Patterns of Influence
in Anglo-American Quakerism

By

THOMAS E. DRAKE, Ph.D.

FRIENDS' HISTORICAL SOCIETY
FRIENDS HOUSE, EUSTON ROAD, LONDON, N.W.1
also obtainable at the
Friends Book Store, 302 Arch Street, Philadelphia 6, Pa., U.S.A.

1958

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY HEADLEY BROTHERS LTD
109 KINGSWAY LONDON WC2 AND ASHFORD KENT

Patterns of Influence in Anglo-American Quakerism

by T. E. Drake

THE common garment of language and culture which Britons and Americans now wear finds its origin in the pattern of warp and woof which Englishmen, Welshmen, Scots, and Irish wove in the pioneering years of the seventeenth century. Today we accept our position in a so-called Atlantic community which for us found solid origins three hundred years ago. Particularly does this hold true of Anglo-American Quakerism. For, as Frederick Tolles pointed out in his presidential address before the Friends' Historical Society six years ago, an Atlantic Quaker Community grew up in the first fifty years after the founding of the Society of Friends in the mid-seventeenth century.[1]

This Atlantic Quaker community took its principal inspiration from the mother meetings in Great Britain, which, as Professor Tolles suggested, exerted their influence not only through the actual emigration of many of their members, but through the continuing contacts of travelling ministers, through frequent epistles from meetings at home to the new meetings abroad, through the voluminous books and pamphlets which flowed from Quaker pens in England, and through financial assistance by the older centres to the new ones in the wilderness. In return for all this the pioneer Quaker settlements had little to offer to Friends at home except an escape from persecution and an opportunity freely to try out the holy experiment which was early Quakerism.

But persecution ceased after the first half-century, and emigration slowed down. How then did the Atlantic Quaker community which we know today develop? What forces of influence, of change, of challenge and response, flowed back and forth across the ocean in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to form the present fabric of Anglo-American

[1] Frederick B. Tolles, *The Atlantic Community of the Early Friends*. Supplement No. 24 to the *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society* (London, 1952).

Quakerism? Has the flow moved mostly westward, as in the first fifty years? Has Quakerism across the sea produced a back-current of any strength or significance? Did this Western frontier of Quakerism develop new sources of power and inspiration, new ways of thought and action which vitally influenced the homeland? How closely has American Quakerism in the years of colonial tutelage and after American independence followed the pattern of development of the Society of Friends in Great Britain? Have the ocean between and the mountains and great West beyond united or separated the Anglo-American Quaker community?

To raise these questions is not to answer them. But only by raising them and by trying to discover at least some of the answers can we explain the differences and the similarities which distinguish British-American Quakerism in our day from the Atlantic community of the early Friends.

To begin with, we may look for a moment at that community, say, in 1701, when William Penn journeyed a second time to Pennsylvania in order to strengthen and liberalize his government there and to settle himself and his family in his new manor house of Pennsbury on the Delaware. In England Friends had set up a system of monthly and quarterly meetings, with London as the centre for the Yearly Meeting and for the executive meetings which carried on the extensive business of the Society. Early divisions had been ironed out, and the basic features of Quaker thought and practice established. In America Quakerism had come and almost gone in Barbados and the sugar islands, and had established itself firmly along the coastal mainland from the Carolinas all the way to New England. Yearly meetings had taken shape in all the major provinces—in North Carolina, in Virginia, on the Chesapeake Bay in Maryland, back and forth across the Delaware in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, in New York, and on the island of Rhode Island in New England. American Quaker thinking, Quaker worship, Quaker meetings for business, Quaker schools, and Quaker ways followed almost exactly the pattern set by Quakers at home. American Friends could hardly be distinguished from those in Britain. They were in fact British: British subjects, born in Britain, British in speech and outlook, differing from their brethren only in the fact that the ocean lay between them and the centre of things, and that the enormous

size of their country had forced them to set up a diffuse organization of many yearly meetings rather than one central body of great power and authority.

How then did these two segments of the Atlantic Quaker community develop in the years after 1700?

In making an analysis of this kind we face, of course, problems similar to those encountered by any student of a homeland and its colonies. So our findings will recall somewhat the interactions of the Greek mother cities and their daughters which dotted the shores of the Mediterranean, the development of Rome and her many provinces, and the relations of the European nations with their great empires abroad. But as we seek the guiding lines of our analysis, we shall undoubtedly find some which are peculiar to Quakerism, as well as others which reflect the factors common to any expansion of a nation, church, or people to lands remote from their point of origin.[1]

First we must recognize the persisting importance of the instruments by which the Atlantic Quaker community originally formed itself. Travelling ministers from England continued to play a fundamental role in shaping American Quakerism. In the eighteenth century men like Thomas Story and the two Fothergills helped to spread an inward-centred Quietism among American Friends. In the nineteenth century Joseph John Gurney affected the development of American Quaker thought as much as any single English Friend before or since. Others we could name, both men and women, who, until the decline of the travelling ministry toward the end of the nineteenth century, made long journeys in America, preaching and counselling, guiding and shaping the ideas and testimonies of the Friends there.

Epistles, pamphlets and books continued to flow from English Quaker presses to the colonies, while the religious diaries or journals of leading English ministers, and later the histories of the heroic age of Quakerism provided the principal reading matter for American Friends in the eighteenth and on into the early nineteenth century. America remained something of a mission field, to which English Friends continued to make contributions to support the

[1] Michael Kraus, *The Atlantic Civilization : Eighteenth Century Origins* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1949), tells the story of early Anglo-American development, and traces the Quaker contacts at some length.

travelling and printed ministry, to build new meeting houses, and to provide relief in time of catastrophe.

But new factors, some of them reflecting the British colonial experience in general, and some peculiar to Quakerism began to supplement these original means of shaping the Quaker community of the North Atlantic basin. To stress only the most important of the basic influences on Anglo-American Quakerism after 1700, I should like to suggest four: First, the physical environment, at home and abroad: on the one hand the tightly knit British islands with their commercial-agricultural economy, rapidly moving toward industrialism and its concomitant cities; on the other an America which was long to be a land of wilderness, forest, and farms, tied to the mother country by the ships and business connections of a few merchants in the eastern towns. Second, the ideas or climate of opinion of the worlds in which Englishmen and Americans found themselves in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Third, the changing institutional forms of church, of state, and of society in the Old World and the New. And, finally, the individual leaders through which these environmental factors, these ideas and institutions manifested themselves in the Society of Friends.

Each of these four factors made itself felt in Quakerism as in the larger world of the British Empire in two directions rather than one. For after 1700 if not before, the currents of the pressures of environment, of opinion, of institutions, and of men flowed both East and West, from Britain to the Quaker groups across the sea, as they had from the days of the first Quaker missionaries and emigrants, and from the Quaker settlements in America back to Quaker Britain. This two-way traffic across the Atlantic in ideas and ways of doing things, this challenge of the old and the new, each to the other, this response of each to the influences brought to it by the currents of their common ocean—this came to be a significant factor in the development of Anglo-American Quakerism in the centuries after the pioneers set up their New Jerusalem abroad.

We can only touch briefly on these four major influences as they operated back and forth across the Atlantic. But even a brief attempt will point up their importance. Let us look for a moment at the world in which the Quakers of the homeland lived in the eighteenth century. Here was a world

which had passed through the fires of religious reformation, and was now settling down to a comfortable *modus vivendi* in which men no longer fought their great wars in the name of religion. The Established Church fell into a quiet and comfortable toleration, to be ruffled only slightly by the stirrings of evangelical fervour which Whitefield and the Wesleys aroused. Friends in England could now relax after the long years of persecution, and live under a policy which permitted them to practise their faith and pursue their lives in comparative ease. For this as well as for other reasons, Quietism developed as the dominant mood of Quaker Britain.

What happened in America? Here, too, the quietistic temper made itself felt, and colonial Friends likewise settled down to improve their farms and expand their counting houses during the long years of peace and toleration under the early Hannoverians. And when war came, as it did at mid-century, American Friends, urged on by their conservative contemporaries at home, gave up completely the old dream of the Holy Experiment, retired from politics, and turned to the modest cultivation of their personal affairs and the silent communion of their religious meetings. The immediate occasion for this voluntary renunciation of a bold and experimental religion came with the great war against the French and Indians who descended on the Pennsylvania frontier. But English Friends had long since prepared their American brethren to follow a quietistic way. All the influences playing upon American Quakerism from England—the preaching of the great ministers like Samuel Fothergill, the books and pamphlets of an age no longer heroic, the establishment of birthright membership, a written book of discipline, and a well-worked out system of advices and queries—all these innovations in England found an immediate and imitative response in America.

American meetings followed so closely the lead of London Yearly Meeting in this period as far as ideas and institutions were concerned, that one sometimes wonders whether any two-way influence existed at all. In the matter of the discipline, to cite one example, London worked out a careful codification of its Rules of Discipline in 1738, and the American yearly meetings, from New England all the way to the South, eventually made it their own. They copied it title by title, subhead by subhead, in great folio volumes in

which they made no apparent distinction between the rules laid down in London and the minutes and advices which they themselves had from time to time adopted. One such item, I recall, misled Rufus Jones when he was preparing his history of the *Quakers in the American Colonies*. A 1727 rule against importing Negroes from Africa which appears in New England's Discipline compiled in 1760 he took to be a decision of the Yearly Meeting in slave-trading Newport. But no such ruling actually appears in the Minutes of the New England Friends for 1727. They simply lifted the item from the London Discipline, in 1760, and incorporated it in their own.[1]

Slavery, however, if not the African slave trade, arose in America as an American problem. Negro and Indian relations held only an academic interest for Quakers in all-white England. But the plantations in Barbados and along the tidal rivers of the American South depended in large part on the labour of Negro slaves. This slavery troubled visiting Friends like George Fox and William Edmundson, and disturbed the first Quaker settlers from England and Ireland. But the Friends who finally grappled with the slavery problem and worked out the Quaker testimony against the institution had been born or lived long in the New World. Pennsylvania meetings early sought guidance from London on how to deal with slaveholding, but to very little effect. But immediate and long-time contact with slavery and its evils gave John Woolman and his generation in America the experience and the power to free the Society of Friends entirely from the taint of trafficking in the bodies of men. Once the American Friends had finally hammered out a solution of the slavery problem for their own farms and meetings, they then rallied Friends in England to an attack on the slave trade on a world-wide scale. Anthony Benezet, William Dillwyn and others aroused English Quakers to start a campaign against the slave trade in Parliament, while they themselves fought for this reform in the American state legislatures and in the new national Congress. So institutions, ideas, and men from the American environment combined to carry a challenge back across the sea from the new Quaker world to the old.

[1] See Rufus M. Jones, *The Quakers in the American Colonies* (London, 1911), p. 157, and Thomas E. Drake, *Quakers and Slavery in America* (New Haven, 1950), p. 41 n.

Like slavery, the American War for Independence set up new currents in American Quakerism which affected the development of the Society of Friends as a whole. This war appeared to some American Friends to present the necessity of choosing between their country and their religious society. They chose their country, and so took a vigorous, public-minded and perhaps worldly segment of "Free" or "Fighting Quakers" out of the Society of Friends in America. On the other hand, most of those who remained loyal to their religious principles did so without feeling obliged to renounce their allegiance to the new United States. But they necessarily cut themselves off still further from active participation in political life, and deepened the currents of Quietism, withdrawal, internal reform and private philanthropy which had come to them from Britain. So the intensely personal ministry of a William Savery from Philadelphia could convert at the end of the eighteenth century a gay young English Quakeress from the life of the world to a strict adherence to ancient Quaker ways and divert her abundant energies from mundane pursuits to the cause of prison reform.

We cannot say, however, that with political independence and leadership in the anti-slavery crusade that American Quakers shifted the balance of influence and innovation to their side of the Atlantic. Independence made a difference. But I am inclined to believe that the most distinct change came over the relations of British and American Friends after the new American Congress reversed the old Imperial policy of containment of settlement within the mountain barrier, and opened the American West to American pioneers. When Friends along with other Americans began in the 1780's and 90's to move out through the passes of the Appalachians, planting new meetings on the waters of the Monongahela in western Pennsylvania, and eventually settling town after town in Ohio and Indiana, they weakened their ties with the Mother Country by putting the mountains as well as the sea between them and Friends in Britain. And in so doing they exposed themselves more fully than before to the influence of the western American frontier.

Something, any English Friend can tell you, has made American Quakers "different". Not only their broad "a's" and their peculiar ways mark them as a people unto themselves. They are Americans. And as Americans they have

shared with their countrymen the extraordinary experience of moving westward on a rapidly expanding frontier. After originally taking a full century and a half to settle the few hundred miles between the Atlantic and the mountains, the people of the United States rushed westward at such a rate that in hardly more than a generation they had pushed through the forests of the Ohio valley, across the Mississippi, out on to the plains of Illinois, Iowa, and Kansas, and even to the farther ocean beyond the Rockies.

In the period of that great Westward Movement in the United States, what we may now regard as an American Quakerism took form, just as America herself shook off her colonial ways and attitudes and became a new nation. To analyse the effects of the frontier on American Quakerism is as difficult an undertaking as it is to define precisely what kind of a United States grew up as a result of the conquest of the American West. But be that as it may, we can certainly recognize the importance of this experience in forest and prairie, which created Lincoln's America and left its mark on ours.

I shall always remember the judgment which I heard Sir Wilmot Lewis express on this point in an address to a Yale University audience some twenty-five years ago: As he told of his long experience as representative of *The Times* in Washington—he was then dean of the foreign journalists' corps by reason of his many years of service in the American capital—Sir Wilmot said that he always had three words of advice to inquiring younger colleagues when they came to the United States for the first time and asked him how they could begin to understand it. First, he told them, read the daily newspapers, to follow the events of contemporary American life and to catch the trend of conservative opinion in the United States. Second, read the "little weeklies of the Left", as he called them, to learn the other side (and their Left represented not a Communist point of view but the carry-over of Progressivism whose roots lay in the "Valley of Democracy", the American West of the nineteenth century). Third, and here he paused for emphasis, I tell them to read Frederick Jackson Turner's essay, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History".[1]

[1] Published in the *Report* of the American Historical Association for 1893 (pp. 199-227) and many times since.

The Western frontier then, toward which Americans moved so slowly in the days of their colonial tutelage, and into which they ventured so boldly and swiftly after 1783 and especially after 1815, explained much to Sir Wilmot and his fellow journalists of what they saw around them in Washington in the early days of the New Deal.

If America as a whole felt so strongly the impact of the frontier—of forest and Indians to conquer, of great rivers and greater prairies to cross, of new lands to plough and new towns and cities to build, of schools and churches to establish, a civilization to create from a wilderness; if this experience made men less European and more American, less attached to old ways and more inclined to experiment with new, less bound by class and monarchy and more devoted to equality and republicanism, can we doubt that American Quakers, who felt the Western fever as much as anyone in America, escaped the influence of this frontier?

Not that American Friends were cut off completely from English influences. No, nor did Americans as a whole produce so much by way of innovation as Frederick Jackson Turner in his enthusiasm as a Middle-Westener may have imagined. For now, as we continue to study the turbulent realm of nineteenth-century religious ideas and their impulse toward social reform, we have come to realize that hardly anything originated in the United States except possibly the anti-slavery crusade and the women's rights movement. Not Unitarianism nor its bitter rival, Evangelicalism, not the peace movement nor the temperance agitation, not the educational reforms such as the Sunday Schools, nor Joseph Lancaster's ingenious device for educating the masses at little expense, not the utopias of Robert Owen and Charles Fourier.

But—and here is the difference—in frontier America men had the freedom and the energy to put these ideas into practice, to try them out, and to carry them, in some cases, far beyond the dreams of their European originators.

Who but the Americans would or could have taken temperance to the lengths of national prohibition? Who but Americans, and these Pennsylvania Quakers, would have carried prison reform to the extreme of employing solitary confinement for humanitarian reasons? Where but in America could the process of religious fractionalization have gone as

far as it did in the exciting days of the Great Evangelical Revival of the nineteenth century, and have produced such a multitude of sects and churches as now dot the American religious landscape?

Here I think lies the explanation of the extent and violence of the Separations which shook the American Quaker world after 1827. The three great conflicting movements in Anglo-American religious thought at the turn of the eighteenth century all showed themselves in Quaker thinking as well. Pietism took the form of an inward-centred Quakerism of the older sort; Rationalism, Deism, and Unitarian ideas attracted a number of thoughtful Friends; Evangelicalism captured the minds and hearts of a considerable majority. All these originated on this side of the ocean, not in America. English and Irish Friends may have been stirred to controversy by the writings or visits of individual Americans of quietistic, liberal or evangelical points of view. But these Americans such as Job Scott, Hannah Barnard, and David Sands simply gave voice to ideas which had come first out of British and Continental religious experience. And the carriers of these ideas in the other direction outnumbered and outweighed the Americans who influenced Britain.

Friends in Great Britain, though troubled by minor schisms such as that in Ireland in the 1790s, worked through the conflict of the older Quakerism and the new with no serious defections from their ranks. American Friends, on the other hand, not only found themselves already divided into many different Yearly Meetings. Heterogeneity marked their background and outlook as well. City Friends felt themselves superior to country Friends and frontier Friends. Rural and Western Friends resented the domination and novel ideas of the city Friends. All of them found themselves influenced, but unwilling to be dictated to, by the Anna Backhouses, the Thomas Shillitoes, the Joseph John Gurneys and the William Forsters who helped kindle American Quakerism with the spark and tinder of evangelical ideas, and then tried to control the blazing fires which resulted in the American Quaker forests.

The frontier experience partially explains why the pastoral system eventually took such hold on many American meetings in the nineteenth century. In the eastern cities

certain Quaker groups early responded to the message of Evangelicalism and reform which came from England. Twelfth Street Meeting in Philadelphia, a prime example, embraced with enthusiasm the many social reforms which Evangelicalism brought with it. But, although these Philadelphia Friends never felt the need of a professionalized ministry, other Friends, with a smaller corps of competent ministers of their own, did so. Rural meetings in New England and New York, meetings in the seaboard South and in the Middle West, felt the force of the evangelical enthusiasm not only in the sober form in which English travelling ministers occasionally brought it to them, but in the whirlwinds of Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian revivals which swept over rural and frontier America. Paid preaching, Scripture reading, public confessions of sin, hymn singing, and the excitement of revivalistic meetings came to mean religion to the Friends in these regions. Their own individual ministry, attenuated by lack of formal education and lack of sufficient contact with the well-springs of ancient Quakerism, gave way to paid preachers who had been schooled in the new revivalism of the neighbouring sects. So "Friends Meetings" became "Friends Churches", until, in my own experience, one could find a great Friends congregation in California enjoying a Sunday morning session with singing by a robed choir and preaching by a professionally trained clergyman who left, as I remember, a kind of vestigial remnant of ancient Quaker worship—some four minutes for "silent prayer"—in an otherwise completely programmed service. Thus the levelling influence of the frontier environment triumphed. Many American Friends ceased to raise up ministers from among themselves in the old Quaker way, but came to depend on paid pastors to promote their spiritual life and direct the business affairs of their church.

The schisms which resulted from this new Evangelicalism brought isolation with it, for they cut American Friends off from each other as well as from Britain. An important segment of American Quakers found themselves severed completely from their British roots when London Yearly Meeting refused to accept the Hicksites' contention that they, too, were Friends. Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Orthodox body ceased entirely in the eighteen-fifties to

correspond with Friends meetings elsewhere, in order to avoid a further division that threatened in their ranks. And although the spread of cheap printing might seem to have made it easier for Friends to communicate with each other, it appears rather to have enabled each separate group to provide its own periodical literature. *The Friend*, founded in Philadelphia just after the Separation of 1827-28, a prototype of the Quaker weekly which persists down to our own day, found its readers largely among Orthodox Friends of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting; while *The Friend* of London (1843), the Hicksite *Friends Intelligencer* (1844), the evangelical *Friends Review* (1847), and the pastoral Christian Worker (1871) each circulated primarily within its own particular constituency.

So the nineteenth century witnessed a growing divergence in the Atlantic community of Friends. Industrialism and the rise of cities affected English Friends sooner than American. Across the seas the frontier experience raised a kind of cultural Appalachian barrier between Western Quakerism and the Friends nearer the Atlantic and in England. Growth in numbers took place most noticeably in the new West, but through methods which Friends of conservative tendency felt would destroy the essential elements of original Quakerism. The new science of Darwin, the new philosophy of Spencer, and the new intellectualism of the German universities, drove further wedges between Friends of more liberal mind who absorbed these ideas, and those who joined their evangelical neighbours in opposition to such infidel notions. Quakerism, no longer closely enough knit to respond and adapt to the intellectual and religious challenges of the century, and increasingly reflecting the opinions and practices of its nearby neighbours, seemed to be flying apart.

Other forces restrained this centrifugal tendency, of course. The great reform and missionary movements which accompanied Evangelicalism brought certain Friends into closer contact across the ocean than had been true before. Anti-slavery, for instance, united Joseph Sturge and John Candler from England with John Greenleaf Whittier in New England and Levi Coffin in Indiana in a common cause. But it likewise alienated the more conservative Friends of Philadelphia, Richmond, and elsewhere in the fear that the radical approach to slavery as promoted by some English

and American reformers would, as it did, lead to further schisms in the Society of Friends, and—a fear too well borne out—to bloodshed between the North and the South.

The American Civil War and its tragic aftermath gave Friends opportunity for a new type of relief work, extensive in character and imaginative in method. English Friends as well as American responded to this need, and the experience of dealing with the wreckage of that great war prepared Friends for similar efforts at the time of the Franco-Prussian War and in the catastrophic conflicts of our present generation.

Meanwhile, towards the end of the nineteenth century, new forces for cohesion began to operate in the larger Quaker community. The interest in higher education which showed itself in America in the founding of Haverford in 1833, of Earlham in 1859, of Swarthmore in 1864, of other Quaker colleges, and universities of Quaker inspiration, brought in time a generation of Friends who shared with their British contemporaries in the intellectual advances of the day. English Friends had less far to go, intellectually speaking, than the Americans. Their schooling had been better and their learning more profound than that of the American Quaker generations in the ages of Quietism and the frontier. But, just as British Friends became free to attend the Universities after 1871, so American Friends took the opportunity to study not only in their own denominational academies and colleges, but also in the new universities at home and the great ones abroad. Not since James Logan's time had Friends in England and America participated so fully in the intellectual activities of their common world.

We see this especially in Rufus Jones and his generation. In the eighteenth century John Woolman's challenge to English Friends sprang from the limpid simplicity of his spiritual insight. At the end of the nineteenth century Rufus Jones found kindred minds as well as hearts in England to encourage him in his search for truth and light. With him, I think, a new era began in the growth of the Anglo-American Quaker community; and, for that matter, in American Quakerism itself. Born and brought up in the rather evangelical New England Yearly Meeting affiliated with the Friends of the Middle West, he never let that contact cool.

His life at Haverford College made him a Philadelphia Friend as well. Indeed, he became, we may say, "The American Friend", in keeping with the journal of that name which he created in 1894 by merging the *Friends Review* and its pastoral opponent, the *Christian Worker.* This American Friend studied at Harvard and in Marburg, and his fruitful association with John Wilhelm Rowntree and William C. Braithwaite brought him close to the best in English Quaker thought. So perhaps Rufus Jones, more than the curious one-time Quakeress from Rhode Island, Jemima Wilkinson, who coined the name for herself in the seventeen-nineties, might well be called "The Universal Friend". He and his associates on both sides of the Atlantic—the Rowntrees, the Braithwaites, and many others in England; the Thomases, Sharplesses and Rhoadses, to name only a few in America—fused a new unity into twentieth-century Quakerism.

After about 1890 American Friends themselves gradually grew together. The evangelical yearly meetings centralized their activities somewhat in a Five Years Meeting in Richmond, while Hicksite and Orthodox Friends in the East began to co-operate in Young Friends' affairs, in social, historical, and philanthropic enterprises. The challenge of the First Great War not only to Friends' cherished testimony for peace, but to their ingenuity to do something to make peace a possibility, found English and American Friends working side by side in a new approach to Quaker service and fellowship. A World Conference of Friends resulted in London in 1920 and a Friends World Committee after the second conference at Swarthmore and Haverford in 1937. In response to the opportunity which a world almost continually in the process of war or reconstruction presented, the Anglo-American Quaker community began to take on the characteristics of a world community of Friends.

As we review the interplay of British and American Quaker influences through three centuries, we may now ask what kind of a pattern discloses itself. Certainly that pattern shows considerable complexity. England has not supplied all the inspiration and leadership, nor has America been always either a passive recipient or a radical innovator. In their ardent embracing of Evangelicalism, in their vigorous advocacy of women's rights both within and without the Quaker community, in their more rapid abandonment,

perhaps, of some of the ancient peculiarities of Quaker dress and address, the Quakers of the American frontier may seem to have been radical. But as the frontier passed, and America moved toward a more complex industrial society, but less swiftly so than did Britain, American Friends sometimes appeared to be more conservative than Friends across the water. Some of them indeed criticized British Friends for being too closely involved in the political activities of a labour movement and the social policies of a welfare state. But this perhaps was simply a carry-over from the individualism of the frontier, an individualism which may appear radical in one contex and conservative in another.

In any event, we now recognize that in the Quaker community of the twentieth century all have a role to play. Friends from Europe, from America, from Africa, from Asia, and from Australasia each contribute something to the totality of Quaker thought and action. English and American Friends each have their talents and their place. This dual role might be described, but too simply, as one of ideas and action. I recall how Charles J. Rhoads, the Philadelphia Friend who directed American Quaker relief work in France in 1918, once described to me the difference which he saw between the young men on the British and American teams. The British, Charles Rhoads said, far outshone the Americans in their ability to handle themselves in discussing the problems of the day. They had minds sharpened by the kind of education which Britain gives her best young men—an education in ideas and how to deal with them. The Americans, on the other hand, led the group when they were in the field. Whether it was a balky Model T Ford to be fixed or a prefabricated house to put up, they did it quickly and effectively. Their educational experience had had a strongly practical bent.

But we cannot be content with any such simple division of Anglo-American Quakers into thinkers and doers. We can say, however, that since William Penn's day English and American Quakerism have grown up side by side in a continuing community of Friends. Gradually the Quaker New World, influenced by its own extraordinary environment, developed differences in outlook and character from the older Quaker world in Britain. American Friends, though always sensitive to currents of thought from England, produced

certain ideas and leadership on their own part. Cut off somewhat by political independence, shaken by Evangelicalism, and exposed to the transforming influences of the Western frontier, they seemed for a time to lose contact with British Quakerism, and to give themselves over to innovation, schism, and separation. But primary Quaker principles eventually reasserted their binding strength, and the increasing homogeneity of the common culture in which Friends lived, better education, and a deeper sense of the needs of a world in travail, drew Friends in Britain and America back together in the twentieth century. Now, partners rather than leaders and followers, they share in a renewed and vital Atlantic Quaker community.