campbell's attitude and practice in the Christian-Reformer merger of 1832.⁶³ The strategy of appealing to the pioneers is also illustrated in two books, The Pioneers on Worship, edited by John Allen Hudson,⁶⁴ and The Pioneers on Instrumental Music and Societies, by John T. Lewis.⁶⁵ The line of reasoning in these books is that the pioneers of the Restoration Movement opposed instrumental music in worship and the missionary society and therefore those who advocate the use of instrumental music in worship or the support of the missionary society are departing from the position of those who founded the Restoration Movement.

Since identification with the pioneers of the Restoration Movement is a part of the religious self-image of people in the Restoration Movement, being charged with disloyalty to the positions of the pioneers threatens the self-image of the one thus charged. The strategy of appealing to the pioneers is, therefore, ego-involving. Through the increased ego-involvement, this strategy increases polarization and therefore fulfills the first rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory.

The Strategy of Projection

The strategy of projection does not argue the merits of a position, rather it attempts to plot a line from a position that an opponent once held or that the Restoration Movement or some part of it once held, to the position

⁶³ Christian Standard (October 7, 1885).

⁶⁴ (Kansas City, Mo.: Old Paths Book Club, 1947).

⁶⁵ (Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Publishing Company, 1932).

that the opponent now holds, and then this strategy project that line on out to some position toward which the opponent is supposed to be moving and which is not acceptable to the opponent. The ego-involving factor in this strategy is that the opponent is charged with moving in the direction of a position that is contrary to his own self-image.⁶⁶

The strategy of projection is well illustrated in the slogan which J. D. Tant used to close so many of his articles, "Brethren, we are drifting!"⁶⁷ The "drifters," however, have never been very favorably impressed by those who charged them with drifting. For example, the members of the Campbell Institute at the University of Chicago's Disciples Divinity House--a center of liberal influence--did not take kindly to the charge of the conservatives that their modern methods of Biblical criticism were just one step away from outright atheism. And in the same way, members of the Church of Christ who favor church support of orphans homes have not appreciated the charge of the anti-cooperation group that church support of orphans homes is just one step away from the Social Gospel.

Being charged with moving toward an unacceptable position increases ego-involvement and thus contributes to polarization. This rhetorical strategy has been used in the history of the Restoration Movement in such a way as to fulfill the first rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory.

⁶⁶ For a detailed example of the strategy of projection, see: H. Leo Boles, "Dangerous Trends in Cooperation," Gospel Advocate, LXXIII (October 20, 1932), 717.

⁶⁷ Fanning Yater Tant, J. D. Tant: Texas Preacher (Lufkin, Texas: The Gospel Guardian Company, 1958), p. 357.

The Relation of Unrelated Issues

There have been times in the history of the Restoration Movement when leaders have related issues on which people were not ego-involved with some other issue or some factor with which people were highly ego-involved and this strategy contributed to polarization. As Osgood and Tannenbaum have pointed out, "If two unequally polarized concepts are associated, the less polarized one becomes more so . . . if a neutral concept is associated with a polarized one, it always becomes more polarized."⁶⁸ One of the first unrelated issues or factors to become related in such a way as to contribute to increased ego-involvement, increased polarization, and eventual division was the Civil War issue. This and other examples will be discussed in the following sections.

The Impact of the Civil War

Historians of the Restoration Movement have claimed for years that the Disciples were the only major religious group other than the Catholics to avoid division over the Civil War. Winfred E. Garrison's otherwise excellent history, Religion Follows the Frontier,⁶⁹ probably did more than any other history of the movement in perpetuating this myth. Actually there are many indications that the Civil War contributed greatly to the Church of Christ-Christian Church split which followed the Civil War. Opposition to the

68

Charles E. Osgood and Percy H. Tannenbaum, "The Principle of Congruity in the Prediction of Attitude Change," in The Study of Attitude Change, ed. by Richard V. Wagner and John J. Sherwood (Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1969), pp. 134,135. See also: Sherif and Sherif, pp. 118-119; and Kenneth Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), p. 55.

69

(New York: Harper and Brothers, 1931).

missionary society in the South was at least partly related to the fact that during the Civil War the American Christian Missionary Society passed several loyalty resolutions in support of the Union cause.⁷⁰ Harrison suggested, "Not only did this development [the United Christian Missionary Society's resolutions in support of the Union] bring out the latent opposition of many southern people to the idea of organized missionary work, but it also rendered the Society comparatively bankrupt financially."⁷¹

Following the Civil War the continuing hostility of southern attitudes toward the North made it difficult to bring about any re-unification of the pro and anti society groups. As Walker pointed out,

Most of all, the passions of war and the "subjugation" of the South by the post-war military regime created a state of mind in the South which was not favourable to the catholic nature of the Restoration Movement. It was futile to talk of any union, even Christian union, when men were being coerced into political union by the Federal army. The plea in the South has not yet recovered from the blow of the Civil War.⁷²

David Harrell, a southerner and the outstanding historian from the most conservative element of the Church of Christ, recognized the importance of the continuing North-South hostility in the Restoration Movement.

Northern editors repeatedly charged church leaders of the South with trying to propagate theological conservatism by fanning sectional prejudice. One preacher reported that a minister from "Yankeedom" could not even get a hearing in Texas, and accusations that "a few"

⁷⁰ James DeForest Murch, Christians Only (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1962), p. 154.

⁷¹ Harrison, p. 31.

⁷² Dean Walker, Adventuring for Christian Unity (Birmingham, England: n.p., 1935), p. 42.

Southern editors were trying to "run a Mason-Dixon line through the Bible and the Church of Christ" were frequent by the 1890's. The complaints of Northern churchmen were not without justification. A fiery Southern preacher argued that "neither Tennessee nor Texas would have had any progressive foolishness" if it had not been for the invasion of "carpetbag pastors from the North."⁷³

The nation was already polarized on the Civil War issue. People in the South and the North were already highly ego-involved with that issue. Most people in the Restoration Movement at that point were not ego-involved with the missionary society issue. It was when leaders used the rhetorical strategy of relating the missionary society issue with the Civil War issue that the support for the missionary society greatly increased in the North while opposition to the missionary society greatly increased in the South.

Socio-Economic Factors

Richard Niebuhr has clearly demonstrated that seemingly unrelated factors can be related in such a way as to play a vital role in the formation of denominations.⁷⁴ His classic study demonstrated the role of socio-economic factors in the founding of the Methodist Church as a "Church of the Disenfranchised" and then the shift in the socio-economic status of the Methodist which left room for new denominations to be formed for the "disenfranchised." Much of Simons' theory of persuasion for social movements can be traced back through the Dawson and Gettys study of the Methodist beginnings to Niebuhr's work.

⁷³ David Edwin Harrell, Jr., "Sectional Origins of the Church of Christ," Journal of Southern History, XXX, No. 3 (August, 1964), 271.

⁷⁴ The Social Sources of Denominations (Hamden, Connecticut: The Shoe String Press, 1929).

The nature of the audience which a speaker tries to reach is an "unrelated" factor that has much to do with ego-involvement and polarization. As Simons said, "Actions that may succeed with one audience (e.g., solidification of the membership) may alienate others (e.g., provocation of a backlash)." ⁷⁵ Dawson and Gettys pointed out that the Methodist leaders appealed to the poor while the leaders of the Church of England appealed to the rich. The existing rich-poor polarization in England contributed to division much more than would have been the case had the socio-economic factors never been related to the religious dispute. ⁷⁶

Harrell said that because of the basic differences in the audiences addressed by the Christian Church in the North and the Midwest and the Church of Christ in the South and Southwest, division was inevitable. "If the Disciples had not disagreed over instrumental music and missionary societies, they would have divided over something else, as from the beginning the movement had attracted people from antipodal sociological and psychological backgrounds." ⁷⁷

Benjamin Franklin's American Christian Review was one of the most influential anti-instrumental music, anti-missionary society periodicals in the early days of the Restoration Movement. The Christian Standard was started as a journal to advocate instrumental music in worship and support of the missionary society. However, an unrelated issue was soon related in the controversy between these two papers. Franklin's un-polished style

⁷⁵ Simons, 1.

⁷⁶ Dawson and Gettys, pp. 710-713.

⁷⁷ Harrell, "Sectional Origins of the Church of Christ," 262.

offended the better educated people in the movement. They also objected to the harshness of Franklin's attacks on the denominations. Lamar wrote,

The "earthborn spirit" and cold legalism of the American Christian Review disturbed many Disciples. . . . The great truth for whose defense the Disciples are set demanded a wiser, sweeter, better advocacy--an advocacy that should exhibit the apostolic spirit as well as the apostolic letter.⁷⁸

The conflict over style and thus over the audience to be reached is generally regarded as the main reason for the establishment of the Christian Standard.⁷⁹

The relation of socio-economic factors to doctrinal disputes in the Restoration Movement is clearly illustrated in A. M. Morris' book, Differences Between the Church of Christ and the Christian Church.⁸⁰ At the time Morris wrote this book, the Church of Christ was made up largely of people who had very little education and who were very poor. There was already a polarization of the rich and the poor, the educated and the uneducated, those with high social status and those with low social status. Morris' book contains many blatant appeals to the prejudice of this existing polarization. The amount of money provided for the support of missionaries was not the issue in the missionary society controversy, but Morris made it an issue. He talked about those who "take from the poor who cannot afford to give" and then send the money to "a \$1,500 a year missionary!"⁸¹ Fund-raising techniques of

⁷⁸ James S. Lamar, Memoirs of Isaac Errett (Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1893), p. 301.

⁷⁹ West, Vol. II, 31-32. See also, William J. Tucker, J. H. Garrison and Disciples of Christ (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1964), p. 41.

⁸⁰ (n.p., by the author, [c. 1875]). The only known copy of this booklet is in the Sewell Collection of the Abilene Christian College Library, Abilene, Texas.

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 22.

of the missionary society were not really the point at issue, but Morris made this an issue.

The State Board has an evangelist and sometimes more, and a secretary. Those officers magnify their office. They are to raise money for the board and not unfrequently from the bored, and in this way escape the odium attached to the name of public beggars, while literally begging their own salaries. The board gives these men a salary, provided they beg the salary, and, thus it is not strange that congregations often receive nice little notices that their yearly pledge is due.⁸²

The honesty of the missionary society's fund raisers was not the point at issue, but Morris made it an issue.

Unlike Paul, these brethren rejoice to know that bonds and imprisonment await them in every city. The difference is in the bonds. With Paul it was incarceration. With these men it is imprisonment of Government bonds in the capacious [sic] recesses of their ministerial trousers.⁸³

In this time, the Church of Christ had few ministers and little money to support them. Members of the Church of Christ in this period found it easy to accept the idea that the church is not supposed to pay ministers anyhow. In the anti-paid minister controversy, the issue was the principle involved and not the motives of the men who served as paid ministers. Morris, however, made the motives of the paid ministers an issue.

Pastoring is a nice business and easy, but it is unscriptural. A college boy can pastorate [sic] without much capital. It requires money and industry to run a successful store, factory or shop: but boys with Prince Albert coats, white cravats and patent leather boots, can pastorate and have a pleasant time and it requires no money to start on. A young man can make a thousand dollars a year and perhaps twelve hundred and have no capital to begin with. I presume you have noticed that pastoring is done in the towns and cities chiefly. There are better walks and less mud, snow and slush in town. This is an item. Pastoring in the Christian Church is just as scriptural (and no more so) than pastoring in the Presbyterian church or Methodist church.⁸⁴

⁸² Ibid., p. 18

⁸³ Ibid., p. 19.

⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 15.

Notice that in addition to the rich-poor, educated-uneducated, high social status-low social status kinds of polarization used by Morris, there is the added element of the urban-rural polarization in the above quotation. But Morris was not the only one to use this strategy of relating issues or factors with which people were already ego-involved with various religious controversies.

Appeal to Different Personality Types

Woodrow Wasson's pamphlet on Factors Creating Controversies Among the Disciples of Christ⁸⁵ outlines three basic factors creating division: doctrinal-theological, socio-psychological, and personality-leadership factors. His discussion of the socio-psychological factors stresses the appeal of the conservatives in the Restoration Movement to the "authoritarian" personality type described by Adorno.⁸⁶ Wasson did not consider the factor described by Rokeach⁸⁷ --that the authoritarian personality syndrome of the right-wing extremist is not really different from the closed mind syndrome of the left-wing extremist. The beliefs of the right and left wing extremists are what differ, not their personality types.

Wasson has, however, suggested an important area that deserves further study. The appeal to different personality types is a probable factor in the polarization and eventual division of the Restoration Movement.

⁸⁵(mimeographed, n.p.: n.p., n.d.). Available in Pamphlet file, Disciples of Christ Historical Society Library, Nashville, Tennessee.

⁸⁶T. W. Adorno and Others, The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1950).

⁸⁷M. Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960).

Some writers have noticed a typical personality type characteristic of several different denominations. Some have even claimed that they can recognize characteristic personality types in the various factions of the Restoration Movement.⁸⁸

Concern for Different Audiences

William Tucker has noted an interesting point about the ultimate audience that leaders of the Restoration Movement want to reach and the influence that this factor has on discussion of issues within the movement. Concern for different audiences influenced the controversy over open membership. C. C. Morrison, editor of the Christian Century, favored accepting members without immersion. He was interested in reaching the Methodist, Presbyterians, and others who do not practice immersion. He wanted to bring them into an eventual union with the Disciples. J. H. Garrison, editor of the Christian-Evangelist, was more concerned about bringing the Baptist into union with the Disciples. The Baptist are such strong believers in immersion that they would not likely merge with a group which no longer required immersion.⁸⁹

A person is already ego-involved with his own socio-economic group, his own personality type, and he may be ego-involved with concern for reaching some particular audience. These factors are not directly related to any of the issues which have divided the Restoration Movement, but leaders have associated these unrelated factors with the controversial issues. This strategy has increased ego-involvement and polarization. Thus the rhetorical

⁸⁸ M. F. Cottrell, Refocusing God, the Bible, and the Church ([Denver, Colorado]: by the author, 1962), pp. 103-126.

⁸⁹ Tucker, pp. 75-76.

strategy of relating such unrelated issues and factors fulfills the first rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory by increasing ego-involvement and thus increasing polarization.

The Nature of Issues as a Factor in Polarization

In a broad sense, rhetorical strategies can be understood to include non-verbal as well as verbal elements. The nature of the issues, the prestige of leaders, and the channels of communication are non-verbal elements which so directly related to the present study as to require consideration. The first question to be considered in this section is, what kind of issues contribute most to polarization?

Extreme Positions

Extreme positions contribute more to polarization than do moderate positions. As Sherif and Sherif have pointed out, "there is considerable evidence from earlier research showing that persons who adopt extreme stands are more likely to be highly involved than those with moderate stands."⁹⁰ With this higher involvement comes greater polarization. People who are highly ego-involved with an extreme position tend to have a latitude of acceptance so narrow that the only acceptable position is their own position. They also tend to have almost no latitude of non-commitment. Their own position is the only acceptable position for them and all other positions--even those very close to their own position--are in their latitude of rejection. As a result, the assimilation effect does not operate, but the contrast effect is strengthened.⁹¹

⁹⁰ Sherif and Sherif, p. 119.

⁹¹ Ibid.

The "one-cup" faction in the Church of Christ illustrates this principle. Their insistence that only one cup be used in the Lord's Supper is generally seen as one of the most extreme positions taken by any faction of the Restoration Movement. In this group the latitude of acceptance is very narrow. To the rest of the movement, the "one-cup" group appears as one very small faction. People within the "one-cup" group, however, sub-divide the group and refuse to fellowship other sub-divisions--even though their positions are very similar.

One issue which divides the "one-cup" group is the question of whether fermented or unfermented grape juice should be used in the one cup. Another divisive issue is the question of whether one loaf must be used with the one cup. Those who break the bread before passing it to the congregation are not accepted by those who serve the one loaf with the one cup. Another issue which divides the "one-cup" faction is the question of whether the Lord's Supper can be observed after the sun goes down Sunday afternoon. One splinter group argues that the Lord's Supper must be observed on the Lord's Day and "day" means "while the sun is up." Another splinter group argues that the Lord's Day includes all twenty-four hours of the day. An even smaller group argues that "supper" is an evening meal and Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper at an evening meal, therefore the Lord's Supper can be observed only after the sun goes down Sunday evening.⁹²

People in the various sub-divisions of the "one-cup" faction, having adopted an extreme position and being highly ego-involved with that position,

⁹² Ervin Waters, The Communion (Lebanon, Mo.: Old Paths Advocate, 1945), pp. 46-54.

find the contrast effect working to such a degree that they cannot accept those whose views are very similar to their own.

Extreme positions contribute to high ego-involvement and thus to greater polarization. Therefore the adoption of an extreme position could be viewed as a strategy which fulfills the first rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory.

Unpopular Positions

Another way that the nature of the issue relates to polarization is that some issues are inherently harder to sell than others. Unpopular positions do not attract enough support to polarize the thinking of the movement.

David Lipscomb was one of the most popular and powerful leaders of the Church of Christ in the last half of the nineteenth century. He was probably the greatest leader of the anti-missionary society, anti-instrumental music group that separated from the Christian Church. There was one position that Lipscomb took, however, which never polarized the thinking of the Restoration Movement or any part of it and thus never resulted in the development of a faction.

Lipscomb's position on civil government was so unpopular that it never attracted enough support to become an important issue in the Church of Christ. At a time when patriotism was fierce in both South and North, Lipscomb advocated a withdrawal of Christians from any involvement in civil government. He urged that Christians should not fight at a time when survival, especially in the South, seemed to depend on fighting. He urged that Christians should not vote or hold political office at a time when loyalty to the Confederacy in the South and to the Union in the North was at its highest. Commenting on the unpopularity of Lipscomb's position, his biographer said, "During the

heated days of passion that followed the opening of the war, Lipscomb preached that Christians should not kill. He preached this when the Confederate army held middle Tennessee, and a group of men once threatened to hang him. He preached this when the Federal army moved in and was sneeringly called a Copperhead."⁹³

Unpopular positions are not likely to attract enough support to polarize the thinking of the Restoration Movement and lead to faction development. This may explain why no "conscientious objection" faction has ever developed in the Restoration Movement--even though a great difference has existed on this issue. The conscientious objection issue has been largely ignored during times of peace, but discussed during times of war--especially World War I and World War II. When the nation is fighting a popular war, it has not been popular within the Restoration Movement to advocate conscientious objection.

If the conscientious objection position had been advocated vigorously during the unpopular war in Vietnam, a conscientious objection might have been formed when it had not been possible to form such a faction during popular wars. Whatever might have been the case, no such faction developed. And yet this much is clear: the inherent popularity or unpopularity of an issue is an important factor in determining whether or not the Restoration Movement will be polarized and a faction will develop around that issue. The adoption of an unpopular position can be viewed as a rhetorical strategy which does not fulfill the first rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory.

The Inherent Divisiveness of Issues

Another way that the nature of issues relates to polarization is illustrated in the history of the Restoration Movement. Some issues in the Restoration Movement have been inherently more divisive than others. Issues which involve personal beliefs have not been as likely to polarize and divide the Restoration Movement as have those issues which involved the corporate action of congregations within the movement. That some issues are inherently more divisive than others has been confirmed by Sherif and Sherif.⁹⁴

Earl West argued that the instrumental music question was far more divisive in local congregations than was the missionary society issue--although both were involved in the split between the Church of Christ and the Christian Church.⁹⁵ The missionary society question was rather remote to most people. For many years, very few congregations actually supported the society. Some people believed that it would be proper to support the society and others did not, but since most congregations did not support the society anyhow, the question was largely academic. But the instrumental music question was not as easy to ignore--at least not after congregations started using instrumental music in worship. Those who believed that it is not proper to have instrumental music as a part of Christian worship could hardly ignore instrumental music when used in their own congregations. They either had to change their position on instrumental music in worship or withdraw from the congregation.

⁹⁴ Sherif and Sherif, p. 131.

⁹⁵ West, Search for the Ancient Order, Vol. I, 306-317.

Simple pro or con issues which involve corporate action rather than private beliefs have contributed most to polarization and eventual division in the Restoration Movement. Some of the issues on which the Restoration Movement has experienced diversity without division have been those which involved a wide range of possible positions rather than a simple two-sided, pro or con argument.

Within the Disciples of Christ there is currently a significant difference in levels of support for the efforts to achieve ecumenical union with other denominations. Those who do not favor such efforts have long since left the Disciples and are now in the Church of Christ or the Independent Christian Church. But the leaders of the Disciples of Christ are not at all agreed among themselves as to how far they should go and how much they should compromise in their effort to achieve denominational union.⁹⁶ This kind of diversity, however, does not lend itself to polarization. There are too many possible positions represented.

Within both the Church of Christ and the Independent Christian Church there are theological differences along liberal-conservative lines. Thus far, however, no alignment of opposite poles of influence has developed and thus no polarization has occurred along these lines.

Another issue on which the Restoration Movement has experienced diversity without division--actually a complex of issues--relates to the elders of the local church: their qualifications, tenure, and authority. Some insist that an elder must have two or more children who are faithful Christians to be qualified. Others insist that one or more is the requirement.

Some would allow a man to serve as an elder even though he had no children at all. A few would allow a man to serve as an elder even if he is not married. Some congregations of the Disciples of Christ have appointed women elders. Some of the congregations in the Restoration Movement have appointed elders for a limited tenure, others have appointed them to serve for life. Some regard elders as administrators to carry out the will of the congregation. Others regard elders as having absolute authority over local congregations. All possible positions in between and all possible combinations of these related matters are represented in the Restoration Movement. This high degree of diversity discourages polarization and faction formation. The historical evidence in the Restoration Movement indicates that polarization works best when the issue can be expressed in simple two-sided, pro and con terms. The nature of the issue, therefore, is a factor which must be considered to determine whether or not the first rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory can be fulfilled in a given controversy.

The Leadership Role in Polarization

Prestige and the Assimilation Effect

Polarization does not readily take place in a movement when there is an even distribution of opinions representing many possible positions on an issue. Polarization requires clearly identifiable and opposite poles of influence to attract people within the movement to the conflicting groups. And it is just here that the assimilation effect contributes to the eventual polarization of a movement. For purposes of illustration, suppose that there is within a movement a diversity of opinions on some issue. These positions

might be represented numerically on a scale from one to ten. As long as there is an even distribution with approximately ten per cent of the people in the movement accepting each of the ten positions, then little polarization would be expected. But suppose that powerful leaders emerge representing positions number three and number eight. If these leaders can make the assimilation effect work for them, the people in the positions numbers one through five should be attracted to the leader representing position number three. The people in positions numbers six through ten should be attracted to the leader representing position number eight. The assimilation effect should cause the people to perceive the leader nearest their own position to be closer to their own position than he really is.

Sherif and Sherif have explained how this assimilation effect might be made to operate in such a case. They wrote, "on the basis of available evidence, the present approach postulates that a source with high prestige for the individual's reference groups will increase the range of assimilation."⁹⁷ The assimilation effect should work for leaders with high personal prestige in the movement. The people in the movement should perceive the positions advocated by high prestige leaders as being closer to their own position than is actually the case.

This assimilation effect may help to explain why the Restoration Movement did not divide until after the death of Alexander Campbell, even though the basic causes of the division were present much earlier. Campbell was a leader of such tremendous prestige that people may have tended to see Campbell as agreeing with them even when he did not. Even until this day, all branches

⁹⁷ Sherif and Sherif, p. 132.

of the Restoration Movement claim Campbell as their own and see him as agreeing with them. But the leaders who took over after the death of Campbell did not have the prestige that Campbell had. This being the case, the assimilation effect would not have worked as well for them as it had for Campbell. And for this reason, the differences which had not been perceived under Campbell's leadership became obvious under the leadership of less prestigious men.

Another factor involved here is that there has never been, since the death of Campbell, any one man to emerge as the leader of the Restoration Movement. Therefore whatever assimilation effect worked for the multiple leadership after Campbell's death functioned to draw the people into separate groups under the leadership of several different men. And thus the assimilation effect worked to draw together several factions rather than holding together the whole movement.

But while the assimilation effect may produce conditions which contribute to eventual polarization and division, the assimilation effect may also explain the failure of a possible faction to materialize. When the Restoration Movement was dividing over the related issues of the missionary society and the use of instrumental music in worship, one of the most influential leaders was J. W. McGarvey. McGarvey advocated a position half way between the conflicting camps: pro-missionary society but anti-instrumental music. McGarvey was one of the most prestigious leaders of his generation. With such prestige, he should have had the assimilation effect working for him. But the assimilation effect did not work to draw together a third faction under McGarvey's leadership. A third main branch of the Restoration Movement emerged almost a century later--the Independent Christian Church--but they take a position directly opposite

to the position taken by McGarvey. They are anti-missionary society and pro-instrumental music.

But why did McGarvey's position fail to attract a factional following? The answer may lie in the way the assimilation effect worked for McGarvey. The pro-society, pro-instrumental music group tended to identify with McGarvey because of his defense of the missionary society. The assimilation effect produced by McGarvey's high prestige caused the pro-society, pro-instrument group--at least to some degree--to think that McGarvey was not really as much against instrumental music as he said that he was. Thus they accepted him because of their point of agreement and tended to ignore him on the point of difference. The same thing, in reverse, was the case for the anti-missionary society, anti-instrumental music group. They identified with McGarvey because of his anti-instrumental music position and tended to ignore his support of the missionary society.

This is not to say that McGarvey was ignored in the sense that no one argued with him. McGarvey was involved in many conflicts over these issues. What appeared to people on both sides as McGarvey's basic inconsistency also contributed to McGarvey's failure to attract a following for his position. But the assimilation effect, which would have caused people to minimize--at least to some degree--their differences with McGarvey, may help shed a little more light on this situation.

The factor of leadership prestige must be considered to determine in a given controversy whether or not it is likely that the first rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory will be fulfilled. If leadership prestige works in such a way that the rhetorical requirements of Simons' theory are not fulfilled, then no faction development is likely.

The Role of Opponents

Another important factor about the role of leadership in polarization was alluded to above: polarization works best when leaders emerge as opponents representing opposite poles of influence. J. H. Garrison spoke of a condition in which the "brother" is lost sight of in the "antagonist."⁹⁸ Garrison deplored this kind of situation, but others appeared to seek it. Moses E. Lard wrote,

I am sorry Bro. Shepherd is averse to controversy. Were he not, what a nice time he and I could have. I like controversy. I like it all the better the hotter it grows. I like to see it leap up even to a white heat. Give me a foeman over on the other side deeply entrenched in great banks of error. Only let the truth be with me; and then let the battle rage.⁹⁹

A more recent example of a leader looking for an opponent is seen in Yater Tant's editorials in the Gospel Guardian. Tant published an editorial entitled, "Brother Sewell's Literature Teaches Falsehood."¹⁰⁰ In this editorial, Tant challenged Sewell and those associated with him to answer his charges. Tant's charges, however, were ignored. And in the next issue of the Gospel Guardian, Tant complained because no one had taken up the challenge. He asked, "Who will be the first to accuse us?"¹⁰¹ But Tant found no opponent and the matter soon died down.

98

"Another Sin," Gospel Echo, June, 1869, p. 228.

99

"Church Independence," Apostolic Times, III, No. 49 (March 14, 1872), 388.

100

I, No. 50 (April 27, 1950), 2-3.

101

I, No. 51 (May 4, 1950), 11.

Polarization, in the very nature of things, requires the emergence of two opposite poles or centers of influence. Polarization, therefore, is not accomplished effectively by a leader without an opponent. This may help to explain why the issue of premillennialism did not result in any faction formation in the Church of Christ until this century and why it still has not resulted in the formation of a faction in the other branches of the Restoration Movement. There has been a wide range of millennial views in the history of the Restoration Movement. Many of the early leaders were post-millennialists. Most modern leaders are amillennialists. However, there have been a few premillennialists throughout the history of the movement. For the most part these premillennialists have been ignored. No leader has emerged against them and no premillennial faction developed. There is a premillennial element in the Independent Christian Church, but no united leadership has yet emerged against them and they have not yet been separated into a faction. In the Church of Christ, however, the premillennialists have had to face vigorous opposition. H. Leo Boles, President of David Lipscomb College, debated R. H. Boll, editor of Word and Work, a premillennial journal. The debate was published in the Gospel Advocate and then published by the Advocate in book form.¹⁰²

The main leader to emerge against the premillennialists was Foy E. Wallace, Jr. Typical of his attack on premillennialism was his Houston Music Hall meeting in 1945, published later in his book, God's Prophetic Word.¹⁰³ Friends of Wallace generally credit him with "turning back the

¹⁰² Unfulfilled Prophecy (Nashville, Tennessee: 1950).

¹⁰³ (Oklahoma City: by the author, 1945).

tide of premillennialism." In Wallace and others like him, the premillennialists found a capable and vigorous opposition. And what had not been a divisive issue before became a divisive issue. With the emergence of two camps, with each camp having its champions, polarization took place and a faction soon developed.

There are several issues on which the Restoration Movement has experienced diversity without division. In many of these cases the key factor discouraging polarization and division has been the failure of any united leadership to develop as opponents of potential faction-builders. In the Restoration Movement, polarization has worked best when two leaders of high prestige have emerged as opponents. Their prestige has caused the assimilation effect to work in drawing together followers who line up behind the two leaders. The contrast effect has then worked to push the two groups apart. Thus in determining whether or not the first rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory is likely to be fulfilled in a given controversy, it is necessary to consider both the prestige of the leaders and the emergence of leaders in the role of opponents.

The Role of Communication Channels in Polarization

Whether or not movement leaders will fulfill the first rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory in a given dispute depends to some extent on the type of communication channels used by movement leaders as they discuss the controversial issue. Sherif and Sherif pointed out that "the relationship between ego-involvement and communication structure is clear when the communication presents just two alternatives as in the debate format."¹⁰⁴ The debate

¹⁰⁴ Sherif and Sherif, p. 131.

format is a type of communication channel which provides the maximum encouragement for ego-involvement and polarization.

Channels of communication are also important in another way. If leaders are to attract followers in such a way as to polarize the thinking of a movement and develop a faction, they must have some "platform" from which they can address the whole movement. In the history of the Restoration Movement, there have been times when the right to publish in brotherhood-wide religious papers has been denied to potential faction-builders.¹⁰⁵ When this has happened, the potential faction-builders have not been able to polarize the thinking of the movement. The most that they have been able to do is to start their own papers and perhaps hold their own conventions or other movement-wide meetings, and then address an audience of people who already agree with them. When a platform has been denied the potential faction-builder early enough in the process of faction development, the most that has happened has been the separation and isolation of a small splinter group. Access to movement-wide channels of communication is a factor which must be considered to determine whether or not potential faction leaders are likely to attract followers and thus fulfill the first rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory.

Summary

In this chapter a psychological explanation has been presented showing how polarization, the first step in faction formation, takes place. The key factor is ego-involvement. Rhetorical strategies which contribute to ego-

105

For an example of the right to publish in brotherhood-wide papers being denied, see: Leroy Garrett, "The Advocate's Defense of It's Closed-Door Policy," Bible Talk, III, No. 7 (April, 1955), 115-117.

involvement have been considered. Non-verbal elements which relate to the rhetorical strategies have also been discussed. All of this has been the application to the study of faction formation of Simons' theory of persuasion for social movements--specifically Simons' first rhetorical requirement: that leaders must attract followers. Polarization is the way followers are attracted when a movement is divided into factions, according to the Dawson and Gettys study on which Simons' theory is built. Available historical evidence from the Restoration Movement is explainable in terms of Simons' theory. Polarization has always been involved as the first step in faction development within the Restoration Movement. The first rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory fits the data from the Restoration Movement. It is true, of course, that Simons' theoretical framework does not provide any means of determining in advance which issues will or will not be popular or inherently divisive. These are factors determined in retrospect. Simons' theory does, however, suggest to the critic areas to be considered. Rhetorical strategies which result in polarization constitute one such area. The Restoration Movement has divided over particular issues when the leaders have attracted followers by polarizing the thinking of the movement.

The next three chapters examine the rest of Simons' rhetorical requirements for social movement leadership as applied herein to the study of factions in the Restoration Movement. The next three chapters deal with the rhetorical requirements of identification, separation, and isolation.

CHAPTER THREE

STRATEGIES FOR IDENTIFICATION

Herbert W. Simons' theory of persuasion for social movements lists the following rhetorical requirements for social movement leadership:

1. Leaders must attract, maintain, and mold their followers into an efficiently organized unit.
2. They must secure the adoption of their ideology by the larger structure (i.e., the external system, the established order).
3. They must react to resistance generated by the larger structure.¹

As noted earlier in this study,² Simons' theory is based on the general social movement theory of Dawson and Gettys.³ The Dawson and Gettys theory grew out of their study of the Methodist Church and its formation as a faction within the Church of England.⁴ The present study is an effort to apply Simons' theory about the rhetorical requirements for social movement leadership to the study of faction development within the Restoration Movement.

¹"Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56 (February, 1970), 2-4.

²P. 12.

³Carl A. Dawson and Warner E. Gettys, An Introduction to Sociology (Revised Edition; New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1935), pp. 708-729.

⁴Ibid., pp. 710-713.

There is a close correspondance between the stages of movement development in the Dawson and Gettys theory and the rhetorical requirements of Simons' theory. According to Dawson and Gettys, the first stage in movement development is the stage of social unrest and in this stage the principle task of the leader is to polarize the thinking of the larger structure within which his movement is to be established.⁵ The first part of Simons' list of rhetorical requirements for movement leadership fits this first period or stage of movement development. That rhetorical requirement from Simons' theory is that leaders must attract followers. And in the specific case of faction development, such as the Methodist Church in the Dawson and Gettys study or the factions within the Restoration Movement examined in the present study, the rhetorical requirement is that leaders must attract followers by polarizing the thinking of the larger structure within which their faction is to be formed. Strategies for polarization were discussed in chapter two.

The second stage of movement development, according to Dawson and Gettys, is the popular stage in which the primary leadership task is to provide a sense of group self-consciousness for the developing movement.⁶ In Simons' theory, the specific rhetorical requirements which correspond to this second stage in the Dawson and Gettys theory is that part of Simons' theory which says that leaders must maintain and mold their followers into an efficiently organized unit. Providing group identification is the way Dawson and Gettys say this is done. And this chapter is concerned with strategies for identification.

⁵Ibid., pp. 712-713.

⁶Ibid., pp. 713-721.

The stage of formal organization and the institutional stage are the last two stages of movement development in the Dawson and Gettys theory. These stages correspond to Simons' last two rhetorical requirements and these will be discussed in chapters four and five. The concern of this chapter is with Simons' rhetorical requirement that leaders must maintain and mold their followers into an efficiently organized unit.

According to Dawson and Gettys, the development of factions within a movement begins when the movement is polarized into two conflicting camps. For the process of faction development to continue, it is necessary for these conflicting camps to develop a self-conscious awareness--a sense of group-identity. Identification enables people in a developing faction to see themselves as existing together and working together. Identification is what holds a developing faction together and mobilizes it for the confrontation, conflict, and separation which is to come.⁷

Rudolf Heberle, whose social movement theory Simons cited,⁸ has pointed out that a developing movement cannot be maintained or molded into an efficiently organized working unit without a sense of identification. The tie that binds together an unstructured movement--such as the Restoration Movement or the factions within that movement--is a body of shared beliefs. Heberle said that an unstructured movement exists largely in the minds of individuals.⁹ In much the same way, a faction exists when a group within

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Simons, 1 (footnote #3).

⁹ Rudolf Heberle, Social Movements (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951), p. 6.

a larger movement comes to have a set of shared beliefs that sets them apart from the rest of the larger movement. However, Heberle pointed out that shared beliefs alone do not make a movement. People have to be aware of their shared beliefs for a movement to exist.

We further maintain that mere similarity of sentiments occurring independently among a large number of people does not constitute a movement, nor does mere imitative mass action. A sense of group identity and solidarity is required, for only when the acting individuals have become aware of the fact that they have sentiments and goals in common--when they think of themselves as being united with each other in action through these sentiments and for these goals--do we acknowledge the existence of a social movement.¹⁰

The present study follows the example of Dawson and Gettys in considering a faction as a movement within a larger movement. And if what Heberle said about the larger movement not existing without a sense of group identity is true, it must also follow that factions require a sense of group identity.

The way identification fits into the over-all process of faction development has been illustrated by A. T. DeGroot's comparison of division in the Restoration Movement to cell division.

The approaching schism in the Restoration Movement came about in much the same manner as division takes place in biological cell development. Within the parent cell before the process of separation takes place the different elements exist more or less homogeneously throughout the structure. The activities of division tend to elongate these units and create in them an expansion of their "right" and "left" ends. The eventual outcome, of course, is the complete separation of the individual elements, the gravitation of these "rights" and "lefts" toward the respective ends of the original body, and their reorganization around new nuclei (here, the new interests or doctrines), with constriction of the cell into two separately bordered cells (here, practices and fellowship), until each of the two new units may be definitely differentiated from the other by its distinctive processes.¹¹

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 7.

¹¹ The Grounds of Division Among the Disciples of Christ (Chicago: by the author, 1940), p. 92.

DeGroot's cell-division illustration fits perfectly the stages of faction development as outlined in this study. What DeGroot called "the gravitation of the 'rights' and 'lefts' toward the respective ends of the original body" is the polarization discussed in chapter two. The "reorganization around new nuclei" is the process of faction identification discussed in this chapter. The "constriction of the cell into two separately bordered cells" is the separation discussed in chapter four. The condition DeGroot described as "two new units each definitely differentiated from the other by distinctive processes" is the isolation discussed in chapter five.

The idea that faction leaders must provide a sense of group identity for their developing faction is not a discovery of this study. Rather it is the adaptation of Simons' theory and the theories of Heberle and of Dawson and Gettys which Simons used to the study of faction development--specifically the study of faction development within the Restoration Movement. Providing a sense of group identity is simply the way that faction leaders in the Restoration Movement have fulfilled Simons' rhetorical requirement about maintaining their followers and molding them into an efficiently organized working unit. At one time, all branches of the Restoration Movement were strictly congregational in organization and most of the movement still is congregational. There is no national organization to tie together the movement. The sense of group identity, therefore, is especially needed to provide any coordinated effort.

In the study of Restoration Movement factions, this chapter is concerned with that stage of development in which the faction is provided with a sense of group identity. The purposes of this chapter are to isolate and identify those rhetorical strategies which have contributed to the identification of Restoration Movement factions and to show how these

rhetorical strategies have worked. Rhetorical strategies for providing a sense of group identity for a faction include both verbal and non-verbal elements. The primary focus of this chapter is on what the faction leaders say. The non-verbal element, however, is also important and therefore is considered.

Verbal Elements of Identification

Emphasis on Points of Difference

Stressing the importance of putting the emphasis on points of difference, Simons quoted the statement of Eric Hoffer, "mass movements can rise and spread without belief in a God, but never without belief in a devil."¹² According to Blumer, another sociologist quoted by Simons, movements and factions within movements are generally defined first in terms of what they are against.¹³ In the history of the Restoration Movement, even when pro and con factions have developed over some issue, the pro factions have tended to define themselves in terms of their opposition to the "anti-ism" of the other side.

Factions within the Restoration Movement have not seen themselves as being factions. What they have seen is the difference between themselves and the other groups within the Restoration Movement. But seeing relationships between self and others is the way self-image is developed.¹⁴ Thus a faction

¹²Simons, 6 (footnote # 35). See also: Eric Hoffer, The True Believer (New York: Harper and Row, 1951), p. 89.

¹³Herbert Blumer, "Social Movements," in New Outline of the Principles of Sociology, ed. A. M. Lee (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1946), pp. 200-202.

¹⁴Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif, "Attitude as the Individual's Own Categories: The Social Judgement-Involvement Approach to Attitude and Attitude Change," in Attitude, Ego-Involvement, and Change, eds. Carolyn W. Sherif and Muzafer Sherif (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967), p. 113.

develops a self-conscious awareness as it sees a growing difference between its own position and the positions of other groups. A faction leader, therefore, contributes to the identification process when he emphasizes the points of difference between his group and other groups within the Restoration Movement.

In the history of the Restoration Movement, faction leaders have not confined themselves to a positive presentation of their views. Rather, they have employed a negative approach. They have exposed and attacked doctrines of their opponents. This emphasis on points of differences has characterized the early stages of faction development in the Restoration Movement. After factions have been completely separated and isolated from the rest of the movement, the negative emphasis has usually changed.

One of the earliest examples of this negative emphasis on points of difference which later changed as the faction developed, is seen in Alexander Campbell's Christian Baptist, published from 1823 until 1830. The Christian Baptist emphasized the errors of existing denominations, stressed the differences between the developing group which Campbell was leading and the other religious groups around them, and particularly focused on attacks against errors in the Baptist Church. Campbell and his followers were loosely associated with the Baptists from 1813 until 1825. By 1830, Campbell's followers were so completely separated from the Baptists and isolated from them that new strategies were needed. The Christian Baptist had served its purpose. The Christian Baptist, more than any other factor, made the Restoration Movement aware of itself. With this identification accomplished, the negative emphasis on differences was no longer necessary. Campbell's change in rhetorical strategy at this point is clearly seen in the death of

the Christian Baptist and the birth of Campbell's new paper, the Millennial Harbinger. Even a cursory view reveals that the Millennial Harbinger took a positive approach in setting forth Campbell's views and no longer emphasized the differences between Campbell's position and the positions of others, as had been the case in the Christian Baptist.

When a faction leader emphasizes points of difference between his views and the views of others in the larger movement, this emphasis helps those who share the leader's views to see themselves as being separate from those who do not share his views. This rhetorical strategy of emphasizing differences is illustrated in the development of the Independent Christian Church as it was extricating itself from the more liberal Christian Church (Disciples of Christ).

The Christian Standard is the leading periodical in the Independent Christian Church. In the fifty years in which the Independent group was developing, the Christian Standard used the rhetorical strategy of emphasizing the differences between the liberal and conservative positions in the Christian Church.¹⁵ The Christian Standard exposed the theological liberalism of the Campbell Institute and the "heresies" of various teachers at church-related colleges. Many articles in the Christian Standard attacked the "false doctrines" taught by the Sunday School literature published by the Christian Board of Publications. Many editorials exposed the open membership practice

¹⁵For contrasting views of this controversy, see: Stephen J. Corey, Fifty Years of Attack and Controversy: The Consequences Among Disciples of Christ (Des Moines: The Committee on Publication of the Corey Manuscript, printed by the Christian Board of Publications, St. Louis, 1953), and Edwin V. Hayden, Fifty Years of Digression and Disturbance (Joplin, Mo.: Hunter Printing Company, n.d.). A copy of this pamphlet reflecting the view of the Independent Christian Church is on file in the archives of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society, Nashville, Tennessee.

of missionaries supported by the United Christian Missionary Society and then led the fight against open membership in the United States. Church Federation, Restructure, and the Ecumenical Movement were other projects of the liberal group attacked by the Christian Standard. These attacks on the liberal element in the Christian Church served to give a sense of group identification to the conservatives. By 1950, the conservatives were so completely separated and isolated from the liberals that they no longer needed the rhetorical strategy of emphasizing differences to provide a sense of group identity and so the Christian Standard changed its strategy.

On July 29, 1950, a front page editorial in the Christian Standard announced that the editors of the Christian Standard were tired of fighting the liberals, they were through with the negative emphasis, and the Christian Standard was no longer going to emphasize differences but would shift to a positive approach.¹⁶ By this time, however, the Independent Christian Church had already developed a self-awareness and therefore this strategy for producing group identification was no longer needed.

The modern Gospel Guardian as compared to the Gospel Guardian of the 1950's reflects this same shift in rhetorical strategies. In the 1950's when the anti-cooperation faction was first developing in the Church of Christ, the pages of the Gospel Guardian were filled with attacks on the rest of the Church of Christ. Since then the approach of the Gospel Guardian has changed. The Gospel Guardian now takes a much more positive stand and no longer emphasizes the differences between its position and the position of other

groups in the Church of Christ.¹⁷

One method of emphasizing the differences between a developing faction and the "other side" is the exposé. One of the favorite techniques of faction leaders in the Restoration Movement has been the publication of quotations (usually taken out of context) of extreme statements made by opposition leaders. One of the very old journals in the Restoration Movement was the Heretic Detector. No journal by that name has survived, but the function described by the title of that old periodical is still an important rhetorical strategy of faction leaders in the Restoration Movement. Harlan Overton suggested that some would-be faction builders have even resorted to creating an enemy and attacking a position that no one really holds, simply to identify with themselves a factional following.¹⁸

Points of Agreement Minimized

Minimizing points of agreement is, of course, simply the other side of the strategy which emphasizes points of difference. Both reflect the contrast effect produced by high ego-involvement as discussed in chapter two. By far the most common way of minimizing points of agreement between Restoration Movement factions has been simply to say nothing about the points of

¹⁷ For other examples of the rhetorical strategy of emphasizing points of difference, see: Leroy Garrett, "Twelve BIG Differences between the modern Church of Christ and the New Testament Church," Bible Talk, III, No. 9 (June, 1955), 150-152; and, A. M. Morris, Differences Between the Church of Christ and the Christian Church (n.p., by the author, [c.1875]). The only known copy of this booklet is in the library of Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas.

¹⁸ "Seeds of Distrust," Firm Foundation, LXXXVI, No. 5 (February 4, 1969), 69. See also: C. Wendell King, Social Movements in the United States (New York: Random House, 1969), p. 78.

agreement. But sometimes leaders have said things not just to emphasize the differences, but to minimize areas of agreement. Leroy Garrett reported two speeches which he heard at the 1971 Preachers Workshop at Abilene Christian College. The speeches were on the nature of truth. Garrett reported one comment on the speeches, both from what Garrett called "main-line Church of Christ preachers." That comment was, "they have different Gods."¹⁹ Notice that this comment was not really addressed to the differences between the two speakers. Their differences were epistemological, not theological. The obvious hyperbole of the comment, however, made it appear that the two speakers had almost nothing in common.

Importance of Issues Exaggerated

Factions develop an awareness of their own identity as they see the contrast between their own position and the positions of others in the movement--just as individual self-image is developed by seeing such relationships.²⁰ Exaggerating differences and minimizing points of agreement are two ways of focusing the attention of people on this contrast. Another way in which this is accomplished is by exaggerating the importance of the issue or issues around which the faction is built. In the history of the Restoration Movement two methods of exaggerating the importance of issues have been used. Faction leaders have exaggerated the claims of importance in their teaching. They have also devoted a disproportionate amount of time to teaching their doctrine on the issue or issues in question.

¹⁹ "Unity Meeting in Abilene," Restoration Review, XIII, No. 1 (January, 1971), 10.

²⁰ Sherif and Sherif, p. 113.

In the 1950's, when the anti-cooperation faction was developing in the Church of Christ, the anti-cooperation leaders taught that being wrong on the cooperation issue was just as bad as being wrong on baptism. In the Church of Christ, being wrong on baptism would be regarded as a serious error. In the 1950's, the anti-cooperation leaders were making dire predictions about the eternal destiny of those who supported congregational cooperation. Once their faction was identified, separated, and isolated from the rest of the Church of Christ, this rhetorical strategy of producing group identification through exaggerating the importance of the issue was no longer needed. In recent years, leaders of the anti-cooperation group have admitted their belief that being wrong on the cooperation issue will not, in itself, keep a person out of heaven. Yater Tant, one of the main leaders of the anti-cooperation group, said that he now believes that the "cooperative brethren" will go to heaven. Tant did suggest that the "cooperative brethren" will have to wear a dunce cap and stand in the corner of heaven for the first hundred years or so--but at least he has modified his previous stand and he no longer exaggerates the importance of the issue.²¹

There is a second way in which the importance of an issue can be exaggerated and that is simply by spending a disproportionate amount of time talking about that issue. As was noted earlier, any means of exaggerating the importance of an issue will help provide a sense of group identity for a developing faction. When people have their attention focused on the fact that some do not share their views, when differences are emphasized and

²¹Personal interview conducted at the Abilene Christian College Bible Lectureship, Abilene, Texas, February, 1971.

even exaggerated, people then begin to notice and feel identified with those who do share their views.²² Therefore whatever makes people more aware of differences within a movement will also make them more aware of their identity with those in the movement who share their beliefs. Exaggerating the importance of the issues is one way of making people more aware of the differences and therefore more aware of the group that shares their beliefs on the issues. And spending a disproportionate amount of time talking about an issue is one way of exaggerating the importance of the issue.

The practice of spending a major portion of the time talking about one issue is what various leaders of the Restoration Movement have called "hobby-riding." Religious leaders outside the Restoration Movement accused Campbell and other Restoration Movement preachers of making a "hobby" of preaching on baptism. Leaders of every faction within the Restoration Movement have been accused of making a "hobby" of their position on the issue around which their faction was built. Charles Holt discussed this practice in the Gospel Guardian,

By the word "hobby" I mean that these men can talk of nothing else; they are always riding their "hobby-horse" and to them it has become the most important thing in preaching. They press their hobby with all their might even to the disturbance of churches. With them the hobby is so all-important that one is not sound and cannot enjoy their fellowship who does not agree with them. There are some things for which they contend that are right, but one can become a "hobbyist" even in contending for something true and right.²³

"Hobby-Riding," by definition, exaggerates the importance of issues. And exaggerating the importance of issues contributes to the self-awareness of a group that shares a particular position on those issues.

²² Blumer, p. 202.

²³ "A Lot of Racket," V, No. 45 (March 25, 1954), 706.

"We-They" Language

One technique for producing group identification is the use of language which implies an identity for a group of followers and a separation of those followers from someone else. DeGroot talked about how the use of this kind of terminology helped distinguish the Restoration Movement from the rest of Christendom. "'Our movement,' 'our brotherhood,' 'our fellowship,' and later, 'our agencies'--is a terminology more common even today in Disciples speech than 'the church' or any other wording of Christian ecumenicity."²⁴ DeGroot then went on to show how Campbell's use of such terminology, especially in the Christian Baptist, helped to create the "conscious brotherhood of the Disciples of Christ."²⁵ In the 1966 Reed Lectures of the Disciples of Christ Historical Society, Robert O. Fife discussed how this same technique is still being used to provide group consciousness for Restoration Movement factions.

. . . One may readily observe that tendency to think in terms of groups and classes which has so often done violence to persons. In this process the stereotype, the tests of institutional loyalty, the process of condemnation by association, have all contributed to the development of what might be called a "we-they" complex. It has therefore not been unknown for brethren who challenged these categories on the ground that "We in Christ" was prior to all other "we's" in the Church, who in truth did not wholly "belong" in either of these groups, and who consequently sought fellowship "across the lines," to become objects of suspicion and even contempt.²⁶

²⁴ A. T. DeGroot, Restructure Problems (Fort Worth, Texas: by the author, 1969), p. 48.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 49.

²⁶ "Christian Unity as Reception and Attainment," in Disciples of Christ and the Church Universal (Nashville, Tennessee: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1966), p. 16.

"We-they" language has been used in the developing stages of every faction in Restoration Movement history. And if one can accept the statements of DeGroot and Fife, then it is obvious that the use of "we-they" language has contributed to the self-conscious identification of these factions. Articles with such titles as "'Our' work or 'Their' work?"²⁷ and "Whose side are you on?"²⁸ reflect the continuing use of this technique in the most recent division within the Church of Christ.

Labels

Another way in which faction leaders can provide a sense of group identity for their developing faction is through the use of labels. Since self-image is developed first from seeing relationships to others²⁹ the first kind of labels that are needed are labels for opposition groups. Later, labels are needed for the faction to use to describe itself.

In the Restoration Movement, factions have not generally seen themselves as being factions and faction leaders have not generally accepted the labels their opponents use to describe them. Leaders of the anti-missionary society, anti-instrumental music Church of Christ called the pro-missionary society, pro-instrumental music group the "Digressives." But leaders of the Christian Church preferred to call themselves "Progressives." Leaders of the "cooperative" group in the Church of Christ called their opponents "antis." The non-cooperative group preferred to call themselves "Conservatives."

²⁷

Yater Tant, Gospel Guardian, V, No. 44 (March 18, 1954), 692.

²⁸

Oscar Ellison, Gospel Guardian, V, No. 36 (January 21, 1954), 563.

²⁹

Sherif and Sherif, p. 113.

The Restoration Movement started as a non-denominational, even an anti-denominational movement and it has a long history of opposition to all forms of sectarianism. In this context, therefore, it is difficult for leaders to find terminology to describe their own group. The very act of denominating a group implies that the group is denominational or sectarian. Labeling opposition groups has not been a major problem, especially when they are viewed as sects or factions anyhow. A major problem of personal consistency is involved, however, when an advocate of non-denominationalism seeks a label for his own group.

The three major branches of the Restoration Movement have solved this problem by a de facto division among themselves of the three designations which the early leaders of the movement used. Thus "Disciples of Christ" has come to mean the more liberal branch, "Christian Church" is coming to mean the Independent group, and "Church of Christ" has come to mean the more conservative branch of the Restoration Movement.

The problem of finding some appropriate self-designation for the various sub-divisions of the Restoration Movement has been somewhat more involved. Some leaders have solved this problem by using such terminology as "the true Church," "the faithful," "sound brethren," or "the New Testament Church" as exclusive designations for their group. The Gospel Guardian has published for many years a series of articles on "Where Sound Churches Meet."³⁰ These are all anti-cooperation congregations. In the same way, the congregations mentioned in the Old Paths Advocate are immediately recognized by the discerning reader as being "one-cup" congregations. The "Church Announcements"

³⁰ For an example, see: "Where Sound Churches Meet Near Danville, Ky.," XXI, No. 48 (May 8, 1970), 711.

pages of the Church Messenger list only the anti-Sunday School congregations. Yet none of these periodicals use the identifying labels which opponents apply to their groups. They simply use such terms as "the Church" or "the faithful" in an exclusive sense.

One group has solved this problem by admitting their sectarian status. In 1963, Richard Ramsey published a Directory of Premillennial Churches of Christ.³¹ In this way he was able to provide a visible form of group identification for his small and scattered faction. But faction leaders who deny their sectarian status cannot afford to take such a step.

Providing identification through some self-designation for a faction without resorting to the use of factional labels has presented a major problem for faction leaders. One way that some faction leaders have solved this problem has been to use as a self-designation the faction label that opponents use, but without admitting the validity of that label. "Anti-ism" was a label applied by the cooperative group in the Church of Christ to the doctrine of the anti-cooperation group. Obviously, the anti-cooperation leaders would not accept such a label. They were, however, able to use this label to accomplish the purpose of providing group identification without admitting the validity of the label. Thus they could talk about "what the liberals call 'anti-ism'" and that would identify their position without accepting the stigma attached to the use of this particular label.³²

The use of labels to identify factions can involve some rather fine distinctions. The "one-cup" group uses the term "the class faction," to refer

³¹(Hammond, Louisiana: The Exhorter).

³²Lary R. Devore, "Whither Goeth Anti-ism?" Gospel Guardian XXI, No. 37 (January 22, 1970), 583.

to "one-cup" congregations which have Bible classes. "The cups faction" is the term they use to describe the vast majority of congregations in the Church of Christ, which have both individual communion cups and Bible classes.

Another rather fine distinction in labels is illustrated in the terminology of Yater Tant, leader of the anti-cooperation group. Tant used to call the cooperative group the Liberals. Now that his faction has separated and is isolated from the cooperative group, Tant's attention has turned to the problem of classical theological liberalism which he sees in the cooperative group. Now he distinguishes between the liberal (without quotation marks) position of the cooperative group's left-wing and the "liberal" (with quotation marks) position of the more conservative part of the cooperative group. In the same way he now distinguishes between My Brethren (without quotation marks) meaning the anti-cooperation group and "My Brethren" (with quotation marks) meaning Tant's group plus the cooperative group in the Church of Christ.³³

The names of leaders have often been used as faction labels in the history of the Restoration Movement. Those outside the Restoration Movement have often labeled the whole movement as "Campbellites." Factions within the movement have been known by the names of faction leaders. The "Boll-ites" were the premillennial followers of R. H. Boll. "Sommerites" were the anti-college, anti-local minister group led originally by Daniel Sommer. That group is now known in some areas as "Ketcherside-ites"--although the mature Carl Ketcherside no longer fits easily into such a category.

The names of religious periodicals have also been used as faction labels. The "Gospel Guardian-ites" are the anti-cooperation group in the Church of

³³ Yater Tant, "Stand Off and Remain Aloof," Gospel Guardian, XXI, No. 11 (July 17, 1969), 165.

Christ. Several years ago when the anti-instrumental music, anti-missionary society Church of Christ was splitting away from the Christian Church, many Texas congregations of the Church of Christ were called "Firm Foundation-ites," after the periodical published in Austin, Texas. Independents who split off from the Disciples of Christ have been called "the Standard Bunch" after their principle religious journal, the Christian Standard.

In the history of the Restoration Movement, being labeled by an opposition group and giving a label to the opposition group have both been important elements in the process of providing a sense of group identification for developing factions. Self-designations have generally been too long and too complicated for frequent use and therefore the labels given by opposition groups has probably been the more important factor.

Slogans

The use of slogans has also contributed to the identification of developing factions. Such slogans as "We speak where the Bible speaks; we remain silent where the Bible is silent" helped to provide a sense of group identity for the Restoration Movement in its very early days. Those who accepted the slogan were a part of the movement and those who rejected it were not. A. T. DeGroot pointed out that at one time a slogan helped to hold the Restoration Movement together--in the Civil War days when almost every other religious body in America divided. DeGroot concluded,

The principle reason that the brotherhood did not divide [over the slavery issue] was that it had a slogan. . . . So well had they engrafted another slogan ("in essentials unity, in opinion liberty, in all things charity") it became apparent to them immediately that to divide over a question not absolutely settled in the Bible was nothing less than silly.³⁴

³⁴"Slavery is a Matter of Opinion," Christian-Evangelist, LXXXVIII, No. 9 (March 1, 1950), 202.

Thus according to DeGroot, a slogan helped hold the Restoration Movement together in the days of the Civil War. But often what the slogans have held together has not been the whole movement but a developing faction. Thus various epithets concerning "Institutionalism" and its danger helped identify the anti-cooperation faction in the Church of Christ. On the other hand, epithets concerning "Legalism" helped identify the cooperative group.

Faction leaders in the Restoration Movement have provided a sense of group identity for their factions by emphasizing points of difference, minimizing points of agreement, exaggerating the importance of issues, using "we-they" language, using labels, and using slogans. These rhetorical strategies constitute the verbal element of identification. Three non-verbal elements are also important: the nature of the issues, the prestige of the leaders, and the channels of communication. These non-verbal elements are considered in the remainder of this chapter.

Non-Verbal Elements of Identification

The Nature of Issues

The important thing about issues and their role in the process of faction identification is that some issues lend themselves much more readily to the process of identification than do others. To make the greatest possible contribution to the process of faction identification, the issue must be one on which people on both sides can find ready identification. One of the rhetorical requirements of Simons' theory was that leaders mold their followers into a unit.³⁵ Some of the issues in the Restoration

³⁵ Simons, 3.

Movement have been too complicated for simple group identification. Leaders have not been able to persuade those who agree with them on these issues to see themselves as belonging to a distinct group defined by their shared beliefs on these complicated issues. In these cases, therefore, leaders have failed to fulfill one of the rhetorical requirements of Simons[†] theory and in these cases no faction has developed.

There are several examples in the history of the Restoration Movement of controversies which did not result in faction formation because of the failure of people who shared certain views to identify themselves as a distinct group. For example, the many-sided controversy over the eldership qualifications, tenure, and authority has involved such complex positions that people have not been able easily to identify their own position in relation to the positions of others. No united leadership has ever developed and thus no faction has ever developed in opposition to the conscientious objection position. The reluctance of people to identify themselves as the pro-war or pro-killing group helps to explain why no faction ever developed along these lines. In the same way, no united leadership has developed and no faction has been formed in opposition to those who argue that there are no Scriptural grounds for divorce and re-marriage. The reluctance of people to identify themselves as the pro-divorce group helps to explain why no such faction has emerged. In these cases no faction developed because the nature of the controversial issue discouraged group identification. Therefore, in these cases, the leadership failed to fulfill one of the rhetorical requirements of Simons[†] theory.

A comparison of the issues on which the Restoration Movement has divided with those issues on which the Restoration Movement has experienced diversity without division indicates that those issues which naturally

arrange themselves into simple pro or con propositions with which people can quickly and easily identify are the issues on which the Restoration Movement has divided into factions. The simplicity of the issue has been a vital factor. Complex issues which cannot be expressed in simple, two-sided propositions have been the subject of little discussion and less division.

Leadership Prestige

In C. Wendell King's book on Social Movements in the United States, King pointed out that over and above all the usual qualities of personal prestige needed for leadership, there are two requirements that a movement leader must fulfill in order to contribute to group cohesion within his movement: the people must be able to identify with the leader and the leader must be identified with the movement's central issue.³⁶ When young Daniel Sommer asked Benjamin Franklin, editor of the American Christian Review, what a young man should do who aspired to leadership in the Restoration Movement, Franklin's counsel was "constantly discuss the brotherhood issues."³⁷ If people in the Restoration Movement have been able to identify the man with the issue and then identify themselves with the man, they have been more likely to identify themselves with the issue and thus to see themselves as a separate group. The prestige of the leader, therefore, is a factor which must be considered in determining whether or not a movement leader will be able to fulfill the rhetorical requirements of Simons' theory in any particular case.

³⁶(New York: Random House, 1969), pp. 33, 77-78.

³⁷ Joseph Franklin and J. A. Headington, The Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin (St. Louis: John Burns, Publisher, 1879 [reproduced by Old Paths Book Club, Rosemead, Calif., 1956]), p. 460.

Communication Channels

The primary channels of communication in the Restoration Movement have been the movement-wide religious periodicals and the movement-wide gatherings such as conventions, lectureships, and such like. In the polarization stage of faction development, the important thing about the channels of communication is their availability.³⁸ The faction builder needs a platform from which he can address the whole movement. As polarization continues, the channels of communication serve another rhetorical purpose: they provide a sense of group identity for the developing faction. Harrell pointed out how the Christian Standard provided a sense of group identity for the Disciples in the North.³⁹ Garrison said that the anti-instrumental music, anti-missionary society group did not present a serious challenge until journalistic champions advocated that cause and identified a faction around these issues.⁴⁰ Dowling commented that "each editor also created a constituency substantially in agreement with the particular emphasis of his publication; and, in turn, this constituency supported that paper."⁴¹

The importance of religious periodicals in the Restoration Movement is such that Tucker commented, "The Disciples do not have Bishops, they have

³⁸ King, p. 36. See also Dawson and Gettys, pp. 710-713.

³⁹ "Sectional Origins of the Church of Christ," 269.

⁴⁰ Winfred E. Garrison, An American Religious Movement (St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, [1945]), p. 122.

⁴¹ Enos E. Dowling, The Restoration Movement (Cincinnati, Ohio: Standard Publishing Company, 1964), p. 92.

editors."⁴² Garrison commented, "the editor's chair has come nearer to being a throne of power than any other position among Disciples."⁴³ One of the main powers of the editors has been their power to provide a sense of group identity for a factional following.

There is a sense in which the medium is the message concerning the identification of groups. Having separate channels of communication for two groups tends to identify them as separate from each other. Campbell recognized this danger. His opposition to the proliferation of religious journals in the Restoration Movement probably came more from this concern than from any editorial jealousy.

Having separate channels of communication contributed to the Disciples-Independent split. Those who organized the North American Christian Convention designed it as a preaching convention in a mild protest against the liberal policies of the International Convention of the Christian Church. Having two conventions, however, eventually led to two separate fellowships.

As one studies the origins of the North American Christian Convention it appears that the responsible leaders of this movement did not think of it as an alternative to the International Convention, but as an additional gathering to meet a need not served by the International Convention.

It is true that the "North American" grew out of an expression of protest against the way in which the thorny issue of "open membership" on the foreign field had been handled in the International Convention. But the felt need was also positive: brethren wished a gathering which would be less involved with agency affairs and more marked by Biblical preaching, inspiring fellowship, and addresses concerning significant issues of the Church in our time.

The first North American Christian Convention was held in Indianapolis in 1927. Brethren who attended it appointed a committee to call another

⁴²William E. Tucker, J. H. Garrison and Disciples of Christ (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1964), p. 38.

⁴³Winfred E. Garrison, Religion Follows the Frontier (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc., 1931), p. 210.

gathering should such a meeting prove desirable. Thus the sequence of conventions commenced. In the early years many brethren attended both the International and the North American conventions. But in the course of time this number diminished. As a result both conventions gradually became composed of brethren who had little communication with the others.

The effect of this was twofold: First, the different purposes of the two conventions, which were not in themselves contradictory, were accompanied by growing social isolation and group consciousness. Second a large body of brethren who continued to share basic convictions came to be separated by the accidents of social and institutional life.⁴⁴

The fear of division resulting from the two conventions prompted the Christian-Evangelist's editor to attack the decision of the North American Christian Convention to start meeting annually. In an editorial entitled, "Does This Mean Division?" the Christian-Evangelist said,

It has been our fear from the beginning of this "protest" movement that despite the best intentions of those promoting the convention it would eventually become a means of dividing our brotherhood. Preaching conventions tinged with protest cannot remain mere audiences, innocently to disband with a doxology at the close and return home. They tend to become organisms in spite of themselves, and if repeated periodically--as these have been over the past twenty years--there is little hope but that they will ultimately become the instruments of division. . . . The decision at Indianapolis to hold the convention annually from now on can only mean that the process toward division into a separate organism will be greatly accelerated.⁴⁵

In the history of the Restoration Movement, having separate channels of communication has tended to identify separate groups. Whether conventions, lectureships, or periodicals--any platform for addressing the Restoration Movement as a whole has been important in the process of polarization; but those platforms which addressed only a part of the movement--the separate platforms for separate factions--have been even more important in creating a sense of group identification for the factions. Having separate channels of communication helps fulfill the rhetorical requirement of identification.

⁴⁴Fife, p. 15.

⁴⁵LXXX, No. 23 (June 7, 1950), 551.

Summary

This chapter has focused on the rhetorical strategies as well as some non-verbal rhetorical factors involved in the process of producing a sense of group identification for a faction. The purpose of this chapter has been to apply Simons' rhetorical requirement that leaders must maintain and mold their followers into an efficiently organized unit. This rhetorical requirement from Simons' theory has been applied to the specific case of faction formation within the Restoration Movement. In the case of factions the requirement is that leaders must provide a sense of group identification which will hold together their followers and mobilize them for the separation to come. In the examples noted from the Restoration Movement, when leaders have fulfilled this rhetorical requirement, their factions have developed further. When leaders have failed to fulfill this requirement, their factions have failed to develop any further.

CHAPTER FOUR

STRATEGIES FOR SEPARATION

Simons' list of rhetorical requirements for social movement leadership includes as the second main point the requirement that leaders must secure the adoption by the larger structure of the movement's ideology, particularly their program for change.¹ In the case of factions developing within a movement, the movement itself is the larger structure.² The leaders of a faction appeal to people in the movement to adopt their faction's ideology or program for change. In the case of an unstructured movement such as the Restoration Movement, faction membership is defined in terms of accepting a faction's ideology.³ When a leader tries to secure the adoption of his faction's ideology, he is actually recruiting members for his faction. In a more structured movement, a faction leader's efforts might be directed toward getting his faction's ideology adopted by the power structure in control of the movement's organizational machinery.⁴ That situation would present a totally different

¹Herbert W. Simons, "Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56 (February, 1970), 3-4.

²Carl A. Dawson and Warner E. Gettys, An Introduction to Sociology (Revised Edition; New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1935), pp. 708-713.

³Rudolf Heberle, Social Movements (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951), p. 7.

⁴Simons, 8-10.

picture. But this study is concerned with faction development in an unstructured movement--the Restoration Movement.

There are several ways in which a leader within a movement might go about trying to persuade others in the movement to adopt his ideology. One possibility is that the leader might seek to modify the thinking of the whole movement in such a way that no faction is formed.⁵ Faction formation, however, always involves some kind of separation.⁶ As a leader attempts to sell his ideas to others in a movement, there must always come a time when his efforts result in a separation of his followers from the rest of the movement. If there is no separation, then by definition, there is no faction. Thus the rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory that movement leaders must secure the adoption by the larger structure of their ideology becomes in the case of faction leadership a rhetorical requirement of separation: faction leaders must persuade others in the movement to adopt their ideology and as a result to separate themselves from the rest of the movement.

In addition to the possibility that a movement might be modified with no faction formation, a second possibility is that separation may be delayed while faction leaders employ a strategy of infiltration and subversion in an attempt to build up a power base, take over existing institutions, and take control of the channels of communication before shifting to a strategy of open confrontation with those of opposing views. If the final separation is delayed long enough and the process of infiltration and subversion is unhindered,

⁵Mayer N. Zald and Roberta Ash, "Social Movement Organization: Growth, Decay, and Change," in Protest, Reform, and Revolt, ed. Joseph R. Gusfield (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970), p. 526.

⁶Dawson and Gettys, pp. 721-724.

the group that was previously the majority will loose control and become the minority that is expelled when the separation finally comes.⁷

A third possibility is that movement leaders, in response to a faction's strategy of infiltration and subversion, may call for an open confrontation and force a separation before the faction builders have had a chance to build their power base or take control of institutions and channels of communication. If the majority leadership forces a separation soon enough, before the minority faction's strategy of infiltration and subversion has had time to work, then the majority will retain control and the expelled minority will tend to be relatively small.⁸

A fourth possibility is that faction leaders may adopt a largely defensive posture from the first. Instead of making a serious effort to recruit new followers, they may concentrate on protecting an existing following. Their basic strategy in this case will be one of preservation--the preservation of a remnant.⁹

A fifth possibility is that separation may come with no attempt to employ any other strategy. Leaders may polarize the thinking of the movement, identify with themselves as large a faction as possible, then separate and isolate that faction from the rest of the movement.¹⁰ Separation may be

⁷ Philip Selznick, "Institutional Vulnerability in Mass Society," in Protest, Reform, and Revolt, ed. Joseph R. Gusfield (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970), pp. 258-273.

⁸ Heberle, pp. 388-407.

⁹ Joseph R. Gusfield, "Rejection of the Social Order," in Protest, Reform, and Revolt, ed. Joseph R. Gusfield (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970), pp. 85-89.

¹⁰ Dawson and Gettys, pp. 715-716.

avoided by a strategy of modification. Separation may be delayed by a strategy of infiltration and subversion. Separation may result in only minor division when a strategy of preservation is employed. But separation must come for a faction to be formed.

The idea that separation is a rhetorical requirement for faction leadership is not a discovery of this study. Rather, it is the application to the study of faction development of social movement theory in general and specifically of Simons' requirement that movement leaders must secure the adoption of their ideology or program for change by the larger structure. In the case of the Restoration Movement factions of interest in the present study, this simply means persuading people to adopt a faction's ideology and thus become a part of a faction which is separated from the rest of the movement.

The purposes of this chapter are to isolate and identify the rhetorical strategies which have been employed by Restoration Movement leaders in the various approaches to the selling of ideas within the Restoration Movement and to show how these strategies have worked--especially how these rhetorical strategies have contributed to the separation of factions in the Restoration Movement.

The Strategy of Modification

Some movements succeed so well that they lose their reason for being and cease to exist. When a leader modifies the thinking of a whole on some issue, no faction develops. In the history of the Restoration Movement there is one notable example of modification with no faction formation. In the very early days of the Restoration Movement, Campbell

and his followers accepted the Baptist practice of "close communion." In 1828 Campbell objected to admitting the unimmersed to the Lord's Supper. He argued that such an "open communion" practice would logically require an "open membership" practice. But the restriction was gradually relaxed without much open argument over the issue. In 1862 Isaac Errett wrote in the Millennial Harbinger that probably two-thirds of the churches welcomed to the Lord's Supper all who considered themselves qualified to commune. Garrison later wrote explaining how the modification took place.

The solving text was that each should "examine himself and so let him eat." And the standard formula was, "We neither invite nor debar." There was, in fact, very little general controversy on this subject. In time the close communion practice disappeared so completely that most Disciples in the United States do not even know that it ever existed and are somewhat shocked to learn that it is still practiced in the British churches.¹¹

The Strategy of Infiltration and Subversion

In the history of the Restoration Movement, the most notable example of infiltration and subversion is the liberal-conservative controversy within the Christian Church which led to the Disciples-Independent split. Going all the way back to the days of J. W. McGarvey, the emergence of a liberal element in the Christian Church can be seen. The Campbell Institute at the University of Chicago's Disciples Divinity House became the center of a liberal theology quite out of line with the relatively conservative theological views of most people in the Christian Church. The Quarterly Bulletin published by the Campbell Institute expressed in the very first issue the semi-clandestine character of the Institute.

¹¹Winifred E. Garrison, An American Religious Movement (St. Louis, Mo.: The Christian Board of Publication, 1945), pp. 119-120.

The Campbell Institute is not a secret society. Neither does it seek publicity. It seeks to do a work for its own members and for others of like spirit. In the nature of the case the number is limited who meet the requirements of membership and would care to participate in the organization. In order to avoid misunderstanding or the temptation to any controversy concerning the Institute, its principles, or the work of individual members it is considered best to treat these matters as confidences not to be discussed with outsiders. For the same reason the Bulletin is not for general circulation, and it will be possible to make it of more value and interest if this restriction is observed.¹²

E. S. Ames, who wrote the above article in the Quarterly Bulletin does not indicate what these matters were that should be held in confidence. But if subsequent issues of the Quarterly Bulletin are any indication, they were the attitude of the Disciples toward the "pious unimmersed"¹³ and church union.¹⁴

When J. W. McGarvey saw what he regarded as signs of theological liberalism in The Scroll, a general distribution publication of the Campbell Institute, McGarvey was shocked. He challenged the editor to publish the names of the members of the Institute. His challenge was ignored.¹⁵

Ames knew that the liberal element represented by the Campbell Institute was a very small minority and not ready for an open clash with the conservative majority in the Christian Church. He therefore suggested an effort to build up a power base in a limited area. He suggested that

¹² E. S. Ames, "A Suggestion," I, No. 1 (October, 1903), 1.

¹³ "A Perennial Question," I, No. 2 (January, 1904), 1.

¹⁴ "Christian Union," I, No. 3 (April, 1904), 1.

¹⁵ Henry E. Webb, "A History of the Independent Mission Movement of the Disciples of Christ," (unpublished Th. D. thesis at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1954), p. 33.

like-minded (liberal) ministers in every major city should meet occasionally to "cultivate each other and the cause." But his main object was the establishment of a base of operations.

Why not concentrate Institute pastors so far as possible in Illinois and Indiana and make concerted actions in these, or other selected states, on behalf of modern methods and ideas? It is refreshing to see what has already been accomplished in Indiana and Chicago by a few men in recent years. By a little forethought much more could be done.¹⁶

The liberal ministers followed Ames' suggestion and thus they were able to build up a strong power base. One by one they managed to infiltrate and then take over the colleges operated by the Christian Church. The more conservative element counter-attacked by forming the Bible College League, which tried to regain control of the schools. But as Webb observed,

The League created bitterness but was able to accomplish very little that was constructive. Being mostly negative in purpose, it soon lost its initial enthusiasm, and died. Most of the men involved later turned their energies toward the positive task of creating a competitive institution, the McGarvey Bible College in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1923.¹⁷

The liberal element represented by the Campbell Institute also sought control of the International Convention of the Christian Church. They needed this control in order to accomplish one of their goals. They wanted to bring the Christian Church into the Federal Council of Churches of Christ of America. J. H. Garrison led the fight to get the Disciples into the Federation. In fact, Garrison helped to organize the Federation and suggested its name. The conservative element saw church federation as an abandonment of the restoration principle for achieving Christian unity, thus the stage was set for a major conflict.

¹⁶E. S. Ames, "Notes," Quarterly Bulletin, I, No. 4 (July, 1904), 10.

¹⁷P. 57.

The conservatives expected Garrison to bring up the Federation issue at the 1906 National Convention in New York. The liberals, however, were not ready to move. Conservatives argued that the National Convention had no authority to consider anything except mission work. The National Convention was not a delegate assembly and had no authorization to act on behalf of the denomination in any matter other than mission work. At the 1907 National Convention in Cincinnati, the liberals still did not bring up the Federation question. They did manage to have the Convention call an ad hoc meeting to discuss the matter. The special meeting on Federation was to be in connection with a convention in Norfolk, Virginia, in October, 1907. Even this convention, the opponents of Federation argued, was not authorized to act on behalf of the entire denomination. The liberals, however, were in control of the meeting and they managed to take action in the name of the Christian Church which was sufficient to get the Christian Church into the Federation.

J. B. Briney, editor of Briney's Monthly, objected to the irregular procedure of the whole affair. He cast the only dissenting vote, but his account of the meeting suggests that the action was not really representative of the Christian Church in general or even of the majority of the people present at the Norfolk Convention. For some reason, the liberal leaders felt that a special meeting called after the adjournment of the Norfolk Convention would be more representative than action taken by the Convention itself.

Briney reported,

The president of the Convention session took the liberty of declaring the session adjourned, without any vote or motion to that effect. When this announcement was made, large numbers of those present arose to leave the hall, and it really looked as if there would be a stampede. But the doors of the Convention Hall were ordered locked, and by much persuasion, backed up with the information that the doors were locked, and that all means of egress were cut off, the people were induced to

remain. . . . But only two hundred people in the crowd actually voted [on the Federation issue] and that vote simply represented those two hundred people, not the Disciples of Christ.¹⁸

The liberals, however, had won. The Federation accepted this action in the Norfolk Convention as official and thus the Disciples were taken into the Federation.

In the continuing conflict between the two branches of the Christian Church, the conservatives attempted to expose the liberals. In 1906-1907 the Christian Standard contained many attacks on the liberals from such writers as J. W. McGarvey, E. V. Zollars, Charles Loos, J. B. Briney, Frederick D. Kershner, and J. T. Brown. Two articles by Briney, "The Safety of Our Missionary Society,"¹⁹ and "The Place of the Plea in the Curriculum,"²⁰ provoked a bitter reply from E. S. Ames and the controversy between these two men was long and acrimonious. J. T. Brown's attack on A. W. Fortune, "What Will the Newly Elected Teacher of Theology in the College of the Bible Teach?" continued through eight issues of the Christian Standard.²¹

The efforts of the conservatives to "smoke out" the liberals proved to be too little and too late. Webb outlined the developments in the remainder of this controversy,

¹⁸ "Action Taken at the Norfolk Convention," Christian Standard, XXXIII, No. 42 (October 26, 1907), 1772.

¹⁹ XXXVII, No. 35 (September 2, 1911), 1419.

²⁰ XXXVII, No. 30 (July 29, 1911), 1211.

²¹ XLVIII, No 30 through No. 37 (July 27 through September 14, 1912), 1206-1485.

The next few years are the bitterest of all, for they represent the last desperate attempt of the conservative brethren to capture control of the national agencies of the brotherhood. It is in this period that epithets became crystallized and such terms as "compromisers," "radicals," and "modernists," became fixed nomenclature for the organized element and "independents," "anti-missionary bunch," "reactionary," and "non-cooperatives" are used as titles for the conservative element. Churches are urged to free themselves from "entangling alliances" and to support "loyal" missionaries. The inferences behind many of these terms are quite unsavory. From this point on, support of the United Christian Missionary Society is looked upon as prima facta evidence of sympathy with its liberal tendencies. On the other hand, refusal to support the Society is viewed as disloyalty to the brotherhood and schism. Thus the United Society became a test of fellowship among a people who claim to reject all human tests of fellowship.²²

In the history of the Disciples-Independent split, liberal leaders who employed the strategy of infiltration and subversion used several techniques as a part of their over-all strategy. In the period when they were still trying to build their power base, take over existing institutions, and take control of the channels of communication, they tended to avoid any direct clash with the opposition. They avoided the debate format in favor of a one-sided presentation of their position. They sought common ground with their audiences. The plea for tolerance was an important part of their strategy.

Another element in the liberal's strategy in their infiltration and subversion of the Christian Church was that the liberal group tried to avoid too much polarization and group identification before they were able to take control. As will be demonstrated later in the cases of the Premillennial group and the anti-cooperation group in the Church of Christ, when the polarization-identification process has started too early, the separation has come before the faction leaders have had time to infiltrate and take over the group in which they were working.

²² Webb, p. 133.

One way in which liberals in the Christian Church avoided premature polarization, identification, and separation, was by their leaders expressing positions in vague, ambiguous statements. Sherif and Sherif pointed out that vague statements contribute to assimilation rather than contrast.²³ With the assimilation effect, people tend to perceive the vaguely stated position as being closer to their own position than it really is. Vague statements of positions, therefore, help to prevent a premature separation.

The specific elements in this strategy of infiltration and subversion are similar to the techniques used in the strategy of modification. There are, however, two important differences. In the case of modification, there is no polarization or group identification. Both of these are present to some degree in the case of infiltration and subversion. In the case of modification, there never is an open confrontation or separation. In the case of infiltration and subversion, the conciliatory strategies are only temporary and eventually there is a shift to a strategy of direct confrontation leading to separation. Once the minority has taken over through its strategy of infiltration and subversion, the group that was previously in control is expelled.²⁴

Imposed Separation

If the majority leadership responds to the infiltration and subversion strategy of the minority soon enough, the minority can be exposed and then separated before they have had time to take over. This is what the conservative group tried to do in the Disciples-Independent split, but they failed. There

²³ Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif, "Attitude as the Individual's Own Categories: The Social Judgement-Involvement Approach to Attitude and Attitude Change," in Attitude, Ego-Involvement, and Change, eds. Carolyn W. Sherif and Muzafer Sherif (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967), pp. 131-132.

²⁴ Selznick, pp. 258-273.

have been times, however, in the history of the Restoration Movement when the strategy of imposed separation has worked.

Leaders of the "main stream" Church of Christ in the first decades of this century felt that the premillennial faction was using the strategy of infiltration and subversion. R. H. Boll, a leading premillennial teacher, was the front page editor of the Gospel Advocate and as the most popular Gospel Advocate writer seemed to be "next in line" for the position of editor-in-chief. E. L. Jorgensen, another premillennial leader, compiled the most popular hymnal in the Church of Christ, Great Songs of the Church. The early editions of this hymnal contained many songs which the "main stream" leaders saw as teaching premillennialism. Such men as J. N. Armstrong at Harding College and George A. Klingman at Abilene Christian College were urging that millennial views not be made a test of fellowship. Teachers with premillennial views were employed at both of these colleges. A growing number of local congregations were coming to accept premillennialism.

Foy E. Wallace, Jr., editor of the Gospel Advocate and later founder of the Gospel Guardian, began a campaign to "smoke out" the premillennialists. His pressure drove Klingman out of his post as head of the Bible Department at Abilene Christian College and cost Harding College much of its support. There is some question as to whether there ever was any united "premillennial strategy," but Wallace and others responded as if there were such a strategy. The rhetorical strategies of Wallace and others were successful in separating and isolating the premillennialists from the rest of the Church of Christ. If there was a strategy of infiltration and subversion being used by the premillennial group, it did not work. The strategy of imposed separation left the premillennial group as nothing more than a remnant.

Another example of imposed separation was the strategy of the cooperative group in the Church of Christ in the mid-1950's. At this time the anti-cooperation element led by the Gospel Guardian was seen by many leaders in the Church of Christ as using a strategy of infiltration and subversion--at least on a local level. The Church of Christ does not have any central organizational machinery to be subverted, as was the case when the liberals took control of the Christian Church. The only platforms for addressing the whole Church of Christ were the religious periodicals and the brotherhood-wide lectureships, especially the large gathering at the Abilene Christian College Lectureship. These platforms were open to anti-cooperation leaders until well into the 1950's.

The strategy of infiltration and subversion used by the anti-cooperation group was for the control of local congregations. Anti-cooperation preachers found work with cooperative congregations by being vague and misleading about their true position. They worked quietly for a while, teaching their doctrine to key individuals in the church. When they had their power base well established, they called for an open confrontation and expelled the cooperative members from their own congregations. This, of course, is the way the cooperative leaders saw the situation. Anti-cooperation leaders would not share this estimate of the situation. But since this is the way the cooperative leaders saw the situation, they responded by calling for the expulsion of the anti-cooperation group.

By the mid-1950's, the pro-cooperation leaders in control of the brotherhood papers refused to publish any more anti-cooperation articles. In July of 1955, Reuel Lemmons, editor of the Firm Foundation, began an attack on the anti-cooperation doctrine. In the 1956 Abilene Christian

College Lectureship, Lemmons blamed the anti-cooperation element for dividing the Church of Christ.²⁵ Leaders of the pro-cooperation element called for the expulsion of the anti-cooperation group from the fellowship of the Church of Christ. This expulsion took place gradually over the next decade.

The separation and isolation of the anti-cooperation group did not destroy the anti-cooperation faction, but it did stop its growth. The anti-cooperation faction now controls only one of the colleges related to the Church of Christ, Florida College. The Gospel Guardian is the only major religious periodical controlled by this faction. At one time the anti-cooperation group claimed as much as twenty per cent of the Church of Christ. Today they represent less than ten per cent. Several unity meetings have been held with Reuel Lemmons as one of the leading influences behind these meetings. Leaders of the pro-cooperation element in the Church of Christ now generally share the view that the imposed separation of the anti-cooperation faction was both necessary and effective and that this division of the Church of Christ may yet be healed.

The Strategy of Preservation

There have been times in the history of the Restoration Movement when faction leaders have not really made a major effort to recruit new members into their faction. Rather, they have adopted, from the first, a defensive posture and have sought to separate and isolate an existing group of followers in order to protect them from the influence of other groups within the larger movement.

²⁵Reuel Lemmons, "Christian Fellowship," in 1956 Abilene Christian College Bible Lectures (Austin, Texas: Firm Foundation Publishing House, 1956), pp. 342-358.

To some extent the ultra-conservative group within the Independent Christian Church--the group with its "headquarters" in Ottumwa, Iowa, falls into this category. The anti-Sunday School faction and the "one-cup" faction in the Church of Christ clearly fit this description. The anti-college, anti-local minister group used to fit this description. However, their present leader, Carl Ketcherside, has begun a "unity drive" in recent years. The group which he now leads is no longer content with the strategy of preservation. They now appear to be more interested in a kind of assimilation and are striving to reach a much wider audience than before.

The specific rhetorical strategies which Restoration Movement leaders have used to produce separation have been the same whether the over-all approach has been one of remnant preservation, imposed separation, separation following a period of infiltration and subversion, or just plain separation.

Specific Rhetorical Strategies Which Produce Separation

Change of Audience

Social Movement theorists generally agree that the beginning of a period of separation within a movement is marked by a change in the audience addressed by faction leaders. Earlier in the process of faction development, the faction leader spends most of his time addressing the movement as a whole. Most of his effort is invested in attempts to recruit more followers. The period of separation starts when the leaders stop talking to the movement at large and start talking primarily to their own faction members, telling them that they must withdraw themselves from the larger structure.²⁶

²⁶ Dawson and Gettys, pp. 715-716, 721-724.

The willingness of faction leaders to make this change in audiences and to call for the separation of their followers from the rest of the movement--or the willingness of majority leaders to call for the expulsion of a dissident minority--constitutes the sine qua non of separation. Without such a decision there is no division into separate groups.

An example of the change in audiences is seen in the Christian Standard before and after the separation of the Church of Christ. The Standard was created to manifest a progressive spirit and "withstand the tides of rigid primitivism."²⁷ Garrison and DeGroot have argued that "more than to any other journal and person it was to the Christian Standard and Isaac Errett that the Disciples were indebted for being saved from becoming a fissiparous sect of jangling legalists."²⁸ The service that the Standard performed was the contribution that the Standard made to the separation of the Church of Christ from the Christian Church. Until the 1890's, the big fight was between the anti-missionary society, anti-instrumental music Gospel Advocate on the Church of Christ side and the Christian Standard and Christian-Evangelist on the Christian Church side. But Tucker pointed out,

During the 1890's . . . the Christian-Evangelist began to ignore the rantings of the schismatics [Tucker's terminology for the Church of Christ]. After about 1897 it argued with the Christian Standard. Paradoxically, this absence of argument [between the Church of Christ and the Christian Church journals] indicated the lack of unity in the movement.²⁹

²⁷ William Tucker, J. H. Garrison and Disciples of Christ (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1964), p. 42.

²⁸ Winifred E. Garrison and A. T. DeGroot, The Disciples of Christ: A History (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1954), p. 20.

²⁹ Tucker, p. 200.

Isaac Errett stopped trying to persuade the anti-missionary society, anti-instrumental group. He addressed his remarks instead to his own followers and urged a shift in strategy.

Let the grumblers alone, and the do-nothings, and the arguifiers, and go to work. The demands are loud and earnest. . . . It does not require a high order of intellect to find fault and kindle suspicion and tear down what others are trying to build up. . . . It is a cheap, shoddy piety that spends itself in finding faults and breathing suspicions of the motives and conduct of others. . . . We beg our brethren in all states to turn a deaf ear to controversy and fault-finding, and make a bold strike for higher achievements in the coming year.³⁰

The conservative response to this call for separation is seen in T. R. Burnett's call for a similar separation by people in the Church of Christ.

Brethren, proceed to re-establish the ancient order of things, just as if there never was a Church of Christ in your town. Gather all the brethren together who love Bible order better than modern fads and foolishness, and start the work and worship of the church in the old apostolic way. Do not go to law over church property. It is better to suffer wrong than do wrong. Build a cheap and comfortable chapel, and improve it when you get able. It is better to have one dozen true disciples in a cheap house than a thousand apostate pretenders in a place who love modern innovations better than Bible truth.³¹

Tucker quoted a letter from J. H. Garrison to his son and in this letter are clear indications that the change in audiences also occurred in the Christian Standard's fight over Federation.

Yes, I think the federation discussion is about over with a few stray shots here and there. . . . No discussion among us has ever separated our people into two classes so distinctly--the intelligent leaders and better class of laymen on the one side and the demagogues and 2 x 4 preachers on the other.³²

³⁰ Christian Standard, (August 17, 1872), p. 260.

³¹ "Burnett's Budget," Gospel Advocate, (May 9, 1895).

³² Tucker, p. 174.

Insistence on Conformity

If movement and factions exist largely in the minds of people, as suggested earlier, then it must be true that movements divide when people decide for them to divide. The Restoration Movement has divided when movement leaders have decided to insist on conformity--at all costs. Issues which were previously regarded as "matters of opinion" have then become "matters of faith." Correctness of doctrine has thus become a "test of fellowship." Those who have refused to conform have been expelled and isolated from the rest of the movement.³³

Denial of Brotherhood

A rhetorical strategy heard in informal conversations of faction leaders much more than seen in print is the strategy of suggesting a denial of brotherhood with those who do not conform. In many religious debates in the history of the Restoration Movement, the opponents have started by calling each other "Brother," but before the debate was over, they were making a point of using "Mister" instead of "Brother."³⁴ If asked about their beliefs, these opponents might not actually deny their brotherhood, but the

33

Bill Carmack, "McCarthyism in the Church," Gospel Guardian, V, No. 37 (January 28, 1954), 589. For another discussion of non-conformists being expelled, see: "What Was Campus Evangelism?" Mission, October, 1970, pp. 14-23.

34

This is my own personal observation based on my experience in listening to Restoration Movement debates over the past twenty years. Most of these debates were never published. Those that were published were edited before publication and such references were removed. I have not found any examples of this strategy in any printed debates. However, no one who has listened to many debates in the recent history of the Restoration Movement can deny that this strategy is often employed.

suggestion of the denial is clear.³⁵

Summary

This chapter has considered the rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory that movement leaders must secure the adoption of their movement's ideology by the larger structure. This chapter has focused on the various ways in which faction leaders in the Restoration Movement have gone about securing the adoption of their faction's ideology--which in the Restoration Movement has meant to recruit members for the faction and thus separate a following from the rest of the Restoration Movement. Five possible approaches were considered. The strategy of modification used in at least one Restoration Movement controversy changed the whole movement without any faction formation. The strategy of infiltration and subversion used by several Restoration Movement leaders has delayed separation while the leaders built a power base and prepared for an eventual confrontation. Imposed separation is a response to the strategy of infiltration and subversion which has been employed by Restoration Movement leaders. The strategy of preservation, which some Restoration Movement faction leaders have used, makes no real effort to enlist new faction supporters, but simply seeks to separate and isolate existing supporters. Separation, whether it happens by itself or with one of these other approaches, has always been essential to the formation of a faction in the Restoration Movement.

The rhetorical strategies which have contributed to separation of factions in the Restoration Movement have been considered. Faction leaders

³⁵For examples of denial of brotherhood in disputes, see: Dudley Spears, "An Open Letter to Yater Tant," Gospel Guardian, XXI, No. 11 (July 17, 1969), 161-162; and William E. Wallace, "Wells of Fellowship Poisoned," Gospel Guardian, XXI, No. 26 (October 30, 1969), 406-407.

have stopped addressing the movement as a whole and have started addressing their own faction suggesting a separation. Faction leaders have insisted on conformity and have expelled those who refuse to conform. The implied denial of brotherhood has also contributed to the separation of Restoration Movement factions. These rhetorical strategies have fulfilled the rhetorical requirement of separation. When leaders have failed to fulfill the rhetorical requirement of separation, the process of faction development in these cases has proceeded no further.

CHAPTER FIVE

STRATEGIES FOR ISOLATION

Simons' theory of persuasion for social movements lists three rhetorical requirements for movement leadership. The last of these requirements is that leaders must react to resistance generated by the larger structure.¹ This requirement corresponds to the period in movement development that Dawson and Gettys called the "institutional stage." In their discussion of the development of the Methodist Church as a faction within the Church of England, Dawson and Gettys said that in this period after a larger movement has been polarized and a faction clearly identified and separated from the larger structure, the primary leadership task is for the faction leader to maintain the isolation of his faction.²

There are, of course, many kinds of social movements and many kinds of "larger structures" within which these movements operate. Simons' main concern is with Civil Rights and Anti-Vietnam War protest movements. He mentioned several strategies that the "established order" might use to resist such protest movements.³ His discussion of the counter-strategies which

¹Herbert W. Simons, "Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56 (February, 1970), 4.

²Carl A. Dawson and Warner E. Gettys, An Introduction to Sociology (Revised Edition; New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1935), p. 725.

³Simons, 6.

protest movements might use in reaction to this resistance is not especially relevant to the present study of faction leadership in the Restoration Movement. Yet his requirement that leaders must react to resistance generated by the larger structure is applicable to this study.

The larger structure within which factions develop is the movement divided by the factions. By the definition used in this study, a movement does not have factions unless and until that movement has been divided into two or more isolated groups.⁴ The "resistance generated by the larger structure" to which faction leaders in the Restoration Movement have had to react has been opposition from other factions within the movement.

The concern in the present study is with an unstructured movement--the Restoration Movement. Resistance to a faction in a more structured movement might take the form of legal action, political deals, or a power struggle for control of organizational machinery. Such a pattern of opposition is not applicable in the case of an unstructured movement such as the Restoration Movement. Membership in Restoration Movement factions is defined in terms of shared beliefs. Resistance to Restoration Movement factions has taken the form of efforts by other factions to change people's beliefs. Restoration Movement faction leaders have had to protect their following from such efforts. They have had to be on guard against defections from within.

The isolation of a faction is both a rhetorical requirement and the culmination of a process--the process of faction development. One may speak of "potential factions" or "developing factions" as having "existence" before a movement is actually divided into isolated groups. However, the definition

⁴
P. 4.

of factions used in the present study requires that a movement be divided into isolated groups before these groups can properly be regarded as fully developed factions.⁵ In the typology of Dawson and Gettys, there are four stages of faction development: the stage of unrest, the popular stage, the organizational stage, and the institutional stage. Polarization, identification, separation, and isolation are the rhetorical requirements in the various stages.⁶ Thus, according to Dawson and Gettys, for leaders to build a faction, they must polarize the thinking of the movement, provide a sense of group identity for their followers, separate their followers from the rest of the movement, and then keep them isolated from other factions in the movement.

The idea that isolation is a rhetorical requirement for faction leadership is not a discovery of the present study. Isolation is simply the way that Simons' third rhetorical requirement is fulfilled in the case of factions. Leaders of factions react to resistance from other factions in the movement by isolating their own faction. As the terms are used in the present study, isolation is not a rhetorical strategy. Isolation is a result to be achieved by rhetorical strategies. Isolation is a rhetorical requirement.

The purposes of this chapter are to identify the rhetorical strategies, both verbal and non-verbal, which have been used in the Restoration Movement and which have contributed to faction isolation, and to show how these rhetorical strategies have worked in the history of the Restoration Movement.

5

Ibid.

6

Dawson and Gettys, pp. 710-725.

Justifying the Division

One of the peculiar rhetorical problems facing faction leaders in the Restoration Movement has been the problem of justifying the division which has taken place. Justifying division in a movement that started as a unity movement has always been difficult.

Dawson and Gettys outlined the rhetorical problems faced by Methodist leaders as they separated from the Church of England. First the Methodist leaders faced the problem of polarizing the thinking of the Church of England. At this point, the Methodist leaders addressed a general audience seeking to change people's beliefs. Next they addressed only their followers and urged them to separate from the Church of England. Finally they reached the stage in which the Methodist leaders did not even talk to their followers very much about the original issues around which the Methodist faction was built. They discussed the old issues only to indoctrinate a new generation. And in that discussion there was no dialogue, only monologue.⁷ This changing pattern of communication noted by Dawson and Gettys in the Methodist's separation from the Church of England has been repeated in the separation of various factions within the Restoration Movement.

J. H. Garrison noted the changing rhetorical problems faced by Restoration Movement leaders. In 1895 he wrote that the society and organ questions "are no longer living questions among us. The man who discusses them today discusses dead issues. . . . We have passed beyond them and are

⁷Dawson and Gettys, pp. 708-726. See also: Wellman J. Warner, The Wesleyan Movement in the Industrial Revolution (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1930).

confronting vastly more important questions."⁸ The missionary society and instrumental music questions had been major issues, but with the separation and isolation of the Church of Christ and the Christian Church, the issues were no longer given prominence in either group.

When the missionary society and instrumental music issues were no longer debated seriously, another issue arose to take its place: the question of how the division could be justified. By this time the original issues had become "dead issues" as J. H. Garrison suggested.⁹ Virtually all that could be said on the issues had already been said. Because of this satiation in regard to the old arguments, the isolated factions were less vulnerable to a direct assault on the old issues. They were, however, more vulnerable to an attack through the kind of argument which condemned them for having divided the Restoration Movement over such issues. This pattern of changing the point of attack has been typical throughout the history of faction development in the Restoration Movement.

Blame-Fixing

When factions are attacked with the charge of responsibility for having divided the movement, one possible response is for the faction leaders to fix the blame for the division on the opposition. Blame-fixing is a rhetorical strategy which fulfills Simons' third requirement: that leaders must react to resistance generated by the larger structure.

In the strategy of blame-fixing, the issue is not simply who was right and who was wrong, but rather who was responsible for the division.

⁸"The Transient and the Permanent Elements in the Campbell Reformation," The New Christian Quarterly, July, 1895, p. 76.

⁹Ibid.

In the Restoration Movement, blame-fixing arguments have been typical of the period of faction isolation, but they have also been made earlier in the process of faction development in anticipation of an expected division.

The classic examples of blame-fixing in retrospect are Stephen J. Corey's book, Fifty Years of Attack and Controversy¹⁰ and Edwin V. Hayden's reply, Fifty Years of Digression and Disturbance.¹¹ Corey placed the blame for the Independent-Disciples split on the Independents in general and the Christian Standard in particular. Hayden's view was that the responsibility for the split rested entirely with the liberal "innovators" who introduced open membership, liberal theology, and restructure into the Christian Church.

In the earlier split between the Church of Christ and the Christian Church, the pro-missionary society, pro-instrumental music group blamed the split on the legalism of the "anti" group. The anti-instrumental music, anti-missionary society group was just as quick to blame the split on the ones who introduced these things over which the division occurred. As an example of the blame-fixing strategy employed by some leaders of the Church of Christ, consider the following quotation from A. M. Morris' book Differences Between the Church of Christ and the Christian Church.

We were once at peace. The Church was moving outward and onward with the irresistible power of a conqueror. Today there is scarcely a town, city, or neighborhood, in which there is peace. Families are torn asunder, neighbors and brethren are alienated. And the end is not yet. Some one is responsible for this great gulf stream of sorrow that has almost inundated the whole Church. Who is it? The innovators say the writer and those with whom he stands and the churches are warned not to receive such preachers into their pulpits. I answer them and will prove . . .

10

(Des Moines: Committee on Publication of the Corey Manuscript, 1953).

11

(Joplin, Mo.: Hunter Printing Company, n.d.).

that we have not troubled Israel, but thou and thy father's house in that ye have forsaken the commandments of God and have turned unto Babylon.¹²

Who is troubling Israel? Is it those who plead for a "thus saith the Lord?" Is it those who occupy the original ground of unity? Why this trouble? Why can we not live in peace and grow as did those whose lofty purposes and united efforts gave us the Book of God, in the early part of this century, free from ecclesiastical plunder and emancipated from clerical usurpation?¹³

We had peace when we had no organs, pianos, violins, or horns in our worship. The Salvation Army beat a drum and a tambourine in their worship and this is regarded with contempt by nearly every professed Christian. It is just as scriptural as the instrumental music in the Christian Church.¹⁴

In the above mentioned division, leaders of the Church of Christ blamed the "innovators" for the division, but in some splits those same leaders have been the "innovators" and have then placed the blame for the division on the "antis." The Church of Christ was on the receiving end of the strategy of blame-fixing in the debate between G. K. Wallace and Carl Ketcherside. Concerning the division between the anti-college, anti-local minister faction and the rest of the Church of Christ, Ketcherside said,

Now I am sorry that this division exists. I'm always sorry for that. Of course we get the blame for it. It is just like the old Christian Church argument. But there never would have been anyone who was anti-missionary society if no one had ever started a missionary society. There never would have been an anti-college man if no one had ever started a Bible college. There never would have been an anti-salaried pastor system man if no one had ever put in a salaried pastor system. My brethren, I tell you that you are the ones who introduce these things and split the church of the living God wide open. You are the ones who stand convicted and condemned in heaven's sight, tonight, because you've introduced something that was not in existence at the beginning.¹⁵

¹²(n.p., by the author, [c. 1875]), p. 6.

¹³Ibid., p. 14. ¹⁴Ibid., p. 16.

¹⁵G. K. Wallace and W. Carl Ketcherside, Wallace-Ketcherside Debate (Longview, Washington: A. G. Hobbes, 1953), p. 114.

The strategy of blame-fixing, of course, leads back to a re-hash of the old arguments. Who is "really" to blame for a division depends on who was "right" in the original dispute. The only point made here is that in the isolation stage of faction development, when the old issues are argued again the main point is not just who was right and who was wrong, but who was responsible for the division.

A strategy of blame-fixing fulfills the last rhetorical requirement of Simons' theory. When the larger structure blames the faction for the division of the Restoration Movement, the faction reacts by fixing the blame on the other side.

Re-Definition of the Issue

After the split over instrumental music in worship, the leaders of the Church of Christ frequently used the argument mentioned earlier that if the people in the Christian Church had just left out the instrumental music there would have been no division. This argument was made somewhat more effective by the fact that the people in the Christian Church, for the most part, saw instrumental music as optional. They regarded it as a matter of opinion, not a matter of faith. Although they saw nothing wrong with using instrumental music in worship, they did not insist that it had to be used for the worship to be acceptable to God. This put them into the difficult position of having divided the movement over something which they admitted to be non-essential. J. B. Briney, one of the best known debaters on the pro-instrumental music side, later answered this charge by re-defining the issue. He said that the question was not really instrumental music in worship but Christian liberty. The following quotation clearly illustrates the strategy of re-defining the issue.

We beg leave to say that we do not "defend the use of instrumental music in the worship of the Lord," for when considered in itself, we do not deem it of sufficient importance to call for defense from us. When thus viewed we do not care a rap about it, except from the standpoint of propriety and expediency, and life is too short and other things too important for us to spend time in either defending or opposing instrumental music in worship.

But we do defend the right of brethren to use instrumental music if they desire to do so, and we do this on the ground that we are not willing to see a yoke of bondage made up of human opinion, thrust upon the necks of those whom Christ has made free. At great cost our fathers threw off the yoke of opinionism, and we are unwilling for their children to be driven back into that land of bondage.¹⁶

Issues have been re-defined in several splits. Thus the fight against orphans homes and cooperation later became a fight for congregational autonomy and a struggle against modernism and the social gospel. The one-cup position became a preservation of the unity and meaning of the Lord's Supper. The defense of Bible classes became an effort to protect the Church from the influence of those who teach their opinions as though they were matters of faith.

Re-Definition of Division

In the history of the Restoration Movement, one way that leaders have responded to the charge of responsibility for division has been to re-define division so as to deny that any real division has occurred. That such a strategy could work in a movement so obviously divided is difficult to believe. Yet some leaders have used this strategy well enough to convince some of their followers--which illustrates the point made by Keniston,

Movement groups . . . tend to develop strong barriers on their outside boundaries, which impede communication and movement outside the group; they frequently exhibit an "anti-empirical" inability to use facts in

16

"Christian Liberty," Briney's Monthly, New Series, I, No. 8 (November, 1907), 460.

order to counter emotion-based distortions and impressions: 17
interaction within the group often has a quality of surreality.

In the Independent-Disciples split, George P. Rutledge responded to the charge that the Independents were dividing the brotherhood. His response clearly illustrates the strategy of re-defining division.

Should there be such a thing as a cleavage in the Brotherhood, it would, of course, look quite serious at first. However, when adjusted by time, the situation would doubtless be viewed as a sloughing off rather than a split. Clipping off a piece of bark is not splitting the tree; knocking a plank or two from the side of a house is not splitting the house. It is our conviction that a permanent split of serious proportions in our Brotherhood would be impossible.¹⁸

The strategy of re-defining division uses (or abuses) the language of I John 2:19, "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they all are not of us." By re-defining "us," or "the brotherhood," or "the movement," or "the Church," faction leaders have responded to the charge of having divided the Restoration Movement. Their answer has been that their faction is the movement and the other factions were not really a part of the movement to begin with. Re-definition of division is one of the rhetorical strategies which fulfills Simons' last rhetorical requirement--that leaders must react to resistance generated by the larger structure.

Closing the Lines of Communication

In addition to the rhetorical strategies which justify the division

¹⁷ Kenneth Keniston, Young Radicals: Notes on Committed Youth (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1968), p. 159.

¹⁸ "That 'Split' In The Brotherhood," Christian Standard, LIII, No. 52 (September 28, 1918), 1553.

there are rhetorical strategies which maintain the division. The rhetorical requirement of isolation has been fulfilled in the Restoration Movement primarily by closing the lines of communication.

As noted earlier, the shift from the period of separation to the period of isolation can be seen in the changed patterns of communication. The factions stop talking to each other and start talking to themselves. Also, the factions stop talking about each other and start talking about themselves.¹⁹ Garrison and DeGroot talked about this changed pattern of communication in their discussion of the Restoration Movement split over the missionary society and instrumental music in worship. "The farther the two wings drifted apart, the less acrimonious their relations became, because their relations were actually too slight for either party to be within the range of the other's criticism."²⁰ Tucker was talking about the same change in patterns of communication when the pro-missionary society, pro-instrumental music Christian Standard and Christian-Evangelist stopped fighting the anti-missionary society, anti-instrumental music Gospel Advocate and started fighting each other. It was in this context that Tucker made the remark noted in chapter four, "paradoxically, this absence of debate [between the Church of Christ and the Christian Church journals] indicated the lack of unity in the movement."²¹ By this time (1897) the Church of

¹⁹

Dawson and Gettys, pp. 725-726. See also: Warner, p. 73.

²⁰

Winifred E. Garrison and A. T. DeGroot, The Disciples of Christ: A History (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1954), p. 405.

²¹

William Tucker, J. H. Garrison and Disciples of Christ (St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1964), p. 200.

Christ and the Christian Church had become thoroughly isolated from each other although it was 1906 before the federal census officially recognized this isolation.

In the history of the Restoration Movement there have been several ways in which individuals have kept informed about what is going on in the movement: reading the major religious periodicals; attending the large gatherings such as conventions or lectureships; reading books by movement leaders--particularly books on "brotherhood issues;" reading minor publications such as local church bulletins or tracts on the internal issues of the day; attending special services, revivals, and such like at other congregations; and cultivating personal friendships with members or leaders of other congregations. These methods of keeping informed about what is going on in the movement are the lines of communication which have been important in the history of the Restoration Movement.

Lines of communication are not kept open by accident. Effort is required to maintain communication. All that is required, therefore, to close the lines of communication is to neglect the effort.²² When factions have developed within the Restoration Movement, people in one faction have no longer cultivated personal friendships with people in the other factions. They have stopped attending one another's meetings. Each developing faction has stopped reading the publications of the other. They have stopped attending the same conventions or lectureships. Thus the developing factions have become totally isolated.

22

Bernard Murchland, The Age of Alienation (New York: Random House, 1971), pp. 129-133. See also: Dawson and Gettys, pp. 251-260.

In an unstructured movement such as the Restoration Movement where leaders have little control over followers, personal neglect on the part of the leaders has not been enough to close the lines of communication. The leaders, therefore, have encouraged a pattern of neglect. Positive steps have been taken to persuade individual faction members to close their own personal lines of communication with other factions.

Separate Institutions

Having separate national conventions or lectureships, periodicals, schools, mission and benevolent works, not only contributes to faction identification and separation, as pointed out earlier; the presence of such separate institutions also tends to isolate factions and to keep them isolated. Webb pointed out that the North American Christian Convention served as a unifying force for the Independents. He admitted, however, that the fact that the Independents attended the North American Christian Convention while the Disciples attended the International Convention of the Christian Church tended to isolate these two groups and keep them isolated. He said, "the very fact of having two national gatherings is divisive by nature."²³

DeGroot suggested that the Independents went beyond setting up a separate convention. He said concerning the Independents,

[They set up] agencies to compete with those organizations that were doing the general work of the churches and reporting to them through the International Convention. . . . The object was to create a whole new fabric of agencies which would serve the "loyal" churches--those

loyal to the Christian Standard and its interpretation of New Testament Christianity.²⁴

When the Christian Standard called for the replacement of such "unfaithful" agencies as the United Christian Missionary Society and the Christian Board of Publications, Stephen J. Corey, in an editorial entitled, "This Is Divisive," said, "This is a blueprint for separation for the brotherhood of the Disciples of Christ."²⁵ Creating separate institutions for various Restoration Movement factions has fulfilled the rhetorical requirement of separation. Maintaining those separate institutions has fulfilled the rhetorical requirement of isolation.

Punishment

One way of keeping lines of communication closed is to punish the members of a faction who do not respect the rules of isolation. Evidence from the history of the Restoration Movement demonstrates that this technique has been used to keep lines of communication closed. This is in keeping with the comment by Keniston, "Movement groups . . . tend to develop strong barriers on their outside boundaries, which impede communication and movement outside the group."²⁶

Concerning the isolation following the Independent-Disciples split, Fife commented that those "who in truth did not wholly 'belong' in either of these groups, and who consequently sought fellowship 'across the lines' [became] objects of suspicion and even contempt."²⁷ The same kind of enforced

²⁵ Corey, P. 185.

²⁶ Kenniston, p. 159.

²⁷ Robert O. Fife, "Christian Unity as Reception and Attainment," in Disciples of Christ and the Church Universal (Nashville, Tennessee: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1966), p. 16.

isolation took place in the division over premillennialism in the Church of Christ. Harding College lost support because of J. N. Armstrong's refusal to close the lines of communication with his premillennial brethren. Pressure on Abilene Christian College forced the resignation of George A. Klingman as head of the Bible Department. The pressure on Klingman came because of his refusal to close the lines of communication with the premillennial group. The effort of Klingman and others to keep the lines of communication open were misinterpreted by Dean Walker as evidence that the Restoration Movement was not really divided. In his book, Adventuring for Christian Unity, Walker denied the reality of the division and talked about the signs of a larger fellowship developing. "Such men as Sommers [sic, Walker here obviously refers to Daniel Sommer] himself in his later days, and as George Klingman, are leading the way to a reintegration of the old fellowship."²⁸ The pressure on Klingman and others clearly indicates that Walker was wrong. The movement was thoroughly divided into isolated groups and leaders in the Church of Christ intended to preserve that isolation.

The case of Charles Klingman, brother of George Klingman, furnishes a more vivid illustration of pressure applied to keep lines of communication closed. Charles Klingman was serving as minister of the Garrett Avenue Church of Christ in Dallas, Texas. He preached in a special lectureship at the Ross Avenue Christian Church explaining the position of the anti-missionary society, anti-instrumental music Church of Christ. Another preacher of the Church of Christ in Dallas sent this telegram which appeared in the next issue of the Firm Foundation, "THE FOOL C. C. KLINGMAN HAS GONE DIGRESSIVE AND IS PREACHING FOR THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH." The pressure applied on

²⁸(Birmingham: The Berean Press, 1935), p. 48.

Klingman as a result of his breaking the rules of isolation eventually forced him out of the Church of Christ and he has spent the rest of his life preaching in the Christian Church.²⁹

Another example of pressure applied to keep lines of communication between factions closed emerged in the Wallace-Ketcherside debate. The Beech Grove Church of Christ had been allowing Carl Ketcherside to preach for them once a month. Ketcherside was then leading the anti-college, anti-local minister faction which Daniel Sommer started. When the Beech Grove congregation failed to follow the traditional pattern of isolating the Sommer-Ketcherside faction, leaders of the Church of Christ in the area began to isolate the Beech Grove congregation. Concerning this isolation, Ketcherside said,

Not long ago Brother McNutt [local minister for the Church of Christ in Paragould, Arkansas, site of the debate] wrote an article and circulated it throughout this whole territory to the effect that no faithful preacher would preach at Beech Grove as long as they permitted me to preach there.³⁰

Ketcherside then argued that McNutt's policy of isolating the Beech Grove congregation should not be accepted. He pointed out that not all the ministers of the Church of Christ had accepted it. Ketcherside said, "Brother Emmett Smith has preached at Beech Grove and he is not a 'Ketcherside preacher' he is a 'college-man.'"³¹

When Wallace answered Ketcherside's speech, he did not refer directly

²⁹ Charles C. Klingman, private interview held at his home in Commanche, Texas, February, 1971.

³⁰ G. K. Wallace and W. Carl Ketcherside, Wallace-Ketcherside Debate (Longview, Washington: Telegram Book Company, 1952), p. 46

³¹ Ibid., p. 47

to McNutt's policy of isolating the Beech Grove congregation, but he did offer this comment on Emmett Smith,

[Ketcherside] referred to brother Smith and himself working together out at Beech Grove. I don't know which one has apostatized. I don't know whether brother Ketcherside has become a "college-ite" or brother Smith has become a "Sommerite." I'll let them figure it out. I heard something about a city woman going out on a farm and she looked out and saw a bunch of geese and she said to the farmer, "How can you tell which is the goose and which is the gander?" He said, "I just put them out there and let them figure it out." I just thought I'd let Ketcherside and Smith figure this out. I don't know which one has apostatized. But he [Ketcherside] is doing the very thing for which he [Smith] disfellowshipped Daniel Sommer and his group.³²

Simons' last rhetorical requirement is that leaders react to the resistance generated by the larger structure. The specific rhetorical requirement for faction leaders at this point--as clarified by the Dawson and Gettys study which Simons used--is that faction leaders must maintain the isolation of their faction. This rhetorical requirement of isolation has been fulfilled in the Restoration Movement as lines of communication between factions have been broken by neglect and by positive efforts to establish separate conventions, periodicals, institutions, and such like, for the separate factions. The isolation of factions in the Restoration Movement has been preserved by punishing those who do not respect the rules of isolation.

Language As an Insulator Rather Than a Transmitter

George Owen said, "When cliches and slogans are no longer transmitters but insulators, it is time they are abandoned."³³ In talking about the

³²Ibid., pp. 60-61.

³³"The Quest for Unity among the Disciples of Christ," Lecture delivered at the Missouri Christian Ministers Institute, February 19-21, 1963. Lecture III, p. 11. Manuscript in Disciples of Christ Historical Society Library, Nashville, Tennessee.

divisions of the Restoration Movement, Owen suggested that language used as an insulator has served the rhetorical purpose of keeping factions isolated. Thus when a person talks about "living-link churches," rather than "sponsoring congregations," in the support of missionaries--insiders in the Church of Christ at once recognize him as coming from the Independent Christian Church background rather than from the Church of Christ. One who talks about "full-time ministers," "located evangelists," or "local ministers," would be recognized as an outsider by the anti-local minister group. They prefer the term "salaried pastor." If a person talked about "Revivals" instead of "Gospel Meetings," if he talked about "joining the church" instead of "obeying the gospel," if he called a preacher "Pastor" or "Reverend," he would be recognized as an outsider by people in the Church of Christ.

In a lecture delivered at the "Unity Forum" in July, 1966, at Bethany, West Virginia, commemorating the centennial of Alexander Campbell's death, David Stewart was talking about the negative reaction in the Church of Christ to the term "Campbellite." The use of that term is one way insiders can recognize outsiders. In this connection, Stewart related the following incident,

Pat Harrell, editor and publisher of Kerygma, a journal for preachers, told me about the reactions to an article by Hubert C. Locke, "The Church Fathers and the Campbellites," which appeared in the first issue of his journal. He received numerous letters of reprimand for the choice of the title, even though Mr. Locke meant by it only to include all branches of the Campbell restoration. It seems as though not even an "insider" can use the term "Campbellite" in a merely descriptive sense without incurring the wrath of some brethren.³⁴

Cliches and slogans soon loose their power to transmit much denotative meaning, but they can still transmit some connotative meaning. In the history

³⁴"Alexander Campbell and the Churches of Christ," Restoration Quarterly, IX, No. 3 (1966), 134.

of the Restoration Movement cliches and slogans have served to identify the insiders and the outsiders and at least indirectly help to keep the outsiders out and the insiders in. Faction jargon, cliches, and shibboleths are examples of language used as an insulator rather than as a transmitter. Such use of language has helped fulfill the rhetorical requirement of isolation.

Summary

This chapter has applied Simons' last rhetorical requirement to the study of the Restoration Movement. This requirement is that leaders must react to resistance generated by the larger structure. The Dawson and Gettys study used by Simons makes the rhetorical requirement more specific in the case of faction leadership. Faction leaders must react to the resistance of the other factions by isolating their faction from the rest of the movement. The history of the Restoration Movement reveals several rhetorical strategies which have fulfilled the last requirement of Simons' theory.

In the history of the Restoration Movement, the primary attack on isolated factions has been the charge of responsibility for division. Faction leaders have reacted to this kind of attack by using a strategy of blame-fixing which charges the opposition with responsibility for the division. Faction leaders blamed for the division have also used the rhetorical strategy of re-defining the issue or the strategy of re-defining division. All of these rhetorical strategies fulfill the last requirement of Simons' theory--that leaders must react to resistance generated by the larger structure.

In the history of the Restoration Movement factions, the pattern of communication has been modified in such a way that lines of communication have been closed. The establishment of separate institutions for each faction has isolated the factions of the Restoration Movement. Punishing individuals

who have not respected the rules of faction isolation has also helped to keep factions isolated.

Faction leaders have also used jargon, cliches, and slogans peculiar to their faction--language as an insulator rather than a transmitter--as a means of preserving the isolation of their faction. All of these rhetorical strategies fulfill Simons' last rhetorical requirement by isolating the faction from the rest of the Restoration Movement.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

The following statement of the thesis in the present study was given in chapter one: "The Restoration Movement has divided over particular issues when the leadership has employed rhetorical strategies which have fulfilled the conditions described in Herbert W. Simons' theory of persuasion for social movements."¹ The rhetorical requirements for social movement leadership listed in Simons' theory are that the leaders must: attract, maintain, and mold their followers into an efficiently organized unit; secure the adoption by the larger structure of the movement's ideology; and react to resistance generated by the larger structure.² The present study has involved the application of Simons' theory to the specific case of faction development in the Restoration Movement. In this study, a faction has been considered as a specific kind of movement--a movement within a larger movement. The "larger structure" which Simons talked about has been viewed in this study as the larger movement--the Restoration Movement within which the factions have developed.

The application of Simons' theoretical framework to the study of factions calls for the expression of the general rhetorical requirements

¹"Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56 (February, 1970), 1-11.

²Ibid., 3-4.

of Simons' theory in terms more specifically applicable to factions. Simons used, as a foundation for his own work, the Dawson and Gettys study of the Methodist Church developing as a faction within the Church of England. The typology of movement stages in Simons' theory was taken directly from Dawson and Gettys. The specific rhetorical requirements for faction leadership were expressed by Dawson and Gettys in terminology especially relevant to the present study. Therefore, the rhetorical requirements of Simons' theory have been adapted for use in this present study by the use of the more relevant terminology of Dawson and Gettys.³ Thus adapted, the rhetorical requirements for faction leadership are that faction leaders must: attract followers by polarizing the thinking of the movement; maintain and mold their followers into an efficiently organized unit by providing a sense of group-identification for their followers; secure the adoption of their ideology in such a way that followers are not only recruited, but also separated from the rest of the movement; and react to resistance from other factions by isolating their followers from the rest of the movement. These specific rhetorical requirements for faction leadership have been treated in this study as the requirements of polarization, identification, separation, and isolation. These specific rhetorical requirements for faction leadership are not discoveries of this study, but simply an application of Simons' theory to the specific case of faction development. In particular, the requirements of polarization, identification, separation, and isolation have been applied to the study of faction development in the Restoration Movement.

³Carl A. Dawson and Warner E. Gettys, An Introduction to Sociology (Revised Edition; New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1935), pp. 708-726.

The purposes of this final chapter are: to reach a conclusion about the establishment of the thesis; to evaluate Simons' theory, its applicability to the study of faction development, and its contribution to the understanding of the Restoration Movement; and, finally, to offer some suggestions for additional research.

Establishment of the Thesis

Has the Restoration Movement divided over particular issues when the leadership has employed rhetorical strategies which have fulfilled the conditions described in Simons' theory of persuasion for social movements? The first rhetorical requirement for faction leadership considered in this study was the requirement of polarization. In chapter two, the assimilation-contrast effect was used to show how polarization results from increased ego-involvement. In the history of the Restoration Movement, as was demonstrated in chapter two, leaders who have succeeded in forming a faction have used rhetorical strategies which have increased ego-involvement. Specific ego-involving rhetorical strategies used by Restoration Movement faction leaders include: personal attack, with name-calling, ridicule, and misrepresentation being specific forms of personal attack; attack on personal consistency; guilt-by-association; appeal to the Pioneers; projection (the "dangerous trend" argument); and the relation of unrelated issues such as sectional prejudice, socio-economic factors, appeal to different personality types, and concern for different audiences. Chapter two cited examples of these rhetorical strategies as used by leaders of factions in every branch of the Restoration Movement. No faction in the history of the Restoration Movement has developed without the use of such ego-involving rhetorical strategies as those discussed in chapter two.

Chapter two also considered the role of three non-verbal elements which, in the history of the Restoration Movement, have been essential for fulfilling the rhetorical requirement of polarization. The nature of the issue has been one of the most important factors. Extreme positions contribute more to ego-involvement than do moderate positions. In the Restoration Movement, factions have been built around extreme positions much more than moderate positions. Popular positions have contributed more to faction development than unpopular positions. Issues which involve corporate action have been inherently more divisive than issues which involve personal beliefs. Simple pro or con issues have been more divisive than complicated, many-sided issues.

In the case of many of the issues on which the Restoration Movement has experienced diversity without division, the failure of a faction to develop around the issue has resulted more from the nature of the issue than any other single factor. Lipscomb's unusual position on civil government and the conscientious objector position have both been so unpopular that they never attracted enough of a following to polarize the movement. The failure of factions to develop around the issue of marriage, divorce, and re-marriage, or around the issue of the eldership, their tenure and their authority, can be attributed to the fact that these are complex, many-sided issues rather than simple pro and con issues.

Chapter two also considered the leadership role in polarization. The prestige of the leaders and the emergence of opponents were suggested as two main factors concerning leadership. The assimilation effect works for prestigious leaders so that people with similar views perceive him as being closer to their own position than he really is. Thus leaders with high prestige are able to draw together a following. Then when opposition

leaders emerge, the contrast effect causes the first leader's followers to perceive the opposition leader's position as being more divergent from their own position than it actually is. Leadership prestige and the role of opponents are, therefore, both important factors in fulfilling the rhetorical requirement of polarization.

Some of the issues on which the Restoration Movement has experienced diversity without division have involved a failure to fulfill the requirement of polarization because of a failure to meet one of these two conditions regarding the leadership role. A part of the reason that no faction has developed in the controversy in the Church of Christ regarding marriage, divorce, and re-marriage has been that no leader of really high prestige has arisen to represent any view that differs from the traditionally accepted view in the Church of Christ. No leaders have emerged as opponents on this issue--at least none with high enough prestige to attract a factional following. J. W. McGarvey failed to attract a factional following because he was not seen in the role of opponent. His anti-instrumental music, pro-missionary society position found few followers. His high personal prestige caused the people on both sides of the argument to identify with him because of their shared beliefs and to ignore him in regard to the beliefs that they did not share with McGarvey. McGarvey failed to fulfill the rhetorical requirement of polarization and thus he failed to form a faction.

Chapter two also considered the role of communication channels in polarization. The availability of some platform for addressing the whole Restoration Movement was found to be the most important factor concerning communication channels and their role in polarization. Another point noted was that the debate format as a channel of communication is most effective in producing polarization.

Some of the issues which have failed to divide the Restoration Movement have been issues which brethren simply refused to debate. Before the Civil War there was a debate on the slavery issue, but there has been no debate of any importance on the segregation v. integration issue and that issue has not resulted in any polarization. On the eldership questions--another set of issues on which there has been diversity but no division--there have been no debates. No leaders have emerged as opponents on the eldership issues.

The issues which have divided the Restoration Movement into factions have been those issues which were inherently divisive--simple pro or con issues, generally issues which have involved corporate action rather than personal belief. The divisive issues have tended to have a good bit of popular appeal. The most divisive issues have been the issues involving extreme positions. In the cases of division into factions, prestigious leaders have emerged as opponents. The potential faction leaders have had access to some platform from which they could address the whole brotherhood and the debate format has been characteristic. These non-verbal elements have helped to fulfill the rhetorical requirement of polarization along with the ego-involving rhetorical strategies mentioned earlier.

The first part of the thesis has been confirmed. The Restoration Movement has divided over particular issues when the leadership has employed rhetorical strategies which have fulfilled the rhetorical requirement of polarization--the first of the rhetorical requirements described in Simons' theory of persuasion for social movements. When for some reason the leadership has failed to fulfill the rhetorical requirement of polarization, no faction has been developed.

The second rhetorical requirement considered in this study was the requirement of identification. Chapter three considered several rhetorical strategies which have been used by Restoration Movement faction leaders which have provided a sense of group-identification for their factions. Emphasizing points of difference and minimizing points of agreement are two of these strategies. Exaggerating the importance of the issue is another rhetorical strategy often used in the history of the Restoration Movement. This exaggeration has been accomplished through the claims of faction leaders and through "hobby-riding," which is the use of a disproportionate amount of time in the discussion of an issue. The use of "we-they" language, labels, and slogans have also been involved as rhetorical strategies which have produced a sense of group identification for Restoration Movement factions.

Chapter three also considered the role of three non-verbal elements of identification. The nature of issues has been involved as a factor in the identification of Restoration Movement factions. People in the Restoration Movement have found it easier to identify with some issues than with others. The fact that no group in the movement has ever wanted to be known as the "pro-war" or "pro-divorce" faction helps account for the failure of such factions to emerge. People in the Restoration Movement have not agreed on these issues, but no group-identification has occurred along these lines. The role of leadership prestige, as noted in chapter three, has been that when a Restoration Movement leader has become identified with some issue and the people have been able to identify with that leader, then the people have tended to become identified with the issue. The role of communication channels, as noted in chapter three, has been that separate channels of communication (periodicals, conventions, lectureships, etc.) have tended to identify separate factions.

In the history of the Restoration Movement, factions have not developed over controversial issues when: the nature of the issue was too complicated or was otherwise unsuitable for simple group identification; no leader with high prestige emerged who was identified in the minds of the people with that issue; or no periodical emerged which was identified with that issue. But the most important factor in regard to identification has been that no factions have developed when the leaders have failed to use rhetorical strategies which produce a sense of group-identification. Thus the second part of the thesis has been confirmed. The Restoration Movement has divided over particular issues when the leadership has employed rhetorical strategies which have fulfilled the rhetorical requirement of identification.

The third rhetorical requirement for faction leadership considered in this study was the requirement of separation. Chapter four discussed the ways in which separation can be avoided through a strategy of modification, delayed through a strategy of infiltration and subversion, hastened through a strategy of imposed separation, or minimized in effect through a strategy of preservation. But, as was demonstrated in chapter four, factions do not develop unless and until leaders employ the rhetorical strategies which fulfill the rhetorical requirement of separation. In the history of the Restoration Movement, separation has come about when faction leaders have stopped addressing the movement at large and started addressing their own followers calling for the separation. The willingness of faction leaders to have a separation has been the most important single factor in determining whether or not the Restoration Movement will divide over a given issue. The insistence on conformity has been the key rhetorical strategy in producing divisions in the Restoration Movement.

A rhetorical strategy of implying a denial of brotherhood with those outside the faction has been a part of many separations in the Restoration Movement.

The third part of the thesis has been confirmed. The Restoration Movement has divided over particular issues when the leadership has employed rhetorical strategies which have fulfilled the rhetorical requirement of separation.

The last rhetorical requirement for faction leadership considered in the present study was the requirement of isolation. In the history of the Restoration Movement, once factions have separated, the primary line of attack has been the charge of responsibility for having divided the Restoration Movement. Faction leaders have reacted to this kind of attack by using three rhetorical strategies: the strategy of blame-fixing in which the opposition is charged with the responsibility for the division; the strategy of re-defining the issues to justify the division; and the strategy of re-defining division so as to deny the reality of the division that has taken place. The isolation of Restoration Movement factions has been preserved by closing the lines of communication between the faction and the rest of the movement. Lines of communication have been closed by a strategy of studied neglect, but even more by the creation of competing institutions (periodicals, conventions, lectureships, etc.) and by a strategy of punishment for those who do not respect the unwritten laws of isolation. The isolation of Restoration Movement factions has also been preserved through the use of "language as an insulator rather than a transmitter"--peculiar jargon, cliches, slogans, and shibboleths which identify the "insiders" and the "outsiders."

Faction leaders in the Restoration Movement have used rhetorical strategies which have served to maintain the isolation of their factions.

Thus the entire thesis has been confirmed. The Restoration Movement has divided when the leadership has employed rhetorical strategies which have fulfilled the rhetorical requirements of polarization, identification, separation, and isolation. In every case in which a controversial issue in the Restoration Movement did not result in faction development, that failure can be traced to the fact that the leaders did not fulfill one or more of these rhetorical requirements.

A word of caution is needed at this point. It has been useful in this study to divide the complex process of faction formation into four separate stages. It should be understood, however, that in actual practice there is a great amount of over-lap between the stages. Rhetorical strategies which contribute primarily to polarization, for instance, may also contribute to identification or separation. It is not possible to determine from the use of any single rhetorical strategy exactly how far the process of faction development has gone in a given case. However, from the study of many rhetorical strategies, a pattern should emerge which would indicate, in general terms, the present stage of faction development in any given case.

Evaluation of Simons' Theory

Simons' theory of persuasion for social movements helps to explain why and how factions have been developed in the Restoration Movement. There are several major contributions of Simons' theory. The greatest contribution is that his theory furnishes a fresh approach for the critical analysis of the rhetorical output of faction leaders in the Restoration Movement--and every leader of the Restoration Movement was a faction leader as the terminology has been used in the present study.

A second major contribution of Simons' theory is his emphasis on persuasion--a factor especially important in an unstructured movement which exists in the shared beliefs of individuals. Over seven hundred theses have been written about the Restoration Movement.⁴ The vast majority of these have been issue-centered, theological studies or biographical-historical studies. Less than two dozen of these have really focused on persuasion and none of the theses which have focused on persuasion have studied the way rhetorical strategies fulfill the rhetorical requirements for movement leadership.

Many people in the Restoration movement have "known" intuitively that some rhetorical strategies are divisive, but generally they have not known why. Simons' theory provides a way of determining both what rhetorical strategies are divisive and why those strategies are divisive. Historians of the Restoration Movement have puzzled for years over the question about why the movement has divided over some issues and not over others which appear to be equally important. Simons' theory provides a way of approaching that question. The Restoration Movement has divided when leaders have used rhetorical strategies which have fulfilled the rhetorical requirements of polarization, identification, separation, and isolation. The Restoration Movement has not divided over issues when the leadership has failed to fulfill one or more of these rhetorical requirements.

Based on Simons' theory, suggestions can be offered for determining whether or not the Restoration Movement is likely to divide over a given issue--as demonstrated in the following outline.

⁴Claude E. Spencer, Theses Concerning Disciples of Christ and Related Religious Groups (Nashville: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1964).

How to Determine Whether or Not the Restoration Movement

Is Likely to Divide over a Given Issue

I. Questions to consider in regard to the nature of the issue:

- A. Does the issue involve an extreme position?
- B. Does the issue have enough popular appeal to attract support for both sides?
- C. Is the issue inherently divisive? That is,
 - 1. Does the issue involve corporate action rather than personal beliefs?
 - 2. Is it a simple pro and con issue with which people on both sides can readily identify?

II. Questions to consider in regard to the leadership role:

- A. Has a prestigious leader become identified with the issue?
- B. Have prestigious leaders emerged in the role of opponents representing two sides rather than leaders on just one side or leaders fragmented into a many-sided controversy?

III. Questions to consider in regard to communication channels:

- A. Are channels of communication such as brotherhood periodicals, conventions, lectureships, and such like, available as a platform from which potential faction builders can address the whole brotherhood on the issue in question?
- B. Have separate channels of communication--particularly brotherhood periodicals--become identified as champions of opposing camps in the issue under consideration?
- C. Is the debate format being used in presenting opposing views on the issue to the brotherhood?

IV. Questions to consider in regard to rhetorical strategies:

- A. Are ego-involving rhetorical strategies for polarization being employed? Such as:
 - 1. Personal attack;
 - a. name-calling,
 - b. ridicule,
 - c. misrepresentation,

2. Attack on personal consistency,
3. Guilt-by-association,
4. Appeal to the Pioneers,
5. Projection (the "dangerous trend" argument),
6. Relation of unrelated issues, such as:
 - a. sectional prejudice,
 - b. socio-economic factors,
 - c. appeal to different personality types,
 - d. concern for different audiences.

B. Are rhetorical strategies for faction identification being employed? Such as:

1. Emphasis on points of difference--including the strategy of the exposé;
2. Points of agreement minimized;
3. Importance of the issue exaggerated through:
 - a. Exaggerated claims of importance,
 - b. "hobby-riding," which is the disproportionate use of time in discussing the issue in question,
4. "We-They" language;
5. Faction identifying labels,
6. Faction identifying slogans.

C. Are rhetorical strategies for separation being employed? Such as:

1. Leaders no longer talking to the movement at large, but addressing their own followers calling for a separation;
2. Insistence on conformity with the issue under consideration being made a "matter of faith" instead of a "matter of opinion" and thus becoming a "test of fellowship";
3. Implied denial of brotherhood with those who do not agree on the issue in question;

4. Statements by leaders on one or both sides indicating that they are willing to have a division rather than compromise or tolerate any diversity on the point at issue.

Note: When strategies for separation are not being employed, it is important to determine whether leaders are:

- 1). Using a strategy of modification in an attempt to change the whole movement without any faction formation; or,
- 2). Using a strategy of infiltration and subversion in order to gain control before shifting to a strategy of separation to expell those who do not agree with them on the issue in question.

This is perhaps the most difficult evaluation to make in determining whether or not the Restoration Movement or some branch of the movement is likely to divide over a given issue.

D. Are the rhetorical strategies for isolation being employed? Such as:

1. Justifying the division by:

- a. Blame-fixing,
- b. Re-definition of the issue,
- c. Re-definition of division so as to deny that any real division of the movement or brotherhood has taken place,

2. Closing the lines of communication by:

- a. A Strategy of studied neglect;
- b. Creation of competing institutions (periodicals, conventions, lectureships, etc.);
- c. Punishment of those who do not respect the unwritten rules of faction isolation;

3. The use of language as an insulator instead of a transmitter (jargon peculiar to a faction, cliches, shibboleths, slogans, which identify the "insiders" and the "outsiders").

The more of the above questions answered in the affirmative, the greater the chances that the particular issue in question will result in division and the formation of new factions in the Restoration Movement.

Limitations of Simons' Theory

The contributions mentioned above far outweigh any limitations of Simons' theory. There are, however, a few limitations. The primary limitation of Simons' theory is that it is expressed in terms too specific in their relation to the protest movements Simons was studying. Being thus expressed in such specific terminology, his theory sounds like a theory of persuasion for protest movements and especially a theory of persuasion for the Civil Rights and Anti-Vietnam War protest movements. His theory is not expressed in terminology suitable for a general theory of persuasion for all kinds of social movements---as the title of his article implied. One can infer the general theory behind Simons' too specific terminology, especially with the help of the social movement theorists cited by Simons' article. His theory, however, would have been more functional had this general theory been more explicit rather than implicit.

Another limitation of Simons' theory is his failure to develop the idea of rhetorical requirements changing in the various stages of movement development. He mentioned the classic typology of movement stages developed by Dawson and Gettys and a skeletal typology of stages suggested by Griffin,⁵ but he did not go on to relate these stages in his later discussion of the rhetorical requirements, rhetorical problems, and rhetorical strategies. The stages of movement development and the rhetorical requirements connected with each stage are implied. Simons' theory, however, would have been more useful had these stages been explicitly related to his discussion of requirements, problems, and strategies.

⁵
Simons, 2.

Suggestions for Additional Research

There are several studies of the Restoration Movement which might use the same basic approach as the present study and take up where this study leaves off. One of the most needed studies would be one which would provide further confirmation of Simons' theory and further use of his theory to gain new insight into the history of the Restoration Movement. This suggested study would take the rhetorical requirements of polarization, identification, separation, and isolation, as discussed in this study, as the framework of analysis for a detailed investigation of the rhetorical strategies employed in one specific controversy within the Restoration Movement. Such a study would allow a much more thorough critical analysis than could be possible in such a study as this which has included all the controversies in the one hundred and fifty year history of the Restoration Movement.

One specific controversy which could be studied to great advantage using this approach is the instrumental music controversy between the Church of Christ and the Christian Church. Most of the Restoration Movement studies have focused on the missionary society controversy which was the other issue dividing these two religious bodies. Many movement historians, however, have observed that on the local level the instrumental music question was far more divisive than the missionary society question. When early movement leaders accepted the pro-instrumental music position, this decision had far-reaching consequences in limiting the lines of argument and the rhetorical strategies which they could consistently employ in the future controversies. The one hundred year history of the controversy over instrumental music, with several important changes in stasis, lines of reasoning, and rhetorical strategies, affords an excellent specific case for the detailed application of the general

theory applied herein.

Another way to use the basic approach of the present study for an additional investigation of the Restoration Movement would be to focus on the withdrawal of the Restoration Movement from the rest of Christendom. Many historians have written concerning this early period of Disciple history, but none have used anything even remotely similar to the focus on the rhetorical requirements of polarization, identification, separation, and isolation as presented in this study. Such an approach should prove useful in gaining additional understanding of the early history of the Disciples.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Background in Rhetorical Theory

- Black, Edwin. Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method. New York: McMillian, 1965.
- Burke, Kenneth. A Rhetoric of Motives. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
- _____. The Rhetoric of Religion. Boston: Beacon Press, 1961.

Background in Social Movement Theory

- Blumer, Herbert. "Social Movements." New Outline of the Principles of Sociology. Edited by A. M. Lee. New York: Barnes & Nobel, Inc., 1955.
- Dawson, Carl A., and Gettys, Warner E. An Introduction to Sociology. Revised Edition. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1935.
- Fry, C. Luther. "Changes in Religious Organizations." Recent Social Trends, Vol. I. The President's Research Committee on Social Trends. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1933.
- Gusfield, Joseph R. "Rejection of the Social Order." Protest, Reform, and Revolt. Edited by Joseph R. Gusfield. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970.
- Heberle, Rudolf. Social Movements. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951.
- Hoffer, Eric. The True Believer. New York: Harper & Row, 1951.
- Keniston, Kenneth. Young Radicals: Notes on Committed Youth. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1968.
- King, C. Wendell. Social Movements in the United States. New York: Random House, 1969.

Niebuhr, H. Richard. The Social Sources of Denominationalism. Hamden, Connecticut: The Shoe String Press, 1929.

Selznik, Phillip. "Institutional Vulnerability in Mass Society." Protest, Reform, and Revolt. Edited by Joseph R. Gusfield. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970.

The President's Research Committee on Social Trends. "A Review of the Findings." Recent Social Trends, Vol. I. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1933.

Wach, Joachim. Sociology of Religion. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, & Co., Ltd., 1945.

Warner, Wellman J. The Wesleyan Movement in the Industrial Revolution. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1930.

Zald, Mayer N., and Ash, Roberta. "Social Movement Organization: Growth, Decay, and Change." Protest, Reform, and Revolt. Edited by Joseph R. Gusfield. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970.

Psychological Works

Adorno, T. W., and Others. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1950.

Allport, G. W. Patterns and Growth in Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Frankenstein, Carl. The Roots of the Ego. Baltimore, Md.: The Williams & Wilkins Company, 1960.

Freud, Anna. The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense. London: Hogarth Press, 1937.

Freud, Sigmund. The Psychopathology of Everyday Life. London: Ernest Beam, Ltd., 1948.

Geisel, John B. Personality Problems. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, Co., 1949.

Katz, Daniel. "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes." The Study of Attitude Change. Edited by Richard V. Wagner and John J. Sherwood. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1969.

Landis, Judson T., and Landis, Mary. Building a Successful Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

- Murchland, Bernard. The Age of Alienation. New York: Random House, 1971.
- Osgood, Charles E., and Tannenbaum, Percy H. "The Principle of Contiguity in the Prediction of Attitude Change." The Study of Attitude Change. Edited by Richard V. Wagner and John J. Sherwood. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1969.
- Rokeach, M. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960.
- Rosenberg, Morris. "Psychological Selectivity in Self-Esteem Formation." Attitude, Ego-Involvement, and Change. Edited by Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967.
- Sherif, Carolyn W., Sherif, Muzafer, and Nebergall, Roger E. Attitude and Attitude Change. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1965.
- Sherif, M[uzaffer], and Cantril, H. The Psychology of Ego-Involvement. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966.
- _____, and Hovland, C. I. Social Judgement: Assimilation and Contrast Effects in Reaction to Communication. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.
- _____, and Sherif, Carolyn W. "Attitude as the Individual's Own Categories: The Social Judgement-Involvement Approach to Attitude and Attitude Change." Attitude, Ego-Involvement, and Change. Edited by Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968.
- Wagner, Richard V., and Sherwood, John J. The Study of Attitude Change. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1969.
- Zimbardo, Phillip, and Ebbesen, Ebbe B. Influencing Attitudes and Changing Behavior. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.

The Restoration Movement

- Banowsky, William S. The Mirror of a Movement. Dallas, Texas: Christian Publishing Company, 1965.
- Belcastro, Joseph. The Relationship of Baptism to Church Membership. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1963.
- Brumback, Robert H. History of the Church through the Ages. St. Louis: Mission Messenger, 1957.
- Butler, Pardee. Reply of Elder Pardee Butler, to Attacks Made by Elders Isaac Errett and Benj. Franklin, in Recent Numbers of the American Christian Review. Cincinnati: by the author, 1859. Photostatic copy in the Disciples of Christ Historical Society Library, Nashville, Tennessee.

- Crain, James A. The Development of Social Ideas Among the Disciples of Christ. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1969.
- Davis, M. M. The Restoration Movement of the Nineteenth Century. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1913.
- DeGroot, Alfred T. Church of Christ Number Two. Birmingham: by the author, 1956.
- _____. Disciples Thought: A History. Fort Worth, Texas: by the author, 1965.
- _____. New Possibilities for Disciples and Independents. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1963.
- _____. The Grounds of Division Among the Disciples of Christ. Chicago: by the author, 1940.
- _____. The Restoration Principle. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1960.
- Dowling, Enos E. The Restoration Movement. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1964.
- Eckestein, Stephen D. History of the Churches of Christ in Texas. Austin, Texas: Firm Foundation Publishing Company, 1963.
- Fife, Robert O., Harrell, David Edwin, Jr., and Osborn, Ronald E. Disciples of Christ and the Church Universal. Nashville, Tennessee: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1967.
- Garrison, James Harvey. Christian Union: A Historical Study. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1906.
- _____. Old Faith Restated. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1891.
- _____. The Reformation of the Nineteenth Century. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1901.
- Garrison, Winfred Ernest. Affirmative Religion. New York: Harper & Bros., 1928.
- _____. Alexander Campbell's Theology. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1900.
- _____. An American Religious Movement. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1945
- _____. Christian Unity and Disciples of Christ. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1955.
- _____. Heritage and Destiny: An American Religious Movement Looks Forward. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1961.

- _____. Religion Follows the Frontier. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1931.
- _____. Whence and Whither Disciples of Christ. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1950.
- _____. and DeGroot, Alfred T. The Disciples of Christ: A History. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1964.
- Gates, Errett. Early Relation and Separation of Baptists and Disciples. Chicago: Christian Century Company, 1904.
- Hailey, Homer. Attitudes and Consequences in the Restoration Movement. Kansas City, Mo.: Old Paths Book Club, 1945.
- Haley, J. J. Debates That Made History. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1920.
- _____. Makers and Molders of the Reformation Movement. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1914.
- Hall, Colby D. History of Texas Christian University. Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1947.
- _____. Texas Disciples. Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1953.
- Harrell, David Edwin, Jr. Quest for a Christian America. Nashville, Tenn.: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1966.
- Hayden, A. S. Early History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve, Ohio. Cincinnati: Chase and Hall, Publishers, 1875.
- Haynes, Nathaniel S. History of the Disciples of Christ in Illinois. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1915.
- Hodge, Frederick Arthur. The Plea and the Pioneers in Virginia. Richmond, Virginia: Everett Waddley Company, 1905.
- Hopson, Ella L. Sermons of Dr. W. H. Hopson. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1889.
- Jennings, Walter William. Origin and Early History of the Disciples of Christ. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1919.
- Lewis, Grant K. The American Christian Missionary Society. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1937.
- McPherson, Chalmers. Disciples in Texas. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1920.
- Moore, William T. A Comprehensive History of the Disciples of Christ. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1909.

- _____. The Living Pulpit of the Christian Church. Cincinnati: R. W. Carroll and Company, Publishers, 1868.
- Morris, Don H., and Leach, Max. Like Stars Shining Brightly. Abilene, Texas: Abilene Christian College Press, 1953.
- Mosley, Joseph Edward. Disciples of Christ in Georgia. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1954.
- Murch, James DeForest. Christians Only. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1962.
- Philputt, James M. That They May All Be One. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1933.
- Rogers, James R. The Cane-Ridge Meeting-House. Cincinnati: F. L. Rowe, Publisher, 1910.
- Rowe, John F. A History of Reformatory Movements. Cincinnati: F. L. Rowe, Publisher, 1938.
- _____. The History of Apostasies. Edited and revised by John Allen Hudson. Rosemead, California: Old Paths Book Club, 1956.
- _____. The History of Reforms. Edited and revised by John Allen Hudson. Rosemead, California: Old Paths Book Club, 1957.
- Shaw, H. K. Buckeye Disciples, a History. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1952.
- _____. Hoosier Disciples. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1966.
- Shepherd, J. W. The Church, the Falling Away, and the Restoration. Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Company, 1954.
- Spencer, Claude Elbert, comp. An Author Catalog of Disciples of Christ and Related Religious Groups. Canton, Mo.: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1946.
- _____. ., comp. Periodicals of the Disciples of Christ and Related Religious Groups. Canton, Mo.: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1943.
- _____. ., comp. Theses Concerning Disciples of Christ and Related Religious Groups. Nashville, Tennessee: Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1964.
- Sweet, William W. The Story of Religion in America. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1950.
- Tyler, B. B. A History of the Disciples of Christ. Louisville, Ky.: Guide Printing and Publishing Co., 1895.

Van Kirk, Hiram. A History of the Theology of the Disciples of Christ.
St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1907.

Walker, Dean W. Adventuring for Christian Unity. Birmingham: The Berean Press, 1945.

Welshimer, P. H. Concerning the Disciples. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1935.

West, Earl Irvin. The Search for the Ancient Order, Vol. I. Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Company, 1949.

_____. The Search for the Ancient Order, Vol. II. Indianapolis, Indiana: Religious Book Service, 1950.

Whitley, Oliver Read. Trumpet Call of Reformation. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1959.

Young, C. A. Historical Documents Advocating Christian Union. Chicago: Christian Century Company, 1904.

Young, M. Norvel. A History of Colleges Established and Controlled by Members of the Churches of Christ. Kansas City, Mo.: Old Paths Book Club, 1949.

Biographical Works on Restoration Movement Leaders

Baxter, William. Life of Elder Walter Scott. Reprint. Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Company, n.d.

_____. The Singing Evangelist: Life of Knowles Shaw. Cincinnati: Central Book Concern, 1852.

Boles, H. Leo. Biographical Sketches of Gospel Preachers. Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Company, n.d.

Brewer, G. C. Forty Years on the Firing Line. Kansas City, Mo.: Old Paths Book Club, 1948.

Caldwell, Robert G. James A. Garfield: Party Chieftain. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company, 1931.

Campbell, Alexander. Memoirs of Elder Thomas Campbell. Cincinnati: H. S. Bosworth, 1861.

Campbell, Selina Huntington. Home Life and Reminiscences of A. Campbell. St. Louis: John Burns, Publisher, n.d.

- Castleberry, Otis L. They Heard Him Gladly. Rosemead, California: Old Paths Book Club, 1963.
- Franklin, Joseph, and Headington, J. A. The Life and Times of Benjamin Franklin. St. Louis: John Burns, Publisher, 1879.
- Garrison, James Harvey, Memories and Experiences. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1926.
- Goodpasture, B. C., and Moore, W. T. Biographies and Sermons of Pioneer Preachers. Nashville, Tennessee: B. C. Goodpasture, Publisher, 1954.
- Hall, S. H. Sixty-Five Years in the Pulpit. Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Company, 1959.
- Hanna, W. H. Thomas Campbell, Seceder and Christian Union Advocate. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1935.
- Hastings, Rosetta B. Personal Recollections of Pardee Butler. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1889.
- Keith, Noel L. The Story of D. S. Burnett: Undeserved Obscurity. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1954.
- Lamar, J. S. Memoirs of Isaac Errett. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1893.
- Larimore, Mrs. T. B. Life and Letters of T. B. Larimore. Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Company, 1931.
- Lipscomb, David. Life and Sermons of Jesse L. Sewell. 4th ed. Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Company, 1954.
- MacClenny, W. E. The Life of Rev. James O'Kelly. Indianapolis, Indiana: Religious Book Service, 1910.
- Morro, William C. Brother McGarvey. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1940.
- Nichol, C. R., comp. Gospel Preachers Who Blazed the Trail. Austin, Texas: Firm Foundation Publishing Company, n.d.
- Osborn, Ronald E. Ely Vaughn Zollars. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1947.
- Richardson, Robert. Memoirs of Alexander Campbell. Philadelphia: n.p., 1872.
- Rogers, John. The Biography of Elder Barton Warren Stone. Cincinnati: by the author, 1861.
- Shackleford, John, Jr. Life, Letters and Addresses of Dr. L. L. Pinkerton. Cincinnati: Chase and Hall, Publishers, 1876.

Srygley, F. D. Larimore and His Boys. 5th ed. Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Company, 1955.

_____. Seventy Years in Dixie. Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Company, 1954.

Tant, Fanning Yater. J. D. Tant: Texas Preacher. Lufkin, Texas: Gospel Guardian, 1958.

Tucker, William. J. H. Garrison and Disciples of Christ. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1964.

Wade, John W., ed. Pioneers of the Restoration Movement. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1966.

Ware, Charles C. Barton W. Stone, Pathfinder for Christian Unity. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1952.

West, Earl Irvin. The Life and Times of David Lipscomb. Henderson, Tennessee: Religious Book Service, 1954.

West, Robert Franklin. Alexander Campbell and Natural Religion. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948.

Williams, John Augustus. Life of Elder John Smith. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1904.

Welburn, James R. Hazard of the Die. Austin, Texas: R. B. Sweet Company, 1969.

Books Which Exemplify Rhetorical Strategies Used in the Restoration Movement

Bales, James D. Christian, Contend for Thy Cause. Searcy, Arkansas: by the author, n.d.

_____. Pat Boone and the Gift of Tongues. Searcy, Arkansas: by the author, 1970.

_____. Soils and Seeds of Sectarianism. Rosemead, California: Old Paths Book Club, 1947.

_____. The Christian Conscientious Objector. Berkeley, California: by the author, n.d.

_____. The Holy Spirit and the Christian. Shreveport, Louisiana: Gussie Lambert Publications, 1966.

_____. and Stonestreet, P. W. The Christian and Carnal Warfare. Searcy, Arkansas: printed by James D. Bales, 1947.

- Blakely, Fred O. The Apostle's Doctrine. Highland, Indiana: by the author, 1957.
- Boles, H. Leo. The New Testament Teaching on War. Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Company, n.d.
- _____. and Boll, R. H. Unfulfilled Prophecy. Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Company, 1954.
- Brents, T. W. Gospel Sermons. Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Company, 1891.
- _____. The Gospel Plan of Salvation. 11th ed. Nashville, Tennessee: McQuiddy Printing Company, 1920.
- Clubb, M. D., and Boles, H. Leo. Is Instrumental Music in Christian Worship Scriptural? Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Company, 1927.
- Colley, Flavil L., and Ketcherside, W. Carl. Colley-Ketcherside Debate. Dallas, Texas: printed by Flavil L. Colley, 1954.
- Cope, James R. Voice in the Wilderness. Temple Terrace, Florida: by the author, n.d.
- Corey, Stephen J. Fifty Years of Attack and Controversy. Des Moines, Iowa: The Committee on Publication of the Corey Manuscript, 1953.
- Cottrell, M. F. Refocusing God, the Bible, and the Church. [Denver, Colorado]: by the author, 1962.
- Creath, Jacob. Some Essays on Marriage and Divorce. St. Louis: T. W. Ustick, Printer, 1845.
- DeGroot, Alfred T. Restructure Problems. Fort Worth, Texas: by the author, 1969.
- _____. The Restoration Principle. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1960.
- DeHoff, George Washington, and Garrett, Leroy. DeHoff-Garrett Debate. Murfreesboro, Tennessee: DeHoff Publications, 1955.
- Devaney, Albert Lewis. The Church and Its Elders. Austin, Texas: by the author, 1941.
- Garrison, James Harvey. A Modern Plea for Ancient Truth. St. Louis: Christian Board of Publication, 1902.
- Hayden, W. L. Church Polity. Chicago: J. J. Clarke, 1894.
- Hathaway, Lester, and Deaver, Roy. Hathaway-Deaver Debate. Abilene, Texas: Chronicle Publishing Company, Inc., 1952.

- Hayhurst, L. W., Buchanan, Logan, Johnson, Alva, and Bonneau, Van. Debate on the Bible Class Question. Brownfield, Texas: J. R. Chisholm and Jimmy Wood, Publishers, 1950.
- Homan, W. K. The Church on Trial. Dallas, Texas: by the author, 1900.
- Hudson, John Allen, ed. The Pioneers on Worship. Kansas City, Mo.: Old Paths Book Club, 1947.
- Humble, Bill J., and Garrett, Leroy. Humble-Garrett Debate. Fort Worth, Texas: M. Lloyd Smith and A. G. Hobbes, Jr., Publishers, 1955.
- Isbell, Allen. War and Conscience. Abilene, Texas: Biblical Research Press, 1966.
- Johnson, Ashley S. The Great Controversy. Austin, Texas: Firm Foundation Publishing Company, 1943.
- Kershner, Frederick Doyle. The Watchword of the Restoration Vindicated. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, n.d.
- Kurfees, M. C. Instrumental Music in Worship. Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Company, 1911.
- _____, ed. Questions Answered by Lipscomb and Sewell. Nashville, Tennessee: McQuiddy Printing Company, 1957.
- Lanier, Roy H., and Whitten, D. J. Whitten-Lanier Debate. Abilene, Texas: published by Roy H. Lanier, n.d.
- Lemmons, Reuel. "Christian Fellowship." 1956 Abilene Christian College Bible Lectureship. Austin, Texas: Firm Foundation Publishing Company, 1956.
- Lewis, John T. The Christian and the Government. Birmingham, Alabama: by the author, 1945.
- _____. The Voice of the Pioneers on Instrumental Music and Societies. Nashville, Tennessee: Gospel Advocate Company, 1932.
- Lipscomb, David. Civil Government. Nashville, Tennessee: McQuiddy Printing Company, 1913.
- McGarvey, J. W. A Treatise on the Eldership. n.p., n.p., 1870.
- _____. Sermons. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company, 1894.
- Meyers, Robert, ed. Voices of Concern. St. Louis: Mission Messenger, 1966.
- Morrison, Charles Clayton. The Unfinished Reformation. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.

- Murch, James DeForest. Cooperation Without Compromise. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eardmans Publishing Company, 1956.
- Otey, W. W., and Briney, J. B. Otey-Briney Debate. Cincinnati: F. L. Rowe, Publisher, 1908.
- Porter, W. Curtis, and Waters, J. Ervin. Porter-Waters Debate. Murfreesboro, Tennessee: DeHoff Publications, 1952.
- Ramsey, Richard, comp. Directory of Premillennial Churches of Christ. Hammond, Louisiana: The Exhorter, 1963.
- Scott, Walter. The Gospel Restored. Cincinnati: Printed by O. H. Donogh, 1836.
- Smith, Eugene, and Hunt, Julian O. The Smith-Hunt Debate on Instrumental Music. Dallas, Texas: Good News Press, 1953.
- Srygley, F. B. The New Testament Church. Nashville, Tennessee: McQuiddy Printing Company, 1910.
- Swinney, Oran J., comp. Restoration Readings. Johnstown, Penn.: Reprinted by Old Paths Book Club, 1949.
- Tant, J. D. The Gospel X-Ray. Austin, Texas: Firm Foundation Publishing Company, 1933.
- Thomas, J. D. We Be Brethren. Abilene, Texas: Biblical Research Press, 1958.
- Wallace, Foy E., Jr. Bulwarks of the Faith. Oklahoma City: by the author, 1951.
- _____. God's Prophetic Word. Oklahoma City: by the author, 1946.
- Wallace, G. K., and Hunt, Julian O. Wallace-Hunt Debate. Longview, Washington: Telegram Book Company, 1953.
- _____, and Ketcherside, W. Carl. Wallace-Ketcherside Debate. Longview, Washington: A. G. Hobbes, Publisher, 1953.
- Warren, Thomas B., and Fuqua, E. C. The Warren-Fuqua Debate. Fort Worth, Texas: published by Thomas B. Warren, 1954.
- Willetts, Herbert L. Our Plea for Union and the Present Crisis. Chicago: The Christian Century Company, 1901.
- Willis, Cecil, comp. The Arlington Meeting. Orlando, Florida: Cogdill Foundation, n.d.

Theses

- Coffman, Edward. "The Division in the Restoration Movement." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1930.
- Crawford, Charles Y. "The Eldership in the Church of Christ." Unpublished B.D. thesis, Cincinnati Bible Seminary, 1948.
- Damron, Woodrow Howard. "Disciples-Churches of Christ: A Study in Reproachment." Unpublished B.D. thesis, Brite Divinity School, Texas Christian University, 1940.
- Dawson, Charles Richard. "Elder Isaac Errett: Christian Standard Bearer." Unpublished B.D. thesis, College of the Bible, 1948.
- Day, Charles Alvis. Moses E. Lard--A Master Builder in the Reformation of the Nineteenth Century." Unpublished B.D. thesis, College of the Bible, 1951.
- Fife, Robert O. "Alexander Campbell and the Christian Church in the Slavery Controversy." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Indiana, 1960.
- Ford, Ernest Lesslie. "A Study of the Divisions in the Ranks of the Disciples of Christ." Unpublished B.D. thesis, College of the Bible, 1922.
- Foster, W. C. "The Progress of the Disciples Through Controversy." Unpublished B.D. thesis, College of the Bible, 1918.
- Gibson, Gerald A. "An Historical Analysis of the Lord's Supper and its Various Problems." Unpublished M.Th. thesis, Lincoln Christian College, 1953.
- Harrell, David Edwin, Jr. "A Decade of Disciples of Christ Social Thought." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1958.
- _____. "A Social History of the Disciples of Christ to 1866." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1962.
- Harrison, William Oliver. "Isaac Errett and the Missionary Controversy Among the Disciples." Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Chicago, 1936.
- Humble, Billy Joe. "The Missionary Society Controversy in the Restoration Movement, 1823-1875." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1964.
- Johnston, Roy B. "Isaac Errett and the Struggle of the Disciples of Christ Against Reaction." Unpublished B.D. thesis, College of the Bible, 1929.

- Keese, Delbert Dayton. "The Churches of Christ During the War Between the States." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Butler University, 1954.
- Mell, Glen W. "A Study of the Opinions of Some Leading Disciples Concerning Pacifism." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Butler University, 1936.
- Morrison, Matthew. "The Preaching of Daniel Sommer." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Indiana State University, 1968.
- Riley, Millard L. "The Life and Work of J. B. Briney." Unpublished B.D. thesis, Drake University, 1946.
- Shannon, Thompson L. "Divisions Within the Restoration Movement." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Phillips University, 1933.
- Short, Howard Elmo. "The 'Churches of Christ,' An Inquiry into their Emergence from the General Reform Movement Inaugurated by Alexander Campbell and Others, and their Subsequent History." Unpublished B.D. thesis, Hartford Theological Seminary, 1932.
- Smith, Frank E. "The Editorial Contributions of Charles Louis Loos to the Movement of the Disciples of Christ." Unpublished B.D. thesis, Butler University, 1945.
- Vandergrift, Eileen Gordon. "The Christian Missionary Society: A Study of the Influence of Slavery on the Disciples of Christ." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Butler University, 1945.
- Webb, Henry E. "A History of the Independent Mission Movement of the Disciples of Christ." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1954.
- Whitson, Samuel Montgomery, Jr. "History of Premillennialism in the Churches of Christ from 1915-1935." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Butler University, 1951.
- Willis, Homer Cecil. "W. W. Otey: Controversialist." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Butler University, 1961.

Periodicals

Articles on Rhetorical Theory

- Griffin, Leland M. "The Rhetoric of Historical Movements." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 38 (April, 1952), 184-188.
- Simons, Herbert W. "Patterns of Persuasion in the Civil Rights Struggle." Today's Speech, 15 (February, 1967), 25-27.

Simons, Herbert W. "Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 56 (February, 1970), 1-11.

Psychological Works

Allen, Vernon L. "1966 Review: Attitude and Attitude Change." American Sociological Review, 31 (1966), 283-284.

Eagley, Alice H., and Manis, M. "Evaluation of Message and Communications as a Function of Involvement." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3 (1966), 483-485.

Hovland, C. L., Harvey, O. J., and Sherif, M. "Assimilation and Contrast Effects in Reaction to Communication and Attitude Change." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55 (1957), 244-252.

The Restoration Movement

Butler, Charles P. "That Heretic--L. L. Pinkerton." The Scroll, XL (April, 1943), 235-243.

DeGroot, Alfred T. "Slavery is a Matter of Opinion." Christian-Evangelist, LXXXVIII, No. 9 (March 1, 1950), 202-205.

Garrison, Winfred Ernest. "1896-1946." The Scroll, XLIII (September, 1945), 1-3.

Hamlin, C. H. "The Disciples of Christ and the War Between the States." The Scroll, XLI (December, 1943), 99-119.

Harrell, David Edwin, Jr. "Disciples of Christ Pacifism in Nineteenth Century Tennessee." Tennessee Historical Quarterly, XXI (September, 1962), 263-274.

_____. "The Sectional Origins of the Church of Christ." Journal of Southern History, XXX, No. 3 (August, 1964), 261-277.

Lobingier, Charles S. "The Disciples in the Civil War." The Scroll, XLII, No. 4 (October, 1944), 51-59.

McQuary, Rodney L. "The Social Background of the Disciples of Christ." College of the Bible Quarterly, XIII, No. 1 (March, 1924), 3-16.

Articles Which Exemplify Rhetorical Strategies Used in the Restoration Movement

"A Program on Which All Can Unite." Christian Standard, LXXVI, No. 30 (July 29, 1950), 465.

Ames, E. S. "A Suggestion." Quarterly Bulletin, I, No. 1 (October, 1903), 1.

_____. "A Perennial Question." Quarterly Bulletin, I, No. 2 (January, 1904), 1.

_____. "Christian Union." Quarterly Bulletin, I, No. 3 (April, 1904), 1.

_____. "Notes." Quarterly Bulletin, I, No. 4 (July, 1904), 10.

Blackman, Luther. "Catholic Authority and Infallibility." Gospel Guardian, I, No. 38 (February 2, 1950), 2-6.

Boles, H. Leo. "Dangerous Trends in Cooperation." Gospel Advocate, LI, No. 37 (October 20, 1932), 533.

Brewer, G. C. "A Sop to Cerebus." Firm Foundation, LXVII, No. 30 (July 25, 1950), 4-5.

Briney, J. B. "Action Taken at the Norfolk Convention." Christian Standard, XLIII, No. 38 (October 26, 1907), 1772.

_____. "Christian Liberty." Briney's Monthly, New Series, I, No. 8 (November, 1907), 460.

_____. "The Place of the Plea in the Curriculum." Christian Standard, XXXVII, No. 30 (July 29, 1911), 1211.

_____. "The Safety of Our Missionary Society." Christian Standard, XXXVII, No. 35 (September 2, 1911), 1419.

Brown, J. T. "What Will the Newly Elected Teacher of Theology in the College of the Bible Teach?" Christian Standard, XLVIII, No. 30 through No. 37 (July 27 through September 14, 1912), 1206-1485.

Burnett, T. R. "Burnett's Budget." Gospel Advocate, XXXIV, No. 18 (May 9, 1895), 417.

Carmack, Bill. "McCarthyism in the Church." Gospel Guardian, V, No. 37 (January 28, 1954), 589.

Cope, James R. "When Does Cooperation Become Centralization?" Perceptor, III, No. 5 (March, 1954), 6-7.

Devore, Larry R. "Whither Goeth Anti-ism?" Gospel Guardian, XXI, No. 37 (January 22, 1970), 583.

- Ellison, Oscar. "Whose Side Are You On?" Gospel Guardian, V, No. 36 (January 21, 1954), 563.
- Frank, H. B. "Life of Elder John Smith." Perceptor, III, No. 2 (December, 1953), 18-21.
- Garrett, Leroy. "Twelve BIG Differences Between the Modern Church of Christ and the New Testament Church." Bible Talk, III, No. 9 (June, 1955), 150-152.
- _____. "Unity Meeting in Abilene." Restoration Review, XIII, No. 1 (January, 1971), 10.
- Garrison, James Harvey. "Another Sin." Gospel Echo, June, 1869, pp. 228-229.
- _____. "The Transient and the Permanent Elements in the Campbell Reformation." The New Christian Quarterly, July, 1895, p. 76.
- Holt, Charles. "A Lot of Racket." Gospel Guardian, V, No. 45 (March 25, 1954), 706.
- Humble, Bill J. "The Church is Drifting." Perceptor, III, No. 4 (February, 1954), 76-77.
- Kershner, Frederick. "Stars." Christian Standard, LXXVI, No. 30 (August 10, 1940), 771.
- Lard, Moses E. "Can We Divide?" Lard's Quarterly, III, No. 3 (April, 1866), 330-336.
- _____. "Church Independence." Apostolic Times, III, No. 49 (March 14, 1872), 338.
- Layton, W. Wallace. "The Pope's Claim to Authority, No. I." Gospel Guardian, I, No. 39 (February 9, 1950), 2,7.
- _____. "The Pope's Claim to Authority, No. II." Gospel Guardian, I, No. 43 (March 9, 1950), 1,3.
- _____. "The Pope's Claim to Authority, No. III." Gospel Guardian, I, No. 48 (April 13, 1950), 4.
- Meyer, Jack. "The Gospel in Italy." Firm Foundation, LXVII, No. 2 (March 21, 1950), 8.
- Mullins, Leonard. "Why Shouldn't I Marry a Roman Catholic?" Gospel Guardian, II, No. 17 (August 31, 1950), 2.
- Overton, Harlan. "Seeds of Distrust." Firm Foundation, LXXXVI, No. 5 (February 4, 1969), 69.

- Rutledge, George P. "That 'Split' In the Brotherhood." Christian Standard, LIII, No. 52 (September 28, 1918), 1553.
- Spears, Dudley. "An Open Letter to Yater Tant." Gospel Guardian, XXI, No. 11 (July 17, 1969), 161-162.
- Stewart, David. "Alexander Campbell and the Churches of Christ." Restoration Quarterly, IX, No. 3 (1966), 133-141.
- _____. "Interview: On Premillennial Views." Mission, II, No. 8 (February, 1969), 24.
- Tant, Yater. "Brother Sewell's Literature Teaches Falsehood." Gospel Guardian, I, No. 50 (April 27, 1950), 2-3.
- _____. "'Our' Work or 'Their' Work?" Gospel Guardian, V, No. 44 (March 18, 1954), 692.
- _____. "Stand Off and Remain Aloof." Gospel Guardian, XXI, No. 11 (July 17, 1969), 165.
- "The Catholic Church in Action." Gospel Guardian, I, No. 43 (March 9, 1950), 7.
- Trice, A. N. "Law and Expediency." Gospel Advocate, LXX, No. 11 (March 19, 1931), 314-317.
- Wallace, Cled. "That Disgusted Brotherhood." Gospel Guardian, I, No. 47 (April 6, 1950), 2,4.
- _____. "That Rock Fight in Italy." Gospel Guardian, I, No. 36 (January 19, 1950), 1.
- _____. "Voices from the Past." Gospel Guardian, I, No. 40 (February 16, 1950), 1,5.
- _____. "What Shall We Be?" Gospel Guardian, I, No. 39 (February 9, 1950), 1.
- Wallace, William E. "Wells of Fellowship Poisoned." Gospel Guardian, XXI, No. 26 (October 30, 1969), 406-407.
- Warren, Thomas B. "The Church--How Its Unity Is Both Attained and Maintained." The Spiritual Sword, I, No. 4 (July, 1970), 1.
- _____. "Our Aim." The Spiritual Sword, I, No. 1 (October, 1969), 1.
- "What Was Campus Evangelism?" Mission, III, No. 12 (October, 1970), 14-23.
- "Wheat and Cotton King Embraces the Church." Gospel Guardian, I, No. 43 (March 9, 1950), 7.

- "Where Sound Churches Meet Near Danville, Ky." Gospel Guardian, XXI, No. 48 (May, 8, 1970), 711.
- Whiteside, R. L. "Brewer's Benedict Arnolds." Gospel Guardian, I, No. 20 (September 21, 1950), 2.
- Wright, Cecil N. "Cooperation as a Scriptural Basis." Firm Foundation, LXVII, No. 30 (July 25, 1950), 3.
- Vanderpool, Harold Y., and Randolph, Robert M. "Interview: A Disciples View." Mission, II, No. 9 (March, 1969), 23.
- Woodsen, William. "Instrumental Music in the Worship of God." The Spiritual Sword, II, No. 1 (October, 1970), 31.

Pamphlets

- A Southern Clergyman [Iverson L. Brooks]. A Defense of Southern Slavery Against the Attacks of Henry Clay and Alex'r Campbell. Hamburg, South Carolina: Printed by Robinson and Carlisle, 1851.
- Hayden, Edwin V. Fifty Years of Digression and Disturbance. Joplin, Mo.: Hunter Printing Company, n.d.
- Morris, A. M. Differences Between the Church of Christ and the Christian Church. No information available on facts of publication. Only known copy in Abilene Christian College Library, Abilene, Texas.
- Rice, Ira Y. Axe On The Root, Vols. I, II, III. Nashville, Tennessee: by the author, 1967.
- Wasson, Woodrow. Factors Creating Controversies Among the Disciples of Christ. Mimeographed. No information available on facts of publication. Copy in Pamphlet File, Disciples of Christ Historical Society, Nashville, Tennessee.
- Waters, Ervin. The Communion. Lebanon Mo.: Old Paths Advocate, 1945.
- Wood, Eugene V. An Examination of the Nichol-Whiteside Review of R. H. Boll. Dallas, Texas: by the author, n.d.

Manuscript

- Owen, George. "The Quest for Unity Among the Disciples of Christ." Three Lectures delivered at the Missouri Christian Ministers Institute, February 19-21, 1963. Bound manuscript in archives of Disciples of Christ Historical Society, Nashville, Tennessee.