PRISONERS PRESENT ARMS: SECTARIAN CHRISTIANS AND THE AMERICAN CARCERAL STATE DURING THE FIRST WORLD WAR

A Thesis Presented for the
Master of Arts
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Joshua Ward Jeffery
December 2018

For Candace.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express deep gratitude to Dr. Ernest Freeberg for his support and guidance during my tenure in graduate school. I would like to thank Drs. Vejas Liulevicius and Tore Olsson for serving on my thesis committee. A special thank you to the library faculty and staff of the University of Michigan, Bentley Historical Library, who awarded me a Bordin-Gillette Research Fellowship which made this thesis possible. Special thanks as well to my colleague O.J. Early, who read through several versions of the manuscript, made helpful comments along the way, and provided a real sense of scholarly comradery over the last two years. Also, thanks to Jay Beaman, a sociologist of religion and fellow traveler, who has provided immeasurable support, both human and academic, since he first began to mentor me at Warner Pacific College. Any and all errors and shortcomings are of course, only my own.

ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates the prison experiences of Arthur Dunham, Harold Gray, Evan Thomas, and other conscientious objectors to the First World War. It demonstrates that the Federal government of the United States used scientific management techniques, including the initiation of a discourse of 100% Americanism, the use of propaganda to spread this discourse, and the use of this discourse to encourage Americans to keep their friends, neighbors, and relatives under surveillance. These techniques were used together in order to create an American "carceral state" that allowed the government to surveil and discipline its population in such a way as to establish a hegemonic, pro-war attitude that enlisted the population in enforcing new norms upon American society.

I argue that while the carceral state obtained compliance from a large portion of society, it failed to persuade an important subset of Americans: sectarians. It argues that historians of American religion have generally under theorized the divisions between American religious groups, which has resulted in a progressive/conservative dichotomy that has placed responsibility for American involvement in the First World War with Progressive Christians. Applying the Church-Sect theory of Ernest Troeltsch, Max Weber, and H. Richard Niebuhr, I argue that both Progressives and conservatives supported the war effort, and that it was those members of society who held to a sectarian position (either religious or secular) which rejected American social and culture norms and therefore, with them, involvement in the war, including the rejection of conscription. Such an approach not only reframes the debate over responsibility for the war, but calls on historians to pay closer attention to sectarian groups and their influence upon American religious history.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Chapter One: Setting the Table for War, Resistance, and Suppression 17

Chapter Two: Citizenship and Duty: Arthur Dunham Meets the Carceral State 27

Chapter Three: Segregation in Camp Riley, Prison at Fort Leavenworth 42

Chapter Four: The Dark Side of the Progressive Managerial (Carceral) State 58

Conclusion: Dunham and His Unpublishable Story 68

Bibliography 76

Vita 81

Introduction

The Saturday after Thanksgiving Day in 1918, Arthur Dunham stood handcuffed to the bars of a dark, cold, solitary confinement cell in the basement of the Fort Leavenworth Disciplinary Barracks in Leavenworth, Kansas, for twelve hours. Dunham was subject to the hole because he was incarcerated at the U.S. Army's military prison as a conscientious objector (CO) to the First World War.[1] Growing up Presbyterian and serving his church as an itinerant minister, Dunham was an unlikely candidate for solitary confinement in what prisoners at Leavenworth called "the hole." Dunham was a social worker from Saint Louis, who had earned his bachelor's degree from Washington University in Saint Louis, and had recently earned an M.A. in political science from the University of Illinois in 1917. With those degrees in hand, Dunham was one of the most highly educated conscientious objectors in the entire army.

Despite Dunham's education, his outspoken and outgoing nature, and his familiarity and connections with the conscientious objectors that he was incarcerated with, Dunham's experience at Leavenworth has remained unexamined by historians. His witness against war was overshadowed by Harold Studley Gray and Evan Thomas, both of whom were sons of prosperous, well known families, and who both successfully published their memoirs. Gray published his memoirs in the 1930s, as a caution against American involvement in what would become the Second World War. Evan Thomas' memoirs were published just months after his death in 1974. However, while Thomas himself was not famous during his lifetime, his brother, Norman Thomas, was the Socialist Party candidate for President in six subsequent elections after the death of Eugene Debs in 1926. Conversely, Dunham wrote his memoirs shortly after he was released from prison in 1919, and attempted to publish them in 1920. However, with the U.S.

[1] Arthur Dunham, The Narrative of a Conscientious Objector, Unpublished Manuscript, 117-134.

embroiled in the Red Scare during this time, as well as the onset of a general disillusionment with "the war to end all wars," Dunham was unable to find a publisher.

Dunham's unpublished memoirs, which are held at the University of Michigan's Bentley Library, have been occasionally excerpted or referenced by scholars. However, most of his writing has been ignored by historians of the First World War. This is unfortunate, because Dunham's correspondence during his incarceration, and his memoirs which were based upon those letters, focused exclusively on the conditions of the camp where he was inducted, the CO quarters he resided in for a short time, and then the guard house, and finally, the military prison in which he was incarcerated. Dunham, as a social worker and as a student of human behavior, described the conditions in the guard house and in the military prison more carefully than any other chronicler of the period. Included in his correspondence and his memoirs were records of his interactions with sectarians, both religious and secular, who opposed U.S. entry and participation into the war in Europe. Dunham's writings provide a unique perspective into the conditions that COs and war resisters faced during the war years and their immediate aftermath. Arthur Dunham knew both Harold Gray and Evan Thomas, but he also knew many of the other COs to the war and went out of his way to chronicle his interactions with them.

Dunham's observations of his fellow prisoners and conscientious objectors were so exacting and distinct because, as a keen, trained sociological observer, he made note of the beliefs, values, and experiences of his fellow inmates in greater detail. What emerges is a profile not of the more visible liberal elite conscientious objector—such as Gray and Thomas—but of the vast majority of COs, who were sectarians. In fact, at the start of the war, as both an intellectual and as a member of the Presbyterian church, Dunham was not a sectarian himself. Instead, his experience with the Army war machine arguably made him one. He left the

Presbyterian church to become an independent Christian, and ultimately, a Quaker. His observations, and his own life trajectory, give us a unique window on the CO experience that helps us understand the centrality of sectarianism to conscientious objection in the United States. From his experiences, we can see how sectarians—the largest group of anti-war Americans after the declaration of war in April 1917—understood and faced the conflict.

The government used scientific management techniques, including the initiation of a discourse of 100% Americanism, the use of propaganda to spread this discourse, and the use of this discourse to encourage Americans to keep their friends, neighbors, and relatives under surveillance.[2] These techniques were used together in order to create an American "carceral state" that allowed the government to surveil and discipline its population in such a way as to establish a hegemonic, pro-war attitude that enlisted the population in enforcing new norms upon American society.[3] Stated another way, the federal government succeeded in policing its population by convincing the population to police itself.

However, while the government convinced its population to police itself once the U.S. took up arms against Germany, this group of techniques failed to control one group of American citizens: sectarians. I will argue that sectarians—such as Arthur Dunham—made up the vast majority of conscientious objectors in the United States after the declaration of war in April of

---

[2] A historiography of the historiography of "The New Military History" is developing as scholars grapple with what is "new" about this type of history, what methods ought to be used, and if there should be a distinction now between the studies of society and war, operational history, and cultural military history. For a full discussion, see the following: Michael S. Neiberg, "War and Society," in *Palgrave Advances in Modern Military History*, ed. Matthew Hughes and William J. Philpott (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 42-60; Joanna Bourke, "New Military History," in *Palgrave Advances in Modern Military History*, ed. Matthew Hughes and William J. Philpott (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 258-280; Robert M. Citino, "Military Histories Old and New: A Reintroduction," *American Historical Review* 112, no. 4 (October 2007): 1070-90.

[3] The idea of the carceral state, and an all-encompassing surveillance through the technology of Jeremy Bentham's "panopticon" was first advanced by Michel Foucault in *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 1995). A more recent use of the idea can be found in Avram Bornstien, "Military Occupation as Carceral Society: Prisons, Checkpoints, and Walls in the Israeli-Palestinian Struggle," in *An Anthropology of War,* Alisse Waterson, ed. (New York: Berghahn Books, 2014), 116-140.

1917.[4] Historians of American religion up to this point have argued over whether "progressive" or "conservative" churches were more to blame for religious support of the conflict. I will argue, however, that applying the Church-Sect typology of Troeltsch, Niebuhr, and others to the religious groups in America in 1917 will help break this false dichotomy and will demonstrate that the majority of religious opposition to WWI came from sectarian Christians—such as Arthur Dunham—while the majority of religious support for the war came from both modernist and fundamentalist groups who came together behind Woodrow Wilson in order to cheer on American arms under the banner of messianic interventionism.[5]

Furthermore, I will argue that by applying Church-Sect typology to "secular" categories such as socialists, anarchists, and Wobblies, it will become clear that war resisters, whether religious or secular, were part of sectarian groups.[6] I define a group as a "sect" or as "sectarian" if they are indifferent or antagonistic to the larger values of their culture; which focuses inwardly towards itself and its members, in order to ensure purity of doctrine or political belief; which rejects the domination of the larger world around them through the use of state coercion; and which seeks to transform society through convincing others to join their movement, and then, the eventual replacement of the institutions of society with those of the group.[7] Furthermore, many,

---

[4] For an overview of the fairly new historiography of religion and war, see the following: Harry S. Stout, "Religion, War, and the Meaning of America", *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation* 19, no. 2 (Summer 2009): 275-89; and John D. Carlson and Jonathan H. Ebel, eds. *From Jeremiad to Jihad: Religion, Violence, and America* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2012).

[5] The Church-Sect Typology was developed by several theologians over the course of the 20th Century. See Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, trans. Olive Wyon (New York: McMillan Company, 1927) and H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (New York: Henry Holt Company, 1929).

[6] Sociologist of religion Newt Fowler has also argued that the term sect can be properly applied to secular groups, stating that the term sect "can refer to parties of similar traits in the arts, in politics, in science, as well as in religion." See Newton B. Fowler, Jr., "Church and Sect Applied to Early Disciples: Limitations of Troeltsch and Niebuhr," *Discpliana* 56, no. 2 (Summer 1996): 60.

[7] I base this definition, in part, on the definition provided by Ernst Troeltsch. See *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, trans. Olive Wyon (New York: McMillan Company, 1927), 1:331.

but not all, sectarian groups, are led by a charismatic leader.[8] As such, groups including anarchists, non-state Marxists, and many new religious movements fit this category. This is not to say that sectarians and their institutions are not political, or that they do not involve themselves in the public sphere. Sectarian groups may or may not visibly participate in the politics of the day. Instead, the hallmark of the sectarian is their antagonism to the wider culture.

The story of the incarceration of Arthur Dunham and his associates helps to provide a window into the historiography of religion and war, and provides ample narrative evidence for these arguments. Dunham, as an "independent," sectarian Christian, opposed the war due to his convictions that war and killing were immoral. Dunham as a social worker and political scientist, viewed the government's management of the war, the population, and COs through the lens of the Progressivism, of which he was a dyed-in-the-wool adherent.

While historians of war and society have examined the First World War in detail, historians of religion and war have spent less ink on the conflict.[9] Any survey of the historiography of religion and the Great War must begin with sociologist Ray Abrams' monograph, *Preachers Present Arms.* Writing in 1933, Abrams sought to fill a gap in the literature, because of the books written about the war up until that time, "few have been concerned with the integral relationship of the civilian population to the whole configuration of

---

[8] See Jay Beaman, "From Sect, to Cult, to Sect: The Christian Catholic Church in Zion, PhD Dissertation, Iowa State University, 1990.

[9] An ample historiography on the topic of War and Society in the New Military History has helped to inform this study. For an in-depth examination of government suppression of pacifism and war resistance, see [9] H.C. Peterson and Gilbert C. Fite, *Opponents of War: 1917-1918* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957); for a comprehensive study of the American "home front" during the conflict, see [9] David M. Kennedy, *Over Here: The First World War and American Society*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), for a discussion of the requirements of war-time citizenship, see Christopher Capozzola, *Uncle Sam Wants You: World War I and the Making of the Modern American Citizen* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010); for a study of the process of conscripting citizens and making them soldiers during the war, see Jennifer D. Keene, *Doughboys, the Great War, and the Remaking of America* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003).

war." To do so, Abrams chose as a sample group "the clergy and the churches of the United States," [10] While Abrams' book focused mostly on the clergy, he carefully balanced this focus on them by showing how their actions impacted the average person in the U.S., and he especially studied the effects felt by those marginalized by the nation's war machine and propaganda.

Abrams presented an unflattering picture of the clergy during the war, arguing that much of the clergy was intimately involved in pushing the U.S. to enter the war on the side of Great Britain.[11] Abrams used the concept of social control, which are the means that a society uses to ensure conformity with societal norms, to analyze the actions of the clergy. He concluded that the clergy, in collusion with the government, played an active role in extending federal hegemony over almost every facet of life in order to ensure full cooperation with the war effort.[12] In so doing, the clergy not only contributed to a rise of nationalism, but they also contributed to the general war-time hysteria and became part of the national propaganda machine.[13] Abrams' work, taken as a whole, showed generally that many of the churches put themselves squarely in the service of the government during the war.

A response to Abrams did not come until 1965, when John F. Piper wrote a dissertation to challenge Abrams' findings. Piper argued that Abrams described the churches of the period as having whole heartedly "sold out" to the American propaganda machine during the war, and that most students of religion had bought into this line of thinking. According to Piper, however, "The primary difficulty with the sell-out theory has been and continues to be that it has very little

---

[10] Ray Hamilton Abrams, *Preachers Present Arms: A Study of the War-time Attitudes and Activities of the Churches and the Clergy in the United States, 1914-1918* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1933), xiii.

[11] Ibid, 41-48.

[12] Ibid, xiv-xvi.

[13] Ibid, 95-124.

validity. In fact, there is no reason to give it any credence except as an artifact of historical interpretation."[14] With one quick sweep in this short article that shares a name with that of his later published dissertation revised into monograph, Piper set up a caricature of Abrams' argument and then just as quickly dismissed it as a mere historical construction.

Piper, though, had more issues with Abrams' text than just what he perceived to be its thesis. Objecting strongly to Abrams' claim of being an objective social scientist, Piper claimed:

> he approached his subject with a strong pacifist bias and a determination to show that not only the war but all those who shared in it were morally wrong. The singlemindedness [sic] of his work helped him establish his point and also led him to misunderstand much of the churches' ministry. The discovery of acculturation in the churches' wartime work was like finding sand on a beach. … What Abrams missed was the work and testimony of those who accepted the war but who agonized over their roles, who sought a national wartime ministry that would lift up the Gospel, and who also gradually came to realize that the struggle had changed life for them and their institutions.[15]

While it is obvious that Abrams wrote from a biased point of view, it is difficult to substantiate the claim that he "misunderstood much of the churches' ministry." Abrams' interest in writing had not been to discuss the church as a totality, but to highlight how the government was able to co-opt the clergy as instruments of social control, and to demonstrate how the clergy had acted as a barometer for what was occurring in the culture at large.[16]

While Piper outlined and caricatured the role of the clergy in the politics of the nation, Richard M. Gamble fully fleshed out this role in his book *The War for Righteousness: Progressive Christianity, the Great War, and the Rise of the Messianic Nation.* Gamble began by critiquing Abrams sociological approach in one sentence, before stating his thesis that "the liberal clergy were not merely lackeys in the Wilson administration's attempts at social control,

---

[14] John F. Piper, "The American Churches in World War I," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 38, no. 2 (June 1970): 148.

[15] John F. Piper, *The American Churches in World War I* (Athens, OH: Ohio UP, 1985), 2-3.

[16] Clyde Penrose St. Amant, review of *Preachers Present Arms*, by Ray H. Abrams, *Review and Expositor* 68, no. 1 (Winter 1971): 144.

nor were they caught unaware and unprepared by the outbreak of war; rather, these forward-looking clergy embraced the war as a chance to achieve their broadly defined social gospel objectives."[17] Gamble saw the clergy as willing government agents, acting to secure their own agenda. Gamble also summed up Piper's work in a single sentence, and used Piper's argument to bolster his own, stating that "the Protestant denominations contributed to the war effort in some very practical and visible ways—through relief work and various ministries to the soldiers at home and abroad…"[18] Gamble argued that this relief work and the various ministries aligned with the Social Gospel of the progressive clergy, which would allow them to baptize the conflict as a progressive war of Christian messianism to the nations.

Gamble searched for an interventionist, crusading progressive clergy to hold responsible for the war, and this is exactly what he found. Gamble argued that without a clergy that saw the Kingdom of God as synonymous with western culture, a total war in Europe could not have occurred. Gamble saw the intellectual arguments for "a war to end all wars" coming primarily from the clergy. Like Abrams, he saw the clergy as participating in the propaganda machine, pushing American interventionism, and doing so because they believed it would help them to fulfill their goals in spreading their own form of an American gospel worldwide. As such, Gamble argues, the clergy were not simply the tools of the government, but participants in the Progressive machine for controlling and shaping both American politics and society.

Gamble, however, recently changed his mind about the responsibility of progressives for the war. In a recent book chapter, he argued against a liberal-conservative dichotomy, with progressives being the ones who supported the war effort. Instead, Gamble proposed an

---

[17] Richard M. Gamble, *The War for Righteousness: Progressive Christianity, the Great War, and the Rise of the Messianic Nation* (Wilmington, DE: Intercollegiate Studies Institute, 2003), 3.

[18] Ibid, 155.

evangelical versus confessional dichotomy, with evangelicals largely endorsing an American Civil Religion in the hopes that the war would "be a global force for righteousness."[19] As evidence that he was incorrect, Gamble pointed to an article titled "No False Peace," which was an open letter originally published in the *Outlook* and which was subsequently republished in many different journals in 1917. The article called on President Wilson to reject any peace that did not result from an allied decisive victory, and also to resist the efforts of pacifists to keep the U.S. out of the conflict. The letter was signed by an amalgam of progressive and fundamentalist ministers and religious leaders, including the conservative itinerant preacher Billy Sunday, and progressives such as Lyman Abbot and Harry Emerson Fosdick.[20]

After questioning whether or not the label "evangelical" was a useful description in trying to understand the majority of American Christians, Gamble suggested that using the categories of Paul Kleppner would be more fruitful. Gamble thus proposed to examine the churches through a "pietist-confessionalist continuum" instead of through a lens of progressive versus conservative.[21] Pietist Christians, under a broad definition, include Methodists, Baptists, many Lutherans (especially from Scandinavia), Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and the Disciples of Christ. Confessionalists, in contrast, include Catholics, the Orthodox, some Lutherans, and Anglicans. Gamble saw the Pietists as having an interest in perpetuating "a cultural and morally Christian America," while the Confessionalists had less of a cultural stake in the maintenance of an American "Christian identity."[22] Gamble suggested that if historians

---

[19] Richard Gamble, "Together for the Gospel of Americanism, Evangelicals and the First World War," in *American Churches in the First World War*, ed. Gordon L. Heath (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2016), 17.

[20] Ibid, 15, 18.

[21] Ibid, 20-21.

[22] Ibid, 29.

embrace this "pietist-confessionalist continuum," that they might find something new. Gamble argued, in a statement that deserves quotation at length, that if this work is done, that:

> such a study might uncover a group of apolitical preachers who cared for their flock on Sunday, 8 April 1917—the Sunday after Congress declared war—much as they had done every Sunday before. . . Perhaps they prayed with particular urgency for those in authority in a time of national crisis and met the extraordinary demands of a congregation whose sons had enlisted or would soon be drafted. But they never thought of displaying the stars and stripes on or in their churches and certainly not draped across their altars. They never included . . . "The Battle Hymn of the republic" in their order of worship. Instead, they preached on the mission of the church and not the mission of America, took care not to confuse spiritual and physical warfare, and never thought of interpreting God's promises to Israel and to the church as if they were meant for the united states. If such a group could be found for the First World War and all the way back to the Revolutionary War and forward to the War on Terror, and that group turned out to be large, then the entire narrative of American religious history, especially of religion and war, would have to be retold.[23]

Gamble was correct that finding such a group would require a rewriting of American religious history. However, it is highly unlikely that such a group will be found among Confessionalists.

If Gamble's old dichotomy of progressive versus conservative was problematic (and the fact that it was will be demonstrated below), his new dichotomy between Pietist and Confessionalist was even more so. Paul Kleppner's classic work, *The Cross of Culture: A Social Analysis of Midwestern Politics 1850-1900,* argued that Pietists typically voted Republican, and that Confessionalists tended to vote Democratic.[24] However, Kleppner also showed through his analysis of voting patterns that Southern Pietists also voted Democratic, often for reasons surrounding race. However, Kleppner also demonstrated that these voting patterns changed dramatically after the Depression of 1893, which created a complete realignment of voting patterns. Therefore, Kleppner's categories, while possibly being politically salient before 1893, lack any meaning for the era of World War I politics. Gamble's first false dichotomy, that of conservative versus progressive Christians, was actually much more believable than his second.

---

[23] Ibid, 29-30.

[24] Paul Kleppner, *The Cross of Culture: A Social Analysis of Midwestern Politics 1850-1900* (New York: The Free Press, 1970).

Gamble was not the only one who came to see that his dichotomy between Progressive and Conservative Christians and support for the war effort was a false one. Andrew Preston challenged Gamble's thesis in *The War for Righteousness* in a chapter that recently appeared in *Beyond 1917: The United States and the Global Legacies of the Great War.*[25] Preston, who apparently had not yet read Gamble's revision of his own thesis which had appeared the year before, argued against Gamble's original dichotomy, demonstrating that conservatives were just as much in favor of the war effort as Progressives. In fact, Preston argued that conservative Christians provided "shrill and unquestioning support for America's cause."[26] Preston, in a larger argument about whether the Great War caused a decline in American religion, declared that "Conservative Protestants were never apolitical, and they never separated themselves from American society to retreat into their own subculture."[27] Preston's argument demonstrates, along with Gamble's, that historians of American religion have largely misunderstood the relationship between American religious groups, and have neglected theory which would provide greater clarity to what was occurring during the war. The social relations of American religious groups to the world should be measured according to Sect-Church typology. According to H. Richard Niebuhr, Max Weber, and Ernest Troeltsch, a religious group that separates itself from the larger culture and retreats into its own sub-culture is a sect. Sects are, by definition, not liberal or conservative. They stand apart from oppose the larger political and social institutions of the dominant culture. Denominations, on the other hand, have made peace with the larger culture, and share its values. Churches, the third Weberian ideal type, are dominant religious groups that

---

[25] Andrew Preston, "To Make the World Saved: American Religion and the Great War," in *Beyond 1917: The United States and the Global Legacies of the Great War*, ed. Thomas W. Zeiler, David K. Ekbladh, and Benjamin C. Montoya (Oxford University Press: New York, 1917), 142-58.

[26] Ibid, 147.

[27] Ibid, 145.

claim universality and that often see citizenship as synonymous with church membership.[28] Churches make significant accommodations to culture.[29]

The earliest sectarian groups appeared during the Reformation. Lutherans, as a renewal movement of the Catholic church and as opposed to many of the dominant social values, would have been the first sectarian group of the Reformation. Calvinist churches soon followed, along with the Mennonites, Quakers, and the Church of the Brethren. However, as Troeltsch and Niebuhr argue, most sectarian groups soon become denominations. Lutherans and Calvinists quickly made peace with the dominant culture. Mennonites, Quakers, and the Church of the Brethren, however, were able to resist such acculturating influences and became "institutionalized sects," which maintained their otherworldly stance while developing elaborate systems of organization. In the U.S., with the dissolution of established churches, sectarian groups, including what would become the institutionalized sects, flourished. Methodists, Baptists, and Sandemanians were some of the first sects in the United States. However, by the advent of the First World War, only the Sandemanians remained sectarian. In the early twentieth century, a whole new group of sectarian groups emerged. These included, but are not limited to, the Churches of Christ, various Pentecostal groups, Adventists, the International Student Bible Association (later known as Jehovah's Witnesses), and Christian Scientists.[30]

Most Sectarian groups, which were the chief religious opponents to American participation in the war in 1917, were theological and political radicals. For example, in the

---

[28] Historically, the church-type has included the Anglican Church in England, and the Catholic Church in France and Italy.

[29] For church and sect theory, see Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, trans. Olive Wyon (New York: McMillan Company, 1927), 1:331. For the denomination, see H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (New York: Henry Holt Company, 1929), 3-25.

[30] See Paul Conkin, *American Originals: Homemade Varieties of Christianity* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1997), for histories and descriptions of the vast majority of these sectarian groups.

Churches of Christ, a sectarian group that broke from the mainline, denominational Disciples of Christ in 1906, most members were either socialists or anarchists. Not coincidentally, the sect was also the largest pacifist group in America in 1917.[31]

Sectarian groups are typically anti-war. Denominational and Church typed religious groups, however, are typically pro-war. This is easily seen by dividing groups into their sect/denomination/church categories, and seeing which was and was not pro-war. Sectarian groups in 1917 included Restorationists, Pentecostals, Holiness groups, Adventists, and the International Bible Students Association. All five were anti-war, and members from all were arrested and prosecuted for resisting the conflict.[32] Denominational groups included Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Congregationalists. None of the major denominations or churches in the United States had a significant number of conscientious objectors or war resisters.

Having dealt with the original Gamble thesis, along with Preston's corrective, let us quickly return to Gamble's new dichotomy, that of pietist versus confessional. Gamble's suggestion is based upon the work of Paul Kleppner and Frederick Luebke, but while arguing that historians should examine this dichotomy more carefully, he provides no examples of this idea in action. Since Gamble fails to apply the theory to the war, he leaves this work to other historians. Since I have no argument of Gamble's to analyze, I will propose my own. A look at draft cards easily challenges Gamble's suggestion. Jay Beaman, a sociologist of religion, has

---

[31] For the claim that most Church of Christ members were anarchists, and that the group was the largest peace church in the United States, see Joshua W. Jeffery, "Spies, Slackers, and Saboteurs: Federal Suppression of Religious Pacifism in the Churches of Christ During World War I" (master's thesis, Vanderbilt University, 2015). For Church of Christ socialists, see Michael W. Casey "From Religious Outsiders to Insiders: The Rise and Fall of Pacifism in the Churches of Christ", *Journal of Church and State* 44, no. 3 (2002).

[32] For Restorationists, see Jeffery, ""Spies, Slackers, and Saboteurs." For Pentecostals and Holiness adherents, see Jay Beaman, *Pentecostal Pacifism: The Origin, Development, and Rejection of Pacific Belief Among the Pentecostals* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009). FOR ISBA arrests, see M. James Penton, "The Bible Students / Jehovah's Witnesses in the United States during the First World War," in *American Churches in the First World War*, ed. Gordon L. Heath (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2016).

found close to 11,000 draft cards of conscientious objectors to World War I. Of this number, sectarian groups make up 84.5% of CO draft cards. Comparatively, German Pietists *and* Confessionalists make up just 0.6% of CO draft cards. Just due to their small numbers, it is easy to dismiss a Pietest versus Confessionalist dichotomy as being the controlling paradigm for understanding which religious Americans were for or against American intervention in the Great War.[33] The correct paradigm for understanding how religious groups responded to the war is that of sect versus denomination. American religious groups on the whole, whether conservative or liberal, denomination or church, supported the war effort once Congress declared war. It was America's sectarian groups, including Restorationists, Pentecostals, Holiness groups, and IBSA, along with the Historic Peace Sects, such as the Mennonites, Quakers, and Church of the Brethren, who opposed American entry to World War I.

Gamble's new dichotomy can be further laid to rest by examining his claim that a study of the Pietist-Confessional continuum "might uncover a group of apolitical preachers," who did not give into nationalism, did not wave the flag, and did not play the *Battle Hymn of the Republic*. Gamble argued, "If such a group could be found for the First World War and all the way back to the Revolutionary War and forward to the War on Terror, and that group turned out to be large, then the entire narrative of American religious history, especially of religion and war, would have to be retold."[34] In fact, such a group *has* been overlooked by American historians of religion due to their improper over-focus on denominations and churches. However, this group is not found among the Confessionalists, but among the Restorationist sectarians. Restorationist

---

[33] Jay Beaman, "Un-muting the Genealogy of Peace, WWI" (paper Presented at the "Remembering Muted Voices Symposium: Conscience, Dissent, Resistance and Civil Liberties in World War I Through Today, Kansas City, KS, October 21, 2017), 34.

[34] Richard Gamble, "Together for the Gospel of Americanism, Evangelicals and the First World War," in *American Churches in the First World War*, ed. Gordon L. Heath (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2016), 29-30.

groups have a long heritage. The Sandemanians, a Restorationist group founded in Scotland in 1730, had congregations on the eastern seaboard of North America as early as 1750. These Restorationists were brutally attacked during the American Revolution for being pacifists.[35] The Sandemanians, who died out in the U.S. in the late 19th Century, made a major impact on the thought and theology of Alexander Campbell, one of the founders of the Stone-Campbell Movement, which spawned the Churches of Christ, the Disciples of Christ, and the Christadelphians. Campbell's Movement in the U.S. can be dated to 1812, and it absorbed many Sandemanian congregations.[36] Both the Churches of Christ and the Christadelphians maintained a fervent pacifistic theology throughout the American Civil War, World War I, and into World War II. While Church of Christ pacifism has waned since World War II, the pacifism of the group still exists in some quarters. [37] Christadelphians have also maintained their pacifism. Furthermore, the events of World War I rekindled pacifism among the Disciples of Christ, a group which remains at the forefront of the Christian peace movement in the U.S. today.[38]

Yet, while pacifist Restorationists have indeed existed throughout American history, they have largely been ignored by historians. Sociologist R. Lawrence Moore, in his influential

---

[35] The Sandemanians were also known as the Glasites in Scotland, after their founder, John Glas. The Sandemanian name was used outside of Scotland, where they were known by their chief missionary, Robert Sandeman, the son-in-law of John Glas. For an account of the Sandemanians during the Revolution, see Jean F. Hankins, "A Different Kind of Loyalist: The Sandemanians of New England During the Revolutionary War," *New England Quarterly* 31, no. 3 (1987): 223-49. For a history of the Sandemanians in America during the whole of the 19th Century, see John Howard Smith, *The Perfect Rule of the Christian Religion: A History of Sandemanianism in the Eighteenth Century* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2008). Also see Joshua W. Jeffery, *The Glasite Political Theology Project,* http://www.glasite.com/.

[36] For a discussion of the influence of Sandemanian and Haldanite Restorationists on Alexander Campbell and the theology of the Stone-Campbell Movement, see James L. Gorman, *Among the Early Evangelicals: The Transatlantic Origins of the Stone-Campbell Movement* (Abilene, TX: Abilene Christian University Press, 2016).

[37] For evidence of this claim, see my MTS thesis, Jeffery, "Spies, Slackers, and Saboteurs."

[38] For Disciples, see my article Joshua Ward Jeffery, "'A Barbarous Method of Adjusting Differences': Federal Persecution of Conscientious Objectors in the Disciples During the Great War, 1917-1918," *Stone-Campbell Journal* 20, no. 1 (April 2017): 17-33.

book, *Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans*, has argued that the Disciples of Christ and the Churches of Christ, while being "denominations that have recently been granted mainline status," have "nonetheless remained on the edges of general narratives of American religious history."[39] Finally, in regards to size, the Churches of Christ were the largest peace church in America during World War I, and Restorationist sects and denominations, taken together, continue to be one of the largest Protestant religious groups in the United States. Based on this data, I would suggest that I agree with Richard Gamble's analysis at least in one way: that the entire narrative of American religious history, especially of religion and war, needs to be retold. This thesis, which argues that sectarians made up the vast majority of conscientious objectors to the First World War, provides one solid step in that direction.

[39] R. Laurence Moore, *Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), xiv.

Chapter One: Setting the Table for War, Resistance, and Suppression

When what would become known as the First World War erupted in Europe in July of 1914, most Americans were stunned. "The impossible has happened," declared the Christian Century, one of the leading journals of mainline Christianity at the start of the war. The editor continued, "The nations that have been leading in the world's progress have suddenly abandoned their peaceful and productive pursuits to fly at each other's throats. The world looks on in horror that lacks words for its expression." America's connections to Germany were particularly strong, he explained, but America's sympathies with England were also "deep." He also stated, with great hope, that the war would bring universal peace.[40]

Theodore H. Price of *The Outlook* also thought the war "unthinkable," and therefore, "impossible," but declared that if hostilities did fully commence, the world would "revert to primeval chaos and the reconstruction of civilization will have to be undertaken *de novo."*[41] Roland G. Usher at *The Atlantic Monthly* called the war "literally incomprehensible."[42] Arthur Dunham, who turned 21 just days after the declaration of war in 1914, and who had recently finished a bachelor's degree at Washington University in St. Louis, found the war to be "far-off and unreal."[43] Soon, Dunham would find the war to be close to home and very real.

While some Americans, such as former President Theodore Roosevelt, urged the government to prepare the United States to enter the conflict, most Americans wanted nothing to

---

[40] Charles Clayton Morrison, "Man's Wrath Praising God," *The Christian Century* 31, no. 34 (August 20, 1914): 789.

[41] Theodore H. Price, "Commerce and Finance: The Overture of War as Heard in Wall Street," *The Outlook* (15 August 1914): 934-937.

[42] Roland G. Usher, "The Reasons Behind the War," *The Atlantic Monthly* (October 1914): 441-451.

[43] Arthur Dunham, The Narrative of a Conscientious Objector, Unpublished Manuscript, 4.

do with the European war.[44] The editors of the *Outlook*, however, not only argued that the U.S. should immediately engage in a preparedness campaign—specifically for the Navy—but that the country should also seek commercial independence. Their plans included new laws that would authorize the purchasing of foreign flagged ocean-going vessels by U.S. citizens for the purpose of creating an American merchant fleet.[45]

But while politicians, businessmen, and the editors of major social, literary, and religious journals quickly supported preparedness efforts, many ordinary Americans mobilized to oppose both preparedness and any American involvement in the war. Michael Kazin has convincingly argued that anti-war activists "organized the largest, most diverse, and most sophisticated peace coalition to that point in U.S. history. Not until the movement to end the Vietnam War half a century later would there be as large, as influential, and as tactically adroit a campaign against U.S. intervention in another land. There has been none to rival it since."[46] These opponents included much of the American public: socialists, radical union members from the International Workers of the World, sectarian pacifists, progressive Christians, progressive secularists, feminists, ethnic Germans, and many others who had no interest in the U.S. joining the fray.[47]

But while the majority of Americans opposed joining the war in 1914, a series of events slowly worked to turn public opinion solidly against Germany, even if it did not convince most Americans that the United States should enter the conflict when it did in 1917. At the beginning

---

[44] "Mr. Roosevelt on the War," *The Outlook, (*15 August 1914): 886.

[45] "The Duties of the United States," *The Outlook*, (15 August 1914): 893-4.

[46] Michael Kazin, *War Against War: the American Fight for Peace, 1914-1918* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2017), xii.

[47] For a discussion of American feminists opposing the war, see Frances H. Early, *World Without War: How U.S. Feminists and Pacifists Resisted World War I* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1997). For detailed discussion of the rest of these groups and their resistance to the war, see H.C. Peterson and Gilbert C. Fite, *Opponents of War: 1917-1918* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957).

of the war, Great Britain began blockading German ports to prevent war material from the U.S. and other neutral countries from reaching Germany. In retaliation and to prevent similar materials from reaching England, German submarines attacked British ships, especially those suspected of carrying munitions and war supplies. In 1915, a German submarine attacked and sunk the RMS Lusitania, killing 1,198 souls, including 128 Americans. Americans were outraged at the attack, even though Germany had warned the government that it planned to attack the ship, and had even published written warnings in New York newspapers above and below advertisements for the Lusitania.[48] Germany quickly realized that such events would turn the tide of public opinion against it, and subsequently ceased submarine warfare against civilian vessels in order to keep the United States from joining the war on the side of the allies.[49] As a progressive Christian who was well educated, Dunham most likely supported President Woodrow Wilson's argument that Americans should be neutral in thought and in deed. However, Dunham provided no extant evidence as to his attitude during this time.

Germany engaged in other reckless acts that raised American ire. German agents sabotaged munitions plants. An American-born but German raised doctor engaged in biological warfare, injecting American horses bound for the western front with anthrax and other toxic substances, killing or crippling them. German agents also used explosives to destroy stockpiled munitions on Black Tom Island in New Jersey.[50] These actions not only angered many

---

[48] "German Embassy Issues Warning: Advertises Notice of Danger to Travelers in the War Zone," *New York Times*, May 1, 1915.

[49] For a full account of the Lusitania disaster, see Willi Jasper, *Lusitania: The Cultural History of a Catastrophe* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016).

[50] On the explosion at Black Tom Island, see Jules Witcover, *Sabotage at Black Tom: Imperial Germany's Secret War in America, 1914-1917* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: Algonquin Books, 1989). For German operations against American horses bound for the front, see Robert L. Koenig, *The Fourth Horseman: One Man's Secret Mission to Wage the Great War in America* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2006).

Americans, but also increased suspicion of German-Americans in the U.S., some of whom would pay the price for these events during vigilante attacks. Even more ominous in the minds of many, however, was the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare by the Germans.

By late 1916, the German High Command came to believe that it needed to resume unrestricted submarine warfare due to military setbacks, stalemates, and increasing shortages of war material. Germany notified the United States that it would no longer restrict its submarines to strictly military targets, which caused a severe public backlash against Germany in the United States. Evan Thomas learned about the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare first hand, when a passenger ship that he took home from England to the United States was attacked and narrowly escaped being sunk by a German U-Boat.[51]

Additionally, the disclosure of the Zimmerman Telegram—and its attempt to bring Mexico into the war against the United States if the U.S. chose to enter the conflict, infuriated Americans and turned public opinion solidly against Germany. The British waited for a suitable time to forward the telegram on to Washington, and Wilson then used the telegram when he decided to break diplomatic relations with Germany and seek American entrance into the war.[52] Wilson's request for a declaration of war, however, was a major about-face in his policy. In 1914, he had quickly declared in 1914 that the United States was and would be a neutral party in the European war.[53] Michael Kazin has recently and convincingly demonstrated that the vast majority of the country was against American entry into the war, both before and after Congress'

---

[51] Louisa Thomas, *Conscience: Two Soldiers, Two Pacifists, One Family* (New York: Penguin Books, 2012), 177. Also see, "War is Hell in Absence of More Expressive Word, Says Kirby Page," *Houston Chronicle,* n.d, for a more detailed account of this encounter with a German submarine.

[52] For additional background on the Zimmerman Telegram, see Thomas Boghardt, *The Zimmermann Telegram: Intelligence, Diplomacy, and America's Entry into World War I* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2012).

[53] David M. Kennedy, *Over Here: The First World War and American Society*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 46.

declaration, and that the country saw "the largest, most diverse, and most sophisticated peace coalition to that point in U.S. history."[54] In opposition to the established historiography that the nation's pacifists, conscientious objectors, and war resisters were isolationists, Kazin demonstrates that this diverse group that opposed the war were in fact, in the words of Woodrow Wilson, "progressive internationalists."[55] Thus, their opposition to the war was not simply political, but instead, these groups believed for a variety of both religious and secular reasons that killing, and war generally, was morally wrong.[56]

Arthur Dunham was just one among thousands who advocated peace after war broke out in 1914. Dunham, and the many men and women who ended up incarcerated at Fort Leavenworth and other prisons for resisting the war, in many ways perfectly illustrate Kazin's argument that the peace movement in 1917 was the largest and most diverse coalition for peace that the country had ever seen.

Kazin makes this main argument, that the peace movement at the beginning of the war was the largest in American history, by chronicling the bewildering amount of religious and secular peace movements, demonstrations, letter writing campaigns, and other actions to attempt to keep America out of the war from 1914 to 1917.[57] Kazin then demonstrates that the entrance of America in the war did not occur because of a failure of these movements, but instead, because of the election of Woodrow Wilson. Kazin convincingly argues that because Wilson had argued so much for peace, and because he had weathered the pro-war arguments of Republicans

---

[54] Michael Kazin, *War Against War: The American Fight for Peace, 1914-1918* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2017), xii.

[55] Ibid, 47.

[56] Ibid, xiv.

[57] Ibid, 63.

three years before his re-election, Progressives had a difficult time dealing with his about face in the winter and spring of 1917. Kazin shows that many contemporaries believed that if Charles Evans Hughes, the Republican candidate for President, had won instead of Wilson, most Democrats in the House and Senate would most likely have not voted to go to war, and the United States would had stayed out of the conflict.[58]

Since the majority of the country wanted to stay out of the war, Wilson had a serious problem on his hands when he decided to ask Congress for a declaration of war in 1917. While the resumption of submarine warfare, the Zimmerman Telegram, and the President's own about-face on the topic helped win many Americans over to Wilson's side, it certainly did not win over all, or even, according to Kazin, most Americans.

Wilson and Congress turned to the methods of social and cultural control to achieve those goals, including the coercive power of the law. Historians such as Ray Abrams have shown that Wilson's attempts at social control included the criminalization of free speech, freedom of the press, and overt acts that impeded the draft or the war effort. In order to force compliance, Wilson unleashed the police powers of the federal government. He also urged congress to pass laws to deal with what he saw as disloyalty. Congress reacted to Wilson's prompts, and enacted the Espionage Act in June of 1917, originally in order to criminalize espionage conducted by foreign governments.[59] The act was amended, however, by the passage of several acts in May of 1918 that came to be colloquially known as the Sedition Act.[60] The sedition portions of the Espionage Act were enacted largely in response to American citizens—and not foreign agents—

---

[58] Ibid, 146-186.

[59] While the main thrust of the Espionage Act was to prosecute foreign agents, it was also passed and used to prosecute American citizens whose speech was seen as threatening to the war effort.

[60] Abrams, *Preachers Present Arms,* 128.

who were critical of America's entry into and involvement in the war in Europe. Congress criminalized a number of speech acts, either verbally or in writing, which might "interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States."[61] In practice once these laws were passed, statements as innocuous as "the United States should have kept out of this war," were enough to land a person under federal investigation, and in many cases, these simple words could and did lead to arrest and prosecution.[62] The federal agencies tasked with national security during World War I so thoroughly carried out their duties under the Espionage and Sedition Acts that Jeanette Keith, historian of the American South, describes in her book, *Rich Man's War, Poor Man's Fight,* the dragnet that followed as having an:

> intensity and breadth of surveillance that heralded the birth of the American surveillance state. The Bureau of Investigation, the Military Intelligence Division, and the American Protective League were not just spying on leftists, feminists, pacifists, and immigrants—the ''usual suspects'' in the history of state suppression of the American left—they were spying on just about everybody, with the gleeful compliance of everybody's neighbors… Curse the president, bad-mouth the Red Cross ''ladies,'' and before you knew it, you had to account for your words to a federal agent. And not in New York or Washington, but in the smallest, dustiest, crossroads towns in the rural South.[63]

The fact that the federal security apparatus worked so effectively was not lost upon government officials. Attorney General Thomas Gregory saw federal enforcement and surveillance as so efficient that he remarked approvingly that, "It is safe to say that never in its history has this country been so thoroughly policed."[64]

Citizens who opposed the war quickly found that Attorney General Gregory was correct. During the nineteen months that the U.S. was involved in the war, the federal government

---

[61] The act was specifically aimed at false statements, or statements that were intentionally aimed at the government to impede the war effort. For the full text of the act, see 50 U.S.C. 4 § 40 (1917).

[62] For one of many possible examples, see the case of Julis Rhuberg in Peterson and Fite, *Opponents of War*, 153.

[63] Jeanette Keith, *Rich Man's War, Poor Man's Fight: Race, Class, and Power in the Rural South During the First World War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 199-200.

[64] Peterson and Fite, *Opponents of War,* 20.

indicted over 8,000 people for violation of the Selective Service Act[65], imprisoned almost 3,000 men in "objector areas" in Army camps across the United States[66], and prosecuted another 2,000 people under the Espionage and Sedition Acts.[67] Hundreds of additional prosecutions against civilians who opposed the war and the draconian prohibitions that it imposed were made under other federal laws and regulations, including the "Threats Against the President Act," laws prohibiting violation of federal embargoes, the Neutrality Act, the Railroad Control Act, harboring of deserting soldiers, and new laws against the sale of alcohol to military personnel.[68] Courts also prosecuted many service members for being absent without leave, for desertion, and for mutiny against naval officers on the high seas.[69] By my estimate, at least 15,000 people were prosecuted by the federal government for war related crimes, or over 26 people per day over the course of U.S. involvement in the conflict. Several hundred others were arrested and prosecuted under the United States Code of Military Justice, as well as state sedition and criminal

---

[65] Stephen M. Kohn, *American Political Prisoners: Prosecutions under the Espionage and Sedition Acts* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1994), 27.

[66] See Anne M. Yoder, "World War I Conscientious Objection," Swarthmore College Peace Collection, September 13, 2013, accessed October 16, 2017, http://www.swarthmore.edu/library/peace/conscientiousobjection/WWI.COs.coverpage.htm.

[67] Kohn, 14.

[68] Easily accessible statistics for wartime prosecutions that were initiated under laws other than the Espionage Act and Sedition Act are hard to come by. Recently, the National Archives and Records Administration has posted very basic incarceration information for federal prisoners imprisoned at the Atlanta Federal Penitentiary, that include name, incarceration dates, and offense. Similar information, without offense information, has been made available for Leavenworth Federal Penitentiary (the civilian prison, not the military prison), and McNeal Federal Penitentiary. Without offense information, I am unable to determine at this time what prisoners at Leavenworth and McNeil were incarcerated for. However, if the percentage of war time incarcerations are similar at these prisons as they were at Atlanta (at least 23%), then over 675 men were incarcerated in the three extant federal prisons for violation of wartime laws in 1918 alone. This count does not include those incarcerated in military prisons, lockups, and guard houses, or in state, county, or local prisons and jails.

[69] By my count, 274 men were incarcerated in Atlanta Federal Penitentiary for violation of wartime laws in 1918 alone. This count does not include most wartime liquor prohibitions, nor men who were prosecuted under the U.S. Code of Military Justice and incarcerated in federal military prions. With those numbers, these statistics would easily double or even triple. Women who were convicted of federal criminal laws were sent to state prisons during this time.

syndicalism laws across the U.S.[70] The majority of the federal criminal statutes under which these men and women were investigated, arrested, indicted, tried, convicted, and incarcerated were brand new laws in 1917 or 1918. These laws were enacted largely due to the fact that so much of the populace had been adamantly against American involvement in the conflict.

The intrusion of federal law enforcement into the lives of rural southern people, and the quick and gleeful compliance of everybody's neighbors spying for the state, must have been startling, but from a historical perspective, this intrusion should not necessarily be surprising. Michele Foucault argued in his book, *Discipline and Punish,* that the effect of heightened surveillance upon a society can lead to "panopticism," or the idea that totalizing surveillance disciplines the population under observation, leading them to comply with the demands of those in authority. The panopticon was an invention of Jeremy Bentham, which allowed a jailer inside a correctional institution to view all prisoners simultaneously without being seen by them. Since prisoners could not know when they were being individually watched and when they were not, the panopticon ensured compliance with prison regulations. According to Foucault, "He who is subjected to a field of visibility, and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraints of power; he makes them play spontaneously upon himself; he inscribes in himself the power relation in which he simultaneously plays both roles; he becomes the principle of his own subjection."[71] Americans during the war did simultaneously play both roles, both upon themselves, and upon their neighbors. Discourses of "100% Americanism," along with the propaganda meted out by George Creel's Committee on Public Information, created a social environment where people felt they were under surveillance at all times, and therefore, not only

[70] At least 30 states enacted sedition and criminal syndication laws that they used to prosecute war time dissenters. See Kohn, 20.

[71] Foucault, 202-3.

disciplined themselves to obey the government's new wartime laws, but to turn on their neighbors as well. This discipline created "the carceral state." The discourses that Creel's committee generated and helped to disseminate were just as totalizing as the eventual surveillance that they helped to achieve. Creel, in a book that he wrote after the war in order to make sure that the Committee on Public Information did not disappear into obscurity, wrote:

> Many a good and mis-informed citizen, who had an unformed but vivid impression that the "Creel Committee" was some iniquity of the devil, took with his breakfast a daily diet of our material from the same journal that had given him this impression, met us again at lunch when his children came home with what the teacher had given them from material we prepared, heard us again through our Four Minute Men organization when he went to the "movies," where our films might be part of the program, and rose to local prominence by the speeches he drew from the pamphlets of that other useful organization, the Committee on Public Information. Like the truant boy who ran away from the schoolmaster, Hugh Toil, he found us, recognized and unrecognized, at every turn of the road.[72]

Just as the Creel Committee's propaganda found the good citizen at every turn, so too would the hegemonic lens of the carceral state. Creel claimed that due to the work of the committee, "Never was a country so thoroughly contra-espionaged ! Not a pin dropped in the home of any one with a foreign name but that it rang like thunder on the inner ear of some listening sleuth!"[73] Soon, Arthur Dunham and his colleagues would learn just how true this was.

---

[72] George Creel, *How We Advertised America: The First Telling of the Amazing Story of the Committee on Public Information That Carried the Gospel of Americanism to Every Corner of the Globe Corner* (New York, NY: Harper Brothers, 1920), 109-10.

[73] Ibid, 168.

Chapter Two: Citizenship and Duty: Arthur Dunham Meets the Carceral State

As the events that would drag the U.S. into the World War unfolded, Arthur Dunham went to a movie "with a friend" on New Year's Day, 1917. This friend would later become his wife. The movie they watched that night was *The Crisis*, a novel adapted to film about the events leading up to the American Civil War. Dunham and his "friend," Esther Francis Schneider (who was a religious pacifist), saw, among other things, "a remarkably vivid battle scene, with hand-to-hand fighting,--war in its raw, brutal reality." Dunham found that the film turned his mind towards the possibility of America entering the war against Germany, and stated in his memoirs that "We left the picture sobered."[74] Dunham began to think more and more about the possibility of the U.S. entering the war. Esther, who was well educated and who had spent much time reading and thinking about the morality of war, needled him. When Congress declared war in April of 1917, Dunham "believed that America's entrance into the War [sic] was morally unjustifiable."[75] Dunham had come to believe "in the principle of Love as the motive for every individual act and every group relationship. . . Now the war suddenly challenged this principle. Americans were to be sent out to mangle and slaughter Germans." The U.S., which believed itself to be a Christian nation, had decided to reject "the principle of love and the brotherhood of man" when it came to Germany, and therefore, Dunham felt forced to reject the war as grossly immoral and unchristian.[76]

His mind quickly turned to conscription: if he thought the war was morally wrong, what should he do if he were drafted? Dunham had always considered himself more patriotic than

---

[74] Dunham, 4.

[75] Ibid.

[76] Ibid, 5.

most, and felt concerned that he owed a duty of citizenship to his nation. He asked Esther her opinion, and she replied, "What of your duty to God?"[77] Esther's question convinced Dunham to think long and hard about his relationship to the draft. Doing so, he quickly found that it "was the turning point" in his thoughts on the war. Esther's question not only made him rethink the draft, but it proved to be "a question that challenged the fundamental basis" of his beliefs.[78] Arthur came to believe that "Either the war was wrong or my Christianity was worthless," and he set out to embrace the Kingdom of God as his highest allegiance.[79] He wrote to a friend that:

> I have decided about conscription. Unless I believe that the situation has materially changed, or unless I see my duty differently than at present, I will not submit to being drafted for service in this War….. When the principle of Nationality arrays itself against the principle of Love and its expression in Universal Brotherhood, I can not hesitate to place my religion, my allegiance, to God, before even my allegiance to my country.[80]

Dunham had been raised a Christian, but the war and the draft made him into a sectarian that would choose the values of the Kingdom of God over the dominant values of America culture. Many people in the United States opposed American entrance into the war on a variety of grounds, including an interest in maintaining isolationism, their reverence for the Monroe Doctrine, a belief that the causes of the war in Europe did not rise to the occasion of war, the potential cost of the war, the value of maintaining neutral while providing an example to Europe, a rejection of state violence, and other reasons. Dunham, however, rejected the war purely for religious reasons: he believed that all relations should emanate from the motive of love, and war simply did not, and could not, be a loving action.

While Dunham rejected the conflict because he believed it violated the principle of love,

---

[77] Ibid, 4-5.

[78] Ibid, 5.

[79] Ibid, 5-6.

[80] Ibid, 6.

other COs who ended up at Leavenworth rejected the war for other reasons. Examining the lives and paths that led other COs, such as Evan Thomas and Harold Gray, to Leavenworth, can shed light on the various reasons why sectarians rejected the great war and refused to fight.

While Arthur Dunham wrestled with his convictions regarding war and peace in the first months of 1917, Evan Thomas, the brother of Norman Thomas (who would run for President on the Socialist ticket six consecutive times starting in 1928), declared his pacifism two years before, in November of 1915.[81] Before the outbreak of the war, Thomas had been a seminary student at Union Theological Seminary in New York. More interested in social work than church work, he viewed the war as a great social tragedy, and determined to get as close to the action as possible. He quit Union, and moved to Edinburgh, Scotland to continue his theological studies.[82] While there, Thomas read the works of Leo Tolstoy, the famous Russian pacifist and mystic, which heavily impacted his thinking about theology, as well as violence.

However, he also had contact with many people who had brothers at the front, and what he heard about military life disturbed him. Thomas was also appalled at the massive loss of life, and the sheer incompetence of British military officers who led their soldiers in charges across No-Man's Land for no appreciable military gain.[83] In a letter to Norman, Evan Thomas decried the fact that those who entered the army had to give up their freedom to speak openly and critically about the war and their government's military policy. Thomas was greatly disturbed by the fact that military life required unthinking compliance to the will of others. Evan Thomas queried Norman Thomas, "There is no right or wrong – simply obedience to military orders.

---

[81] Evan Thomas to Norman Thomas, November 1, 1915, quoted in Charles Chatfield, ed. *The Radical* "No": The Correspondence and Writings of Evan Thomas on War (New York: Garland Pub., 1974), 27-28.

[82] Chatfield, 19.

[83] Ibid, 31.

May I ask, has any individual the right to give up his individuality so completely? Has the Christian the right to compromise with or blaspheme in this way the holy spirit within him?"[84]

Thomas argued that if the nations of Europe were Christian, they could not have engaged in war against each other, because "Jesus was a non-resistant absolutely, when it came to the point of self-defense or actually injuring another person. He may have taken a whip of cords and driven out a bunch of grafters, but he didn't do it with guns."[85] Instead, Thomas proposed a counter-factual scenario, arguing that if France and Britain had not resisted Germany, that the allied countries would not have been destroyed by Germany, and that such an action would have "done much towards breaking down a narrow nationalism which is a curse to civilization as well as Christianity."[86] Thomas felt that he must not simply argue against war, but attempt to do good in the midst of so much evil. He quit his studies in Edinburgh, and volunteered with the Y.M.C.A. to act as a youth secretary to German POWs in the south of England. His decision to work with POWs, as will be seen, would make a greater impact than he supposed.[87]

Thomas' objection to war and to military service was larger than a rejection of violence, however. It was a rejection of what Capozzola argues was a well-known set of political obligations that citizenship brings with it. Thomas' embrace of non-resistance was also an embrace of sectarianism. It was, in other words, a rejection of the values of the dominant culture, and a rejection of the responsibilities that the national culture imposed upon its citizens. Thomas formulated this new worldview, his new-found responsibilities to the Kingdom of God—which required a rejection of his responsibilities to the nation-state—in Scotland, during a period when

---

[84] Evan Thomas to Norman Thomas, November 12, 1915, in Chatfield, 27-30.

[85] Ibid, 32.

[86] Ibid, 32-33.

[87] Ibid, 79-135.

the United States was not at war, and when he believed the nation would stay out of the conflict. However, he would find soon enough that his new-found commitments would be put to the test.

Thomas did not keep his views on war and peace to himself. He would befriend Harold Studley Gray, who, along with Arthur Dunham, would later become his colleague in a CO barracks, and then in prison at Fort Leavenworth. Gray—the son of Phillip Gray, Henry Ford's general counsel at the Ford Motor Company in Detroit, Michigan—was a student at Harvard when the war broke out. Gray, like Dunham, was quite patriotic, and when the conflagration broke out in Europe in 1914, he joined a "preparedness corps" at Harvard that would prepare him to be an officer in case the U.S. entered the conflict.[88] Harold's father urged him not to join either the preparedness corps or the military, as he felt that Harold was meant for better things. Phillip's attitude would change, however, when conscription began in 1917.[89]

Before war came to the U.S., however, Gray, who was the president of the Young Men's Christian Association (Y.M.C.A.) at Harvard (his father was on the board of the International Y.M.C.A.[90]), was approached by Y.M.C.A. officials with the possibility of spending a year abroad in England working with German POWs. Seeking and finding the approval of his father—who was assured by Y.M.C.A. officials that the experience would be transformative for his son—Gray quit school and traveled to England to spread the gospel to the Germans.[91] Gray's experience in England, however, transformed him in ways that he and Phillip never imagined. Gray—in close company with his friend and fellow Disciple of Christ Kirby Page, Presbyterian

---

[88] Harold Gray to Almena Gray, March 5, 1916, Box 1, Correspondence April – June 1916 Folder, Harold Studley Gray Papers, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan (hereafter cited as Gray Papers).

[89] Phillip Gray to Harold Studley Gray, June 8, 1915, Box 1, Correspondence May – June 1915 Folder, Gray Papers.

[90] David Porter to Harold Gray, March 16, 1916, Box 1, Correspondence Undated Folder, Gray Papers.

[91] Arthur Beane to Phillip Gray, May 16, 1916, Box 1, April – June 1916 Correspondence Folder, Gray Letters.

Evan Thomas, and social gospeller Sherwood Eddy—began to question whether a Christian could participate in warfare.[92] He was troubled by his experiences with German POWs and their treatment by the British, as well as the morality of whether it was permissible for a Christian to kill. In the POW camp, Gray engaged in drawn out arguments with Page, Thomas, and Eddy and, at one point, joined a formal debate on war, arguing the side of the conscientious objector as part of an academic exercise. Those arguments and debate, coupled with his experience with the German POWs and his interaction with British soldiers, had a lasting impact on Gray's thought. In November of 1916, Gray declared himself a pacifist, and by January of 1917, he decided he wanted to return to the United States.[93] A month later, Gray told his mother that he absolutely would not accept conscription: "For my part I am a conscientious objector from the word go. They can shoot me if they like but they won't make me fight," he told her.[94]

When America declared war on Germany in April of 1917, Gray, Thomas, Page, and Sherwood Eddy, all of whom were Y.M.C.A. secretaries in Britain, decided that they could no longer work with German POWs while the rest of the country geared up for war. Kirby and Sherwood Eddy, both ordained ministers and therefore exempt from the draft, decided to proceed to China to engage in missionary work. Thomas and Gray, however, neither of whom were ministers, and therefore, both subject to conscription, each decided that conscience required that they head back to the United States so that they might take a stand against both the requirements of citizenship and against the war itself.[95] Thomas proceeded home first, while Gray stayed in

---

[92] Harold Gray to Almena Gray, October 22, 1916, Box 1, October 1916 Correspondence Folder; Kirby Page to Harold Gray, November 8, 1916, Box 1, November 1916 Correspondence Folder, Gray Letters.

[93] Harold Gray to Almena Gray, November 13, 1916, Box 1, November 1916 Correspondence Folder; Harold Gray to Almena Gray, January 11, 1917, Box 1, January 1917 Correspondence Folder, Gray Letters.

[94] Harold Gray to Almena Gray, February 11, 1917 Box 1, February 1917 Correspondence Folder, Gray Letters.

[95] Chatfield, 132-4.

England for several more months before booking passage back to the United States.

While Harold Gray, Evan Thomas, and their ordained friends debated war in England, Arthur Dunham was working on his degree in St. Louis. When the federal government instituted the draft, Dunham appeared before his draft board—and in fact, a relative served as the board's registrar—and registered for the draft, claiming exemption based upon being a conscientious objector. Dunham told his relative that he believed that the Constitution's First Amendment protections of religion should protect him from the draft, which was duly noted on his draft card. Dunham, however, was fortunate in that his registration number was drawn fairly late in the draft lottery, and therefore, he was not immediately called up for military service.[96]

But while Dunham had embraced sectarian beliefs, especially pacifism and the conviction that the country should not enter the war, he was still a member of the Presbyterian church. During the summer of 1917, Dunham worked as an itinerant minister in Illinois, preaching at a church that lacked a settled pastor. Near the end of his term, Dunham felt convicted to preach on the war, and he presented "the pacifist point of view as strongly as" he could.[97] Other than one member, who Dunham characterized as a former "federal office holder" walking out during his sermon, the congregation took his sermon in stride. In November, Dunham was asked to preach several times in a Presbyterian church in St. Louis, where he had "previously worked and was well known." He preached his anti-war sermon again at this congregation, but unlike his experience in Illinois, he experienced significant resistance. The congregational session summoned Dunham, demanding he appear before the full church and to "retract the 'disloyal' and objectionable comments" he had made. Dunham not only refused, but he challenged the

[96] Dunham, 6-7.

[97] Ibid, 7.

session to report him to the government for violation of the Espionage Act, if they felt he had done so.[98] Much like Harold Gray and Evan Thomas, Arthur Dunham was not only willing to challenge the war, but to challenge the government behind it. Luckily for Dunham, the session was unwilling to file a complaint with the government, but they did inform him that he would likely be excluded from fellowship from the congregation for his anti-war stance.[99]

Dunham had no more difficulties until the Spring of 1918, when the draft board summoned him for a physical examination and to fill out a questionnaire. Dunham stated in his memoirs that he did not place any anti-war statements on the questionnaire, nor did he ask for CO status on the form, because, according to the Selective Service Act, he did not qualify for CO status because, as a member of the Presbyterian Church, he did not belong to any of the "well-recognized sects opposed to war." At the same time, Dunham applied for a "letter of dismissal" from his church in St. Louis, which refused his request, but which also "dropped [him] from the roll." Dunham's break from the Presbyterian Church was complete. He was a sectarian, but not a member of a sectarian religious group.[100] Dunham "then applied to the Friends' Reconstruction Unit in France," because he felt that he should serve his country during the war. His application, however, was denied. In the months that followed, Dunham struggled with whether or not he should accept some sort of non-combatant status, or if he should declare himself an absolutist.[101] In May of 1918, Dunham traveled to a social work conference in Kansas City, where he spoke with a representative from the National Civil Liberties Bureau (later the American Civil Liberties Union, or ACLU). Dunham queried his contact about service as a medic or other non-combatant.

---

[98] Ibid, 7-8.

[99] Ibid, 8.

[100] Ibid, 8-9.

[101] Ibid, 9.

While the NCLB worker was reluctant to advise Dunham (likely because of the passage of the Sedition Act which had occurred that month), he told Dunham that if he himself were drafted, he would most likely refuse both non-combatant as well as "compulsory civilian service" as well. Dunham meditated on this advice, and finally determined that he would refuse any and all service to the government because to do so could aid the overall war effort, even indirectly.[102]

Dunham still struggled with his conception of owed service, however. At the beginning of June 1918, the government announced a farm furlough program, which seemed to him to be "eminently fair." Esther—now Dunham's fiancée—advised him that she had heard that many absolutists were even rejecting farm furlough offers. Dunham marveled at this revelation, wondering how absolutists could justify refusing even to work on a farm during the conflict.[103]

On June 27th, Dunham's local draft board informed him that his number would be called, and that he would be sent to Jefferson Barracks for in-processing. A few days later, he received a summons ordering him to report to his draft board on July 8th in order to be inducted into the United States Army.[104] Dunham, intending to be courteous, sent a letter to the barracks commander, informing him of his decision to be a conscientious objector, stating:

> I am not a Quaker, but my views regarding war are similar to those of the Quakers. I believe that all war is unjustifiable, unnecessary, and wrong; because I believe that it is a violation of Christianity and Christianity's law of Universal Love. I hold this belief, not because it is the creed of any church, but because I am led to it by the reason and conscience which God has given me and because it is a part of my own personal religion. I have the highest respect and admiration for those who go into this war to fight for their own convictions; but I can seek only to be equally true to my own ideas of what is right. . . As a loyal citizen of the United States, I have obeyed the Government as far as I can. . . Faithfulness to my conscience and my religious convictions makes it impossible for me to accept military service. I feel that I can not accept even the 'non-combatant' service in the Medical Corps, since the Medical Corps is an integral part of the Army and is an essential factor in the prosecution of the war. At the same time, I am anxious to render what ever service I can in accordance with my conscience and my religious convictions. . . I should gladly undertake the Friends' Unit Work for the duration of the war, and if, pending the final determination of my status, some arrangement might be made whereby I could perform any service consistent with my

[102] Ibid, 9-10.

[103] Ibid, 10.

[104] Ibid, 10-11.

> religious convictions, I should gladly give my best efforts to such service.[105]

Dunham declared his sectarian stance to the government, stating exactly what he was willing and not willing to do, and then prepared for the worst.

Dunham reported to his local draft board at 9am on Monday, July 8th, wearing "the oldest clothes that" he owned, and expecting to be arrested.[106] To Dunham's surprise, no one was particularly interested in him. The next day, he looked for an opportunity to make his stance known, and he declared his CO stance to a private who had asked him to sign his "service record." Dunham refused, voicing his reasons, and was surprised when the private told him, "I don't know anything about it." The private left and returned with a sergeant, who called him "a damned coward!" Dunham disagreed, and the Sergeant asked him, "How would you like about five years in the penitentiary?" Dunham replied, "I am ready for that if that is the penalty."[107] The Sergeant, after barking a few more insults at Dunham, took him before a First Sergeant, who more politely inquired if Dunham was sure about his stance, and who then took him to a medical officer, who ordered that Dunham be sent to headquarters. Upon his arrival there, he was directed to a Sergeant Major, and then the Captain of the Post, to whom Dunham had written his letter. The Captain quietly questioned him on his stance, and then asked if he would accept non-combatant service. Dunham declined, and the Captain explained that the service record was not an acceptance of military service, but instead, argued that the service was "thrust upon you!" Dunham replied that it was "wished upon him," which angered the Captain. He told Dunham that his stance would most likely be investigated by a Major, and then he would be sent to Fort

---

[105] Ibid, 12.

[106] Ibid, 12, 15.

[107] Ibid, 18.

Leavenworth.[108] Dunham signed the card, and then he passed through a number of offices and under the power of a number of soldiers, all of whom inquired about his lack of a uniform. Dunham had several soldiers argue with him, but at least one private told Dunham he understood his position. In the insurance office, Dunham had his first encounter with what he called "the question," which was, "If some ruffian insulted or tried to rape your wife, what would you do?" Dunham told the inquirer that he would "Probably punch in him the jaw and knock him out, but I don't think that's an analogy to an organized army going out to murder!"[109] Dunham would later state that he could tell much about a man by how far he pushed "the question."[110]

On Thursday, July 11th, he returned to headquarters and was formally deposed in a courtroom by "the major," who had his answers recorded by a court reporter. He asked Dunham to explain his objections at length, and also asked many questions about his membership in the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a peace organization founded at the beginning of the war in Europe. The major told Dunham that he would be held on base until his case was adjudicated, and Dunham then volunteered to work in the Y.M.C.A.'s library, assisting the "much-overworked Librarian."[111] Dunham's request demonstrated that he was not against working, only against anything that might actually contribute to the war effort.

The next day, Dunham was assigned to a new tent, while the rest of his cohort was sent to Texas for basic training. Later that morning, a corporal advised Dunham that he and another CO, William Pardue, would be taken to the base hospital to receive a mental health examination. When Dunham met Pardue, he found that he was a preacher for the International Bible Students

---

[108] Ibid, 18-20.

[109] Ibid, 21.

[110] Ibid, 144.

[111] Ibid, 23.

Association (IBSA), which would later be known as the Jehovah's Witnesses. Both Dunham and Pardue passed their examinations, and Pardue was quite excited because the doctor found Russell's teachings on war "very convincing."[112]

No one in the Army could be troubled with Dunham's request to work in the library, so Dunham assigned himself to this task and began working for the Y.M.C.A.[113] He found himself living in a tent of new recruits, and after discussing his CO stand with a graduate of the University of Kansas, his tent mate exclaimed, "Well, doggone it, I was going to be one [a conscientious objector], too, but I lost my nerve!"[114] This would not be Dunham's last time talking to soldiers who had planned to be conscientious objectors but who had not been able to declare their objection when the time came.

On July 20th, Dunham and Leroy Willard, an IBSA member, were dispatched to Leavenworth.[115] Dunham believed that his travelling companion would receive a farm furlough, since the IBSA was known for its anti-war stance. Dunham and Willard arrived at Leavenworth on Sunday morning, July 21st. They were immediately escorted to the CO barracks, a "three-story brick building, closely hedged in by a barbed wire enclosure."[116] Dunham immediately encountered Roger Baldwin, the director of the NCLB, who was conferring with the COs. Shortly after Dunham and Willard arrived, someone produced an organette, and a worship service began. Along with music and prayers, a discussion of Jesus' beatitudes occurred. Dunham's associates were a ragtag bunch, some educated, others not. He encountered "Jewish

---

[112] Ibid, 24-26.

[113] Ibid, 26.

[114] Ibid, 27.

[115] Ibid, 28.

[116] Ibid, 29-30.

boys from New York, bearded young Mennonite farmers from Kansas, men who looked and spoke like foreigners, and even a few men in uniform – why, no one seemed to know or ask."[117]

After worship, Dunham had his first encounter with Evan Thomas. Thomas presided over a meeting of the COs, where they discussed whether or not the COs should work as Kitchen Police (KP), as well as the other work required around the CO barracks. Dunham reported that "about 18 men objected to this work because the serving included the officer and non-coms as well as C.O.'s."[118] Dunham reported that the men would ask the Captain if they could make their own assignments of work, which would free the work from the connotation that the Army was making the assignments. The men voted, and asked that the men with objections to KP work be exempted from the work, and everyone else would fill in.[119]

Dunham found that he was surrounded with "more shades of C.O.'s than" he had ever imagined. Dunham learned that the Board of Inquiry was "granting furlough's rather liberally," but that many men who were granted farm furloughs or Friend's Service furloughs—which Dunham had sought—were ready to reject them. Many of the men "were ready to fight to the last ditch against the whole principle of conscription." [120] Roger Baldwin told the men that if they refused furloughs, they would be sentenced to prison in the Disciplinary Barracks of the Fort, and that if they refused to work, they would be put in solitary confinement. Another CO, "Henry," who Dunham described as "a young Jewish fellow with a mane of black hair," declared that he would rather be shot than face solitary confinement again. He had experienced solitary

[117] Ibid, 30.

[118] Ibid, 31.

[119] Ibid, 32.

[120] Ibid, 33.

confinement at Fort Hamilton, and could not bear the prospect of experiencing it again.[121]

Conversation turned to the operation of the Board of Inquiry, and one young man complained to Dunham that he felt that he had been wrongfully categorized as a "Class Two" objector—someone who was sincerely opposed to combatant service, but insincere in their opposition to noncombatant service—because he was a Catholic, and the Catholic Church in the United States had supported the war. Another man, who was designated as a "Class Three" objector—someone who was totally insincere in their objection—believed it was because he had become flustered at a series of technical questions regarding his ethics.[122] Many of the COs were interested in the make-up of the three-member board. It was said that Judge Julian W. Mack, a justice on the U.S. Court of Appeals, was Jewish, and understood the sectarian radicalism of many of the Jewish COs. Harlan F. Stone, the Dean of the Columbia University Law School, was more well acquainted with sectarian Christian COs. The third member, Major Richard C. Stoddard, represented the Army in the proceedings, and was known for being fairly quiet.[123]

After talking with his fellow COs about the Board of Inquiry, Dunham took stock of the rest of his surroundings. He discovered five ISBA members holding a worship service on the second floor of the barracks, and then had a conversation about religion with "William," a member of the Plymouth Brethren, one of the historic, institutionalized peace sects. William declared that Dunham was "just a poor lost sinner on the way to hell!" William told Dunham that neither his college education, nor his good works would save him. In talking with other COs, Dunham found that many of them were "intensely conservative in their theology, though some of

---

[121] Ibid, 33-4.

[122] Ibid, 33, 34-35.

[123] Ibid, 35.

them were sharply antagonistic to the organized churches."[124]

The next day, Dunham went hiking with several other COs, but before he left, another CO, who refused to go on the hike, quoted 1 Timothy 4:8 and told Dunham that "bodily exercise profiteth little." This CO, Luther, had spent 30 days in prison before being drafted for his vocal opposition to the war. Dunham tried to argue with him, but found it was difficult to argue with someone with a ready barrage of proof-texts to toss out for every counterpoint.[125]

Later that night, Dunham wandered into a meeting of the "intellectuals," as they were known, which included Evan Thomas and Harold Studley Gray. The men were involved in an intense argument surrounding whether or not the COs ought to partake in KP duty, whether they should follow orders to put up and take down tents which were used by the COs, whether they should assist in cleaning up the barracks, as well as "the importance of Conscription as an issue." The men also discussed when a CO should "assume an 'absolutist' position of refusing to do any work under military direction."[126] Evan Thomas, for his part, rather disliked men drawing "fine distinctions" over what work they were and were not willing to do. Thomas longed for a "big issue" to oppose. Soon enough, he and the others would find one, and face the consequences for making a stand.

---

[124] Ibid, 35-6.

[125] Ibid, 36.

[126] Ibid, 37.

Chapter Three: Segregation in Camp Riley, Prison at Fort Leavenworth

On Thursday, July 25, 1918, the army ordered Dunham and his compatriots to clean their barracks thoroughly. They then boarded a Union Pacific train, headed to Fort Riley, Kansas, about five hours away.[127] When they arrived, Dunham found himself placing his cot on a sleeping porch along with Evan Thomas, Harold Gray, and several "Jewish Socialists." Shortly after they arrived, Evan Thomas called the group together to discuss KP duty and the cleaning of the barracks. Thomas felt that the division of duties as they had been assigned at Leavenworth had not worked well, and he asked the men to vote on various options for dealing with them at Camp Riley. Dunham reported that out of about one hundred men present, only twenty-five voted. The fact that seventy five percent of the men were unwilling to cast a vote frustrated Thomas, and he "resigned from his informal 'chairmanship,' saying that this was a demonstration that it was useless for us to try to organize and that probably organization among us was undesirable – because of our varying positions we should leave everything to the individual."[128] That the vast majority of the men refused to vote is telling and demonstrative of a sectarian and even anarchistic impulse among many of the objectors. Just as sectarians are opposed to the dominant values of the culture, many are also opposed to traditional standards of government, especially those that they feel are not completely voluntary. For example, among the Churches of Christ, the largest of the peace sects during the war, most members embraced a complete rejection of participation in any type of organization outside the local church, including all levels of government.[129] Therefore, it is unsurprising that many of the men were unwilling to

---

[127] Dunham, 39.

[128] Ibid, 41.

[129] For a full theological explication of this type of view, see David Lipscomb, *On Civil Government: Its Origin, Mission, and Destiny, and the Christian's Relation to It* (Indianapolis.: Doulos Christou Press, 2006).

participate in such a meeting, even as it was disconcerting to a man like Evan Thomas, who had arrived at a sectarian position, but one which was opposed to anarchy.

Later that day, shortly after Thomas renounced his 'chairmanship' of the COs, he, Harold Gray, and Howard Moore met and decided that they would take a stand as absolutists. They decided that their 'big issue' which Thomas had so longed for, would be the immorality of conscription. They decided their position would be that of "refusing to do any work under military direction or while they were held by the military under conscription." Harold Gray proclaimed that, "At last, we have no more of these fine lines to draw, -- no more of this continuous round of maddening decisions on little picayunish issues!"[130]

Shortly after this meeting, the men were assembled for the first of four times during that day, and each time the army asked for volunteers to work. The first request was for farm work. Leroy Willard, the ISBA preacher, volunteered, along with nine other men. Dunham and many others felt that these requests were "an effort to draw us into virtual temporary non-combatant service." Later that day, they were asked to erect tents, to pull weeds, and to move a mess hall to where they were encamped. Dunham asked if the building would be temporary or permanent, and an officer told him that it would be temporary. He and about twenty-five others decided to volunteer to move the mess hall. However, Dunham and his friend Roderick later felt that the army had duped them. The "temporary" mess hall was two wooden barracks, which the men had to deconstruct, move several miles, and reconstruct near their barracks as one building. Dunham and Roderick, because of this abuse, turned down other volunteer opportunities to work.[131]

A few days later, an officer assembled the men together and took them to an area with no

---

[130] Dunham, 42.

[131] Ibid, 42-43.

other buildings, but which held finished lumber. The officer in charge of the detail directed the men to break up into groups of eight who would live together in a tent, and to grab materials and assemble their own tent. Dunham, along with Evan Thomas, Harold Gray, Roderick, and several other COs decided to bunk together. However, out of the eight men, only three, included Dunham, Roderick, and a man named Harry, were not absolutists. Therefore, Dunham, Roderick, and Harry—along with Erling Lunde, who was not part of the group—erected the tent without the help of the other COs who would live in the tent.[132]

Later that evening, an officer assembled the men and asked for volunteers for KP. About half the group stepped forward, including Dunham and one of his tent-mates, Theodore. Those that did not volunteer were ordered by an officer to move to a "barren field" down the way. Theodore and Dunham both decided to join the absolutists and face the punishment with those COs who refused. Dunham refused the work because he believed that the army was trying to obtain as much work as it could from COs, that working would require him "to draw more fine lines than ever on all sorts of petty issues," and because he was opposed to the fact that those who did not volunteer would face "punitive treatment." Dunham believed that such punishment was contrary to the orders of the Secretary of War for the treatment of COs, and so he would rather face this unlawful punishment than work while his comrades faced just injustice.[133]

The officer marched them down to the field, where a tent-camp was waiting for them, and he advised them that they would be issued raw rations. They were told that "these rations must be cooked individually over open-fires," and that they would "have to build a latrine" for themselves as there was not one there for their use. The men refused to build the latrine. Dunham

---

[132] Ibid, 43-44.

[133] Ibid, 44-45.

stated that the men came to believe that the Army was acting in bad faith, and that they must have ulterior motives in requiring them to do such work. Furthermore, the men believed that being issued raw rations was also punishment, and the majority of the men refused to draw rations. On Sunday, Evan Thomas, Harold Grey, and Howard Moore began a hunger strike, refusing to eat as long as the army refused to furnish cooked rations. The rest of the men—including Arthur Dunham—finished eating the food that they had with them, and then joined in the hunger strike of the absolutists on Tuesday.[134]

The Colonel in charge granted several men permission to leave the camp to go to town to eat in an attempt to break the strike. The men did not eat, but they did go to town to forward a letter to the War Department, complaining of the conditions, including the requirement to build their own latrine and cook their own food. Dunham took the opportunity to mail an uncensored letter, which indicated that the Colonel had threatened several of the men with court-martial if they were "defiant" or spread propaganda. Two days later, the men were assembled by two officers in order to talk about the hunger strike. The officers offered to provide food to the fifty or so men who were refusing to cook individually, and the group would be allowed to cook communally if they so chose. The Army also offered to provide kitchen supplies, so that the men would not have to cook on an open fire, as well as utensils. Most of the men were amenable to this arrangement, but the absolutists refused to cook food for themselves. Several of the men agreed to cook for everyone, including the absolutists, which then ended the strike.[135] But this compromise, which put the cooking fully under the control of the COs, only temporarily solved the problem. The men would soon learn that the Army would only indulge them so much.

---

[134] Ibid 45-46.

[135] Ibid, 46-47.

While the cooking situation was fixed, the issue of the latrine took more time. The men continued to refuse to build their own bathroom facilities, and so one of the officers designated a space to be used temporarily. This, of course, was not satisfactory to the men. Some of the more persistent COs obtained permission from an officer to visit the regular barracks to use the latrine. Dunham stated in his memoirs that the days that the COs were without a permanent latrine were "three of the hottest July days that" he had ever experienced. Shortly thereafter, the entire group was given permission to use the regular barracks latrines, but the men were harassed by the soldiers there. On August 23rd, the COs who had refused to partake in KP work were finally given their own latrines, which were constructed by COs who had volunteered to work.[136]

Besides the kitchen and the latrine, there were, of course, the tents. The men bunked with friends who shared similar views to themselves. The COs began naming their tents, and Dunham reported that among these were "Camp Bolshevki," which held several Russians, the "International Tent," which held several Jews as well as other foreigners who were socialists. The "Religious Tent" held "intensely religious and, with two exceptions, ultra-orthodox men," which included a Swedish Baptist, a Quaker, a Russian mystic, and a man who Dunham called a "deeply religious… agnostic."[137] A few days later, more men joined the camp, including a large group of "small-sect" men, as Dunham called them, including many Mennonites and Molokans, old order Russian Orthodox who refused to fight in the war.[138]

An "unfortunate misunderstanding," between the COs who were cooking and the absolutists, occurred on August 17th. One of the absolutists severely criticized a cook and the KP

---

[136] Ibid, 46-48.

[137] Ibid, 50.

[138] Ibid, 52.

crew, and the entire volunteer staff resigned en masse. To solve this problem, the Army began issuing uncooked rations to all COs. However, as before, many of the absolutists refused to accept them. On August 20th, Howard Moore declared that he would begin a hunger-strike. Evan Thomas, Harold Gray, and Erling Lunde all joined Howard in his strike, calling for an end to conscription. Thus began one of the most famous incidents in the history of conscientious objection during the war. Eventually, the four were taken to the base hospital, and doctors began force feeding them through a hose. After several days of this, all of the men gave up the strike, with Howard Moore being both the first to begin and the last to give up the strike.[139] This strike of a few COs would end up bringing severe consequences for the rest of the company.

On September 16th, the company was addressed by a Colonel, who offered the men non-combatant opportunities. None of the men stepped forward, and the colonel became angry and accused the men of collusion. One of the COs told the Colonel that he saw no difference between combatant and non-combatant service, and the colonel replied, "Never mind what you think. The President of the United States is doing your thinking! He has decided this matter."[140] Such an argument was of course wasted upon the men who disclaimed the state's right to conscript their service to the state. Near the end of the Colonel's diatribe, two armed soldiers arrived, seeking to arrest Evan Thomas. However, both Thomas and Harold Gray had violated orders and taken a walk and were not present. Erling Lunde told an officer that he believed the soldiers were there to arrest Thomas for his leadership in the hunger strike. Thomas and Gray returned to camp several hours later, and Thomas was immediately arrested. The next day, another CO was

[139] Ibid, 60-67. The story of the hunger strike has been covered by a number of historians. For an intimate and more detailed description of the hunger strike, see Louisa Thomas, *Conscience: Two Soldiers, Two Pacifists, One Family* (New York: Penguin Press, 2011), 218-234.

[140] Dunham, 69, 70.

arrested after it was found that he had gone into town without permission.[141]

Over the next three days, the Colonel assembled the men, and he offered non-combatant status to the anyone who would accept it. He then ordered a group of men to fall out and clean up the grounds, and men who refused were arrested. Over the three days, he had twenty-five men arrested for refusing to follow orders. The Colonel ordered security to be tightened, and guards were posted to keep men from leaving post. Over the next several days, men were increasingly ordered to clean up the area outside of their immediate tent area. While most of the men had complied with the orders to clean up around their own living area, many of them refused to clean outside of this area, and they were also arrested. The army also increasingly subjected the men to increased military discipline, required them to fall-in for reveille each morning, and required them to hike while the rest of the soldiers on base were drilled. In order to clarify what they would be willing to do, Harold Gray and Arthur Dunham wrote out statements stating their positions. Gray's statement made it clear that he opposed all conscripted work, but both would agree to clean up after themselves and others in and around the tent camp.[142]

Harold Gray and Arthur Dunham were fortunate that they had not yet been arrested and incarcerated in the Guard House. One of their colleagues, Herman Kaplan, a socialist, refused to obey military orders of any sort once he was arrested. Tiring of his stand, the guards tortured him. Charles Larsen, one of the COs in the Guard House, reported in his diary that:

> Kaplan (after refusing work) was similarly questioned by the officer and likewise said that he could not stand 'attention' nor do any work of a military nature. Thereupon, his arms were tied, a rope fastened around his neck—the free end being thrown over a rod above and held by one of the guards. He was ordered to stand 'Attention'. Upon his refusal, his feet were kicked from under him by the Officer of the Day and prison sergeant, and finally the latter took the free end of the rope from the guard and pulled it, lifting Kaplan off his feet. When the latter's eyes began to bulge and his tongue to stick out, he was let down and asked if he would do some work. He again refused. The rope was then taken from his neck and fastened around one arm, between his elbow and his shoulder. The rope was again pulled, and Kaplan lifted

[141] Ibid, 71.

[142] Ibid, 72-74.

> from the ground. The pain was intense, the arm was being forced out of joint and he emitted loud, agonizing cries, imploring them to shoot him rather than torture him thus.[143]

The functionaries of the carceral state simply could not accept Kaplan's and his fellow COs' refusal to live up to what they believed were their citizenship obligations, and so they resorted to extra-judicial violence to attempt to force compliance. These prison guards did so as agents of the state, on behalf of the state, and the state was the intended beneficiary of their attempts to obtain compliance with the new cultural norm of conscription. However, while these soldiers acted under what appeared to be the color cover? of lawful authority, their actions were a clear violation of their orders, and therefore, were military crimes under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

While Kaplan was being hung from his limbs and neck, other guards took a fire hose into the cell block of the guard house and sprayed COs, to the point where several of them could hardly breathe. Once the officers were done torturing Kaplan, they took Francis Hennessey and Benjamin Berger, who they had sprayed with the fire hose, and commenced with hanging both of them from the rope while demanding that they do some work around the guard house. Shortly after the news of this torture reached the absolutist COs who had not yet been arrested, thirteen of them suddenly opted for non-combatant service.[144] The carceral state with its vigilante violence and extra-legal policing had been successful in obtaining the compliance of some of those who dared violate the social norms of conscription.

The threat of torture would not compel Arthur Dunham's compliance with the carceral state, however. On Saturday, September 28th, the men were assembled, and a lieutenant arrived with a bundle of rakes that he then threw on the ground. The officer ordered a man to pick up a

---

[143] "Who Are the Conscientious Objectors?" (New York: 1000 Friends of Conscientious Objectors, 1919), 18-19, quoted in Dunham, 75.

[144] Ibid, 76-77.

rake, which he did, but then the CO asked the lieutenant if he intended to have the man work, and where. When the lieutenant told him that he would have to work wherever he was ordered, he refused. The lieutenant then ordered each man in the company, including Dunham, to pick up a rake. Dunham and most of the others refused, and they were arrested. Dunham and the others were then marched to the Guard House, where they were incarcerated until their court-martial. Out of thirty-seven men who were ordered to take the rake, only three complied.[145]

After being arrested, Dunham learned that some of the first men arrested by the Colonel had gone on a hunger strike, and when they were released from the hospital, they were transferred to the "Military Police Guard House at Camp Funston." There, they were tortured with cold showers, and the officers made the men scrub each other down with filthy toilet brushes. One of the men refused, and he was thrown down onto the concrete floor and beaten. His comrades reported that "When he recovered he became hysterical."[146] The Provost Martial at Camp Funston, Colonel Barnes, beat some of the COs with a horse whip. Another CO was:

> thrown to the wet ground, punched, kicked and spat at by the guard. He was raised to his feet and dragged around some more. Presently he was dropped and one guard seized him by the hair and rubbed his face in and banged his head on the group. His cheek and forehead were bruised, leaving two ugly skin wounds. Then four guards carried him to the shower-room, stripped him of what little clothes remained on his person, placed him on the cold cement floor, in an exhausted condition, and turned the cold spray upon him. The soldiers then scrubbed him viciously with filthy brushes and brooms. One guard tickled his feet. He was finally brought back to the squad-room in a semi-conscious state.[147]

This was just one incident in a series of abuses that became known as the "Funston Outrages." The treatment of COs at Funston was heavily publicized by peace organizations, the ACLU, and the Friends of Conscientious Objectors, a voluntary organization that sought the release of COs

---

[145] Ibid, 82-4.

[146] Ibid, 96.

[147] Report of Treatment of Conscientious Objectors at the Camp Funston Guard House (New York: Friends of Conscientious Objectors, 1918), and quoted in Dunham, 96-97. The full report details many more incidents of torture.

from imprisonment. This publicity eventually led to both a military and a congressional investigation, and several U.S. Army officers were fired, including Major Frank White, the Army Judge Advocate for Camp Funston, who had presided over the trials of many COs.[148]

But while Arthur Dunham and some of his friends were spared from the worst abuses, they were not spared from court-martial. On Saturday, October 19th, the Army ordered Evan Thomas and two Molokans to pack, and transported them to Leavenworth where they were tried. Dunham learned through a newspaper that they received life sentences at the Fort Leavenworth Military Disciplinary Barracks. Thomas was convicted for refusing to eat during the second hunger strike, and the Molokans for refusing to shovel trash. However, General Leonard Wood, the commander of Funston, reduced their sentences to twenty-five years during his review. On October 25th, Dunham received his indictment, showing that he was charged with violating the 64th article of war for refusing to pick up a rake. Dunham was informed by the private who delivered his indictment that he could face the death penalty for his refusal to work.[149]

Dunham was court-martialed on November 12th, the day after Armistice Day. While the war against Germany might have been over, the war against conscience was not, an irony not lost on Dunham. Dunham pled not guilty, and he called several witnesses to testify. Much of the testimony about Dunham's conduct was contradictory, with one Lieutenant claiming that Dunham had been defiant and completely unwilling to work, while other officers claimed that Dunham had been pleasant, had worked around the camp, and had kept his area clean. Dunham then made a statement regarding his objection to conscription, which can be summed up in his opposition to war because of his adherence to Christianity. Dunham declared himself a "liberal"

---

[148] Capozolla, 79-80.

[149] Dunham, 99-100.

Christian, and informed the tribunal that he was no longer a member of any church as the Presbyterian Church had supported the war effort. He then admitted to refusing to pick up the rake, as he believed it was an order that was both unlawful and contradicted his conscience, because he was being asked to clean an area of the camp that was outside of his immediate living area. At that, the court-martial ended, and Dunham heard nothing until Thanksgiving Day, when he was quickly ordered to pack up and leave. Dunham and five other COs, including Ray, who had been a member of a dissenting sect of ISBA members, Ezra, a "Dunkard" member of the Plymouth Brethren (a group that would split off from the Brethren in 1926), and another regular member of the Plymouth Brethren, boarded a train headed for Fort Leavenworth.[150]

When Dunham and his colleagues arrived, they were greeted by several friends who had arrived before them. Dunham learned that Evan Thomas was being held in solitary confinement for protesting the bad treatment of several Molokans who were COs. Dunham's friend Roderick was also in solitary, as well. Dunham learned that about twenty-six men were in "the hole," and that several of his friends had been in solitary "for three or four weeks. . . receiving the treatment outlined for recalcitrant soldier-criminals who refused to work: solitary confinement, bread and water fourteen days at a time, and hand-cuffed to the bars of the cell nine hours a day."[151] However, Dunham would soon learn about solitary confinement first hand.

After reuniting with friends and becoming acquainted with the basics of prison life, the "count" was called and then Dunham and the rest of the soldiers proceeded to bed at lights out. Dunham woke when the lights came back on—to him, seemingly minutes after they went out. Shortly after, a "room orderly" came by, and hit the bars with a broom, waking prisoners up.

---

[150] Ibid, 103-116.

[151] Ibid, 118.

Dunham quickly came to distrust the orderlies, who were prisoners appointed by the guards to keep an eye on others and to maintain discipline. Dunham believed that the "room orderlies were often more brutal than the guards. . . The room orderly proceeded to use the methods which were used throughout the prison, sharpened usually by bitterness over his own imprisonment."[152] Dunham found the room orderly position and their methods to be a logical expression of the prison system. Indeed, it was, but it was also an excellent example of the carceral state at work. While the army could only employ so many soldiers and officers as guards and wardens, it could easily supplement this number by co-opting prisoners as spies and functionaries. These men would attempt to keep order, and inform on those who would not submit. The Army found that it could better police the prison by convincing soldiers to police themselves.

Dunham was informed once he arrived in the prison that he had been sentenced to twenty-five years in prison. With good behavior, he could have eight years subtracted from his sentence. However, Dunham believed that he would probably be released much earlier, and felt instead that a sentence was "something of an index of the impression made upon the military by the C.O.'s stand." Evan Thomas had been sentenced to life imprisonment, and Harold Gray's prosecutor had asked for the death penalty for his insolence.[153]

Later that day, Dunham and several other new prisoners found themselves in the presence of a lieutenant, the "Assistant Executive Officer" of the prison. He asked each prisoner what type of work they did formerly, and what type of work they would like to do in the prison. Dunham, along with most of the COs present, told the lieutenant that he could not conscientiously do any work while at the prison. The lieutenant noted his response, but made no comment. The very

---

[152] Ibid, 122.

[153] Ibid, 128; "Record of Trail by General Court Martial by Harold S. Gray," (Camp Funston, KS: United States Army 1918), 2.

next day, Dunham was ordered to work, and this time, he was ordered to pick up a broom instead of a rake. He refused, and was ordered to stand along a wall. He was later taken to the Executive Officer's Office, where he again stated that he could not conscientiously work at the prison. He was sentenced to two weeks in solitary confinement, and demoted from a first-class prisoner, to third class. Because Dunham refused to break up rocks as work, the Army reduced his diet to bread and water, and, he was handcuffed to the bars for nine hours a day as punishment.[154]

The cell was eight feet by five feet, and eight feet high, and made of brick and concrete. It contained no furniture, except for a single wooden board that Dunham was expected to sleep on. There was also a sink, a toilet, a dirty tin drinking cup, and three dirty blankets. The cell door was boarded up, so Dunham could not see anything except for a small shaft of light that came through on the top and bottom of the door. Dunham was not allowed to have any personal belongings in the cell, including his bible. The conditions were awful and designed to obtain compliance from the offender. Dunham stated in his memoirs that, "No doubt it is a mark of immaturity of character, but I must confess that two or three times that week the conditions of the solitary were so far psychologically effective as to produce the blackest fits of mental depression that I have ever experienced. Personally, I always felt that this mental effect was the most real torture of the Hole."[155]

Dunham was able to yell to his fellows in the hole, and Dunham, Ted, and Jake, speaking in French and German so as to be unintelligible to the guard, decided to work. Dunham "recognized that in agreeing to work we were compromising the strict logic of our position," but they felt that the conditions, along with the fact that working in the prison did not assist in the

---

[154] Ibid, 132-137.

[155] Ibid, 137-145.

war effort—especially since the war was over—warranted their compromise. The men also worried that the conditions were destroying their health. Dunham would later come to believe that he was wrong to compromise, stating "that it would have been braver, more logical, and more consistent to have persisted in my refusal to work and to have remained in solitary. I regret the weakness which caused me to compromise, and I doubly honor those who refused to compromise." Dunham told a guard that they would agree to work, as long as they were assigned light tasks until they recovered from their stay in solitary. Dunham indicated that conditions improved almost as soon as they informed the Army of their decision. Their cell doors were suddenly left open, they were no longer handcuffed to the bars, and they received actual meals on Sunday and Monday.[156]

After some light work, Dunham was assigned duty on the "First Gang," shoveling dirt into wheelbarrows. After a couple of weeks on this work detail, Dunham was allowed to seek other work, and he was assigned work as a messenger in the clerk's office. He would carry messages several times a day to other parts of the prison, but otherwise, would sit and read.[157]

On January 14th, a friend in the clerk's office told Dunham that Evan Thomas was being released. Dunham himself delivered the message ordering Thomas' release, and Dunham was present when Thomas arrived in his own clothes, carrying his suitcase. Thomas told Dunham that he didn't "want to go before the rest of you fellows. . . Tell the fellows I won't forget them!"[158] Upon Thomas' release, he worked tirelessly for the freedom of his fellow COs, and with his combined labor and that of others, they were finally successful on freeing all COs in custody.

---

[156] Ibid, 146-7.

[157] Ibid, 147-162.

[158] Ibid, 172.

However, Dunham would not have to wait. On Wednesday, January 22nd, Dunham was at work when the adjutant arrived and stated that he had orders to release 113 conscientious objectors. Dunham found out the next day that he and Ted were on the list, and four days later, they were free. Dunham was given discharge papers, and a check for $131.52 of back pay. He and many conscientious objectors would later return this money. Twenty-four hours after Dunham and Ted walked through the main gate, Arthur Dunham was home in St. Louis.[159]

But while Evan Thomas and Arthur Dunham were free, Harold Gray was not. Gray was paroled to the Leavenworth Chicken Farm, but he quickly found that his parole included a prohibition to speak about his pacifism. He requested to go back to Leavenworth, and was returned and thrown in solitary confinement.[160] On July 28, 1919, he was shipped with several other COs to Alcatraz Prison in San Francisco. Gray would remain at Alcatraz until September 5th, 1919, when he was ordered released by Woodrow Wilson. Gray received a dishonorable discharge, and sprawled across it was noted "Character: Bad."[161] Arthur Dunham, Evan Thomas, and Harold Gray were finally all free.

A number of factors played a part in the final release of all conscientious objectors and war resisters. The National Civil Liberties Bureau (NCLB), which was the legal division of the American Union Against Militarism, was one of the largest organizations that worked for the freedom of COs. Roger Baldwin—who Dunham had met upon his first arrival at Fort Leavenworth—the head of the NCLB, had refused to comply with the Selective Service Act, and spent six months in jail for his disobedience. The NCLB served as an information center for a

[159] Ibid, 172-6.

[160] Gray, 240-241.

[161] Ibid., 251-253.

variety of amnesty groups, and helped to fund legal aid work for COs and other war resisters. The League for the Amnesty of Political Prisoners, founded by Emma Goldman and run mostly by anarchists, worked to publicize the plight of federal and state prisoners who had been charged with crimes under the Espionage and Sedition Acts. The group was initially run by Lucy Robins, who eventually went to work for the American Federation of Labor (AFL). Robins sought to mobilize the forces of the AFL, including its less radical elements, in order to bring political pressure to bear on the government so that COs might receive amnesty. Robins contacted tens of thousands of AFL locals, urging them to contact Washington about freeing COs. While many more conservative locals refused, many complied, flooding the White House with amnesty petitions.[162]

Pressure was not just brought to bear by outside groups, however. Theodore Lunde, the father of Erling Lunde, one of the COs incarcerated with Dunham worked with Phillip Gray—the father of Harold Gray—and Evan Thomas in order to rouse first family members of COs, and then the public, to agitate for freedom for COs. Evan Thomas, who was released earlier than Gray or Dunham, wrote letters to the President and the Department of War, seeking the release of COs.[163] However, while Evan was released early, President Wilson was opposed to the early release of many political prisoners. It took continued political pressure and an amnesty proclamation from the next President, Warren G. Harding, before all of America's COs and war resisters were finally freed.

---

[162] Ibid, 169-70.

[163] Letter from Theodore H. Lunde to Phillip S. Gray, January 28, 1919, Gray, Harold S Correspondence January - Februrary 1919, Gray Papers.

Chapter Four: The Dark Side of the Progressive Managerial (Carceral) State

The prison experiences of Arthur Dunham, Evan Thomas, Harold Gray, and other COs in the First World War illuminate a number of issues that have been at the heart of this study. These include questions surrounding sectarianism, the carceral state, and duties of citizenship, themes bound up together and thus difficult to disentangle. In this final chapter, I will examine several incidents in the lives of Dunham, Thomas, and Gray, and analyze how these questions were asked and answered in their own experience of conscription and incarceration.

Although Dunham, Thomas, and Gray were not traditional sectarians, as none of them at the time of their induction into the Army or their incarceration in CO barracks, the Guard House, Fort Leavenworth or Alcatraz were members of sectarian religious groups, the men obviously rejected traditional social values related to military service, duty to the state, and obedience to laws that they objected to. So, too, did the more traditional sectarians who were members of organized sectarian groups, as well as did other, non-religious conscientious objectors—such as socialists and anarchists—who also indulged in a sectarian rejection of dominant culture values. These men, at first glance, had little in common. The men that Dunham—a lapsed Presbyterian—was surrounded by, came from all sorts of religious and secular backgrounds. Among them were Baptists, Jews, Christadelphians, Methodists, Mennonites, Disciples of Christ, independent Christians, Lutherans, Pentecostals, Old German Baptists, Hutterites, Wesleyans, Moravians, Universalists, Molokan Russian Orthodox, members of the Seventh Day Adventists, Plymouth Brethren, Dunkard Plymouth Brethren, Church of God, Holiness groups, the Society of Friends, the Church of God and Saints of Christ, the ISBA (or Russellites), along with humanists, socialists, and anarchists. But while these men all differed on the finer points of theology, the vast majority of them agreed on one thing: that the dominant values of society,

which included the use of violence, participation in war, and the conscription of their labor for any purpose whatsoever that the state deemed necessary, were all values that they rejected, both individually and in their respective communities.

Many of these men also rejected participation in human government or other organizations outside of their own, if the members of the Church of Christ, Christadelphians, ISBA, and Molokans, along with the 75% abstention rate from voting on CO issues, are any indication. However, even though these men shared differing theological and social values, they nonetheless made up one large sectarian congregation in the Guard House and in the Penitentiary. These men, despite their differences, were thrown together via their shared values, and relished their connections. Among Arthur Dunham's papers are numerous sheets of scrap paper, along with typed notes, indicating the names, addresses, and denominations of the men that he shared his fate with. He also saved photographs of himself with different groups of the men, and in some instances, he was kind enough to identify the men in these pictures. These sectarians, brought together through their resistance to the use of their bodies in war, were truly their own church. Considering that these men all believed in a true separation between church and state, the irony that the state brought these men together into one group is palpable.

In addition to their shared anti-war, and in many cases, anti-government faith, these men largely shared another characteristic: sectarians were *typically* of the working classes. Arthur Dunham, Evan Thomas, and Harold Gray were anything but working class, and most of the written sources that survive are from these three men. Of the three, however, Arthur Dunham comes the closest. Unlike Thomas and Grey, Dunham was a social worker, and did not come from a particularly rich or influential family. Later in life, Dunham would become a professor at the University of Michigan—in their social work program—living not far from Harold Gray. But

Dunham never obtained a doctorate, unlike Thomas, and was never independently wealthy, like both Thomas and Gray. He was also unable to find a publisher for his memoirs, unlike both Thomas and Gray. Therefore, while we might describe Dunham as middle class, he certainly was not from the upper crust of society, and this may explain why his social contacts among the COs in all of the locations that he was in was much wider than those of Thomas and Gray.

As mentioned in the introduction, Christopher Capozzola has argued that, in the years before and during World War I, citizenship was understood to come with a set of well-known social obligations. One common thread among the conscientious objectors that Dunham encountered was the tension between their individual conscience and the pressure to adhere to these social obligations. Dunham, in contemplating the possibility of conscription, asked his girlfriend what he should do about his obligation to his community. Esther countered, "what of your duty to God?"[164] Dunham, through Esther's suggestion, came to believe that he owed a greater duty to the Prince of Peace than he did to the President of the United States. Likewise, when Evan Thomas was wrestling with conscription, he described to his brother Norman what he had heard from English soldiers about their duty to the crown, saying, "There is no right or wrong – simply obedience to military orders. May I ask, has any individual the right to give up his individuality so completely? Has the Christian the right to compromise with or blaspheme in this way the holy spirit within him?"[165] Thomas, as well, believed that Christianity placed a greater duty on him than did his United States citizenship. Harold Gray may have had a harder time wrestling with his conscience than either Thomas or Dunham. He joined the "Harvard Regiment" shortly after the war broke out in Europe, in expressed opposition to his father, who

[164] Dunham, 4-5.

[165] Evan Thomas to Norman Thomas, November 12, 1915, in Chatfield, 27-30.

thought that Gray was meant for better things than military service.[166] Grey, of course, would eventually leave the regiment, and fully reject war once he arrived in England, telling his mother, "For my part I am a conscientious objector from the word go. They can shoot me if they like but they won't make me fight."[167] Grey's rejection of war came from both his experiences in dealing with German POWs and his debates over the morality of warfare with his friends Evan Thomas, Sherwood Eddy, and Kirby Page. But while Dunham, Thomas, and Gray were conscripted and declared their conscientious objector status, none of them entered the Army as absolutists.

The pressure of the carceral state transformed the three—and many others—from simple conscientious objectors into absolutists. While the written commands of Secretary of War Newtown Baker towards COs were fairly mild, the implementation of these orders by non-commissioned officers, Lieutenants, Captains, Majors, and even flag-level officers were often anything but. These soldiers took the refusal of COs to conform and obey personally. However, their anger over the non-conformity of COs was much more than that. These soldiers and officers were not offended simply because COs didn't embrace the military, but because they believed that these men were shirking their responsibilities to the nation.

While many educated, middle-class Americans shared many common values concerning the obligations of citizens during the Progressive Era, Jennifer Keene has shown that conscription was not one of them. The draft had never been universally implemented in America before World War I, even during the Civil War, when it was used chiefly to keep soldiers in their respective armies when their terms of enlistment came to an end. Therefore, conscription was *not* a social obligation that Americans were used to when the United States entered the war in April

---

[166] Phillip Gray to Harold Studley Gray, June 8, 1915, Box 1, Correspondence May – June 1915 Folder, Gray Papers.

[167] Harold Gray to Almena Gray, February 11, 1917 Box 1, February 1917 Correspondence Folder, Gray Letters.

of 1917. However, while it had not been part of this bundle of duties, it quickly became one with the passage of the Selective Service of 1917 and the efforts of George Creel's Committee for Public Information. As is well known, the CPI dispatched "four-minute men" around the United States in order to disseminate government propaganda throughout the United States. Very quickly, war patriots denounced any "slacker" who refused to do his patriotic duty, whether that duty be a social responsibility or a legal one.

But being called a slacker was the least pressure these men would face. From Dunham's experience of having a captain become angry with him for stating that his duty had been "wished upon" him instead of "thrust upon" him, to a Colonel telling Dunham, Thomas, and Gray, "Never mind what you think. The President of the United States is doing your thinking! He has decided this matter," this heavy pressure to conform pushed men that simply had scruples about participating in warfare to reject any and all service under the draft. As sectarians, these men were already highly skeptical of many of the dominant society's values and were skeptical of government as well. Being told that they were no longer allowed to do their own thinking because the government had forcibly conscripted them against their will, then, practically invited these men take a stand that would not only reject combatant status, but all non-combatant statuses as well. In other words, the Army's actions, instead of having the intended consequence, resulted in sectarians rejecting all service out of spite, as well as out of conviction.

A rejection of simple negative social pressure was not the sole reason that Dunham chose to reject all service. His experience with other COs, especially those who refused KP duty, and seeing those COs punished for that refusal, pushed him over the edge from the simple rejection of warfare to the rejection of most service under conscription. After seeing his fellow COs being punished for failing to volunteer, he voluntarily chose to share their punishment. Such

punishment for failing to volunteer lends much credence to Capozzola's contention that the U.S. resorted to "coercive volunteerism" during the conflict.[168] But it also significantly discredits President Wilson's contention that conscription was "in no sense the conscription of the unwilling; it is, rather, selection from a nation which has volunteered in mass."[169]

Dunham had certainly not volunteered to be conscripted. He made it quite clear to the military authorities from the very beginning that he was completely unwilling to render any type of military service. However, he certainly volunteered to be punished for failing to volunteer. Dunham, at least at first, was convinced that if the vast majority of American men were being required to render service to the state, that he ought to render some sort of service as well. Dunham was more than willing to provide overseas service through the Friends Reconstruction Unit, or even through a farm furlough. The Army, however, decided that he ought to spend the war in its service, wasting his time and his labor—if they could extract it—on projects around various military facilities. While Dunham would, at least for a while, continue to submit to work that would help to maintain him—specifically, cooking and cleaning around the area where he lived—he firmly refused to engage in any other service after realizing that his fellows would be punished for failing to volunteer. However, while punishment of COs was the tipping point for Dunham, he had felt reluctant for some time about voluntarily engaging in work, especially after he and several other COs had agreed to an army request to move a building they had been told would be a "temporary" mess hall. Dunham and his friends concluded that the building would actually be permanent, and thereafter decided to turn down other "voluntary" work assignments.

---

[168] Capozzola, 10-11.

[169] Ibid, 8.

According to Dunham, their service was not missed by the army.[170] In other words, the only value this work provided to the national war effort would be to bend the will of the conscientious objectors, and confirm the authority of the state over their bodies in wartime.

However, such treatment does not fully explain why COs refused to cook their own food, or to build their own latrine. The views of Dunham, Thomas, and Gray, however, provide much insight into why many of the men refused to participate in such work. Dunham, while willing to engage in work that helped maintain him and his fellows, absolutely refused to engage in work that would further the war effort. However, hardcore absolutists, such as Harold Gray would eventually be, believed that *any and all work* that they did would assist the war effort. Gray believed that if he cooked his own food, it would relieve a soldier that could be sent to the front from having to be assigned to cook. Therefore, radical absolutists refused to do any work whatsoever, because any work that they engaged in, even in the care of themselves, might free up a soldier from non-combatant service, and therefore, aid in the war effort. Eventually, even Arthur Dunham would embrace this view, and he would refuse to engage in any work after he initially arrived at Fort Leavenworth. However, after time in solitary confinement, combined with the fact that the armistice had been signed and that the U.S. was no longer engaged in the war in Europe, Dunham did agree to work. However, even so, he would regret leaving solitary confinement and working in the prison, even if it involved nothing more than symbolically shoveling dirt, and then, delivering messages a few times each day.

But the refusal of a couple of hundred of COs to the war, and the response of the government to them, raises a larger question: why did the government feel the need to imprison COs for refusing to serve in the army? Stated another way, what was at stake for the government

---

[170] Dunham, 43.

with regards to conscientious objection? And why did Army officers and soldiers feel the need to enforce such coercive discipline—to the point of torture, in some cases? This is a much harder question to answer. As I have mentioned, Capozzola argues that the government had to enforce cultural norms—that it had to deal with the fact that COs violated clearly established duties related to citizenship. However, as I have previously explained, Jennifer Keene has shown that conscription was not a social norm in late Progressive Era America. If this is true, then the implication is clear: conscription was a norm that Wilson and Congress invented, one that was needed for America to participate in the war. As such, the government had to disseminate propaganda that would significantly add to the duties of citizenship. The government did this through the Committee on Public Information. The CPI transmitted its propaganda in any way that it could find, including through newspapers, movies, and through the speeches of its Four Minute Men. In doing so, it created a new discourse in American society, one that required men to be willing to submit to military service, and even be willing to give up their lives to "make the world safe for Democracy." But it also did more than that.

According to the French historian, philosopher, and sociologist Jacques Ellul, propagandists engage in propaganda with two distinct aims: the first is to either change the mind of a person or intensify a belief and emotions the person already holds, and the second is to entice a person to action or inaction, depending upon the target.[171] Both modes of propaganda can clearly be seen operating in the carceral state. But while it is easy to understand that propaganda can change minds or reinforce what is already believed, how do we explain the drive to violence that propaganda creates? Ellul states that:

> It is a matter of reaching and encircling the whole man and all men. Propaganda tries to surround man by all possible routes, in the realm of feelings as well as ideas, by playing on his will or on his needs, through his conscious and his unconscious, assailing him in both his private and public life. It furnishes him with a

[171] Jacques Ellul, *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes* (New York: Vintage Books, 1965), xiii.

> complete system for explaining the world, and provides immediate incentives to action. We are here in the presence of an organized myth that tries to take hold of the entire person. Through the myth it creates, propaganda imposes a complete range of intuitive knowledge, susceptible of only one interpretation unique and one-sided and precluding any divergence. This myth becomes so powerful that it invades every area of consciousness, leaving no faculty or motivation intact. It stimulates in the individual a feeling of exclusiveness, and produces a biased attitude. The myth has such motive force that, once accepted, it controls the whole of the individual, who becomes immune to any other influence. This explains the totalitarian attitude that the individual adopts—where a myth has been successfully created—and that simply reflects the totalitarian action of propaganda on him.[172]

This propaganda that created an organizing myth that Ellul speaks of, or what we might call a worldview, was so powerful that it not only was able to instill in Americans the idea that their citizenship obligations now included submitting to the draft, but it also instilled the need to act against those who would dare to reject such obligations. Whether it be the friend of Harold Gray's mother who turned him in to the Bureau of Investigation for saying he would never fight, the soldiers who decided to hang the socialist Herman Kaplan for refusing to work in the Camp Riley Guard House, or the soldiers who tortured prisoners for days on end at Camp Funston for their refusal to fight, CPI propaganda worked to transform the mind and motives of many. For those whom CPI's propaganda failed to convince, the surveillance of the carceral state, and the vigilante violence inspired by the propaganda of this state attempted to bring along the rest.

But why? First and foremost, as Michael Kazin has convincingly shown, the vast majority of Americans were against U.S. participation in the war before, during, and after the declaration of war by Congress. Wilson knew that in order to raise taxes, to convince Americans to purchase war bonds and war savings stamps, and to voluntarily register for, and then submit, to conscription, he had to do more than wave around the Zimmerman Telegram and the German government's statement to the United States that it intended to resume unrestricted submarine warfare. So, Wilson turned to propaganda and coercion in order to obtain compliance with his wishes. Wilson's statement, "Woe be to the man or group of men that seeks to stand in our way,"

---

[172] Ibid, 10.

which he made to a peace group that had hoped to change his mind, is quite telling in this regard.[173] Wilson would not brook dissent, and would use any means necessary in order to meet his goals and to bring the entire nation along with him. The use of this propaganda, coupled with discourses surrounding the obligations of American citizen, and the encouragement of citizens to keep their friends and neighbors, as well as strangers, under watch, truly created a carceral state. This state—through its populace—policed the words, actions, and even thoughts of those opposed to the war, as well as of those whose support did not go far enough. Arthur Dunham, Evan Thomas, and Harold Gray discovered the power of the carceral state first hand, when they allowed the duties of sectarianism to dictate their words and actions instead of the duties of citizenship. Their time in CO barracks, in guard houses, and in prison cells—all because of their visible dissent to the new citizenship obligation of conscription created by the propaganda of the carceral state, would forever change their lives.

[173] Kennedy, 46.

Conclusion: Dunham and His Unpublishable Story

Arthur Dunham's involvement with the carceral state did not end upon his release from prison. Dunham, a keen observer of people and by training a political scientist and social worker, quickly put pen to paper and authored his memoirs of his experience with the Army and the war. Unlike the memoirs of Harold Gray and Evan Thomas, which are more an edited collection of letters to their families and friends, Dunham took his own letters which survived, and wrote a full narrative of his experiences, along with commentary. He was bent on recording the actions, intentions, and results of the carceral state for posterity's sake.

Dunham set to work writing his memoirs shortly after his release, and he submitted his manuscript to the leading publishers of his day. Dunham had finished a first draft of his memoirs as early as September of 1920.[174] He revised these with the help of journalist and social activist Winthrop Lane, and began submitting the finished manuscript to publishers in June of 1922. He sent the manuscript to MacMillan, Knopf, as well as to many other trade publishers.[175] Once rejections began to roll in, Dunham, at the suggestion of a friend, made inquiries with periodicals, to see if a magazine or newspaper would be interested in printing his manuscript in serialized form.[176] No one would publish it. Dunham was generally told by the publishers that they already had too many other books on the war in press, and that they could not handle any

---

[174] Arthur Dunham to Winthrop Lane, September 22, 1920. Box 24, Correspondence regarding effort to publish "Narrative of a Conscientious Objector," Arthur Dunham Papers, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan (hereafter cited as Dunham papers).

[175] Dunham to Lane, June 7, 1922, Box 24, Correspondence regarding effort to publish "Narrative of a Conscientious Objector," Dunham Papers; See also Dunham to Lane, July 8, 1922.

[176] Howard Colwell to Arthur Dunham, March 31, 1919, Box 24, Correspondence regarding effort to publish "Narrative of a Conscientious Objector," Dunham Papers.

more books on the topic.[177] Dunham followed up with at least one publisher, Knopf, asking about the viability of publishing the book sometime in the future.[178] The editor, Blanche Knopf, replied but refused to provide him with any advice or her thoughts on the book.[179] After many rejections, Arthur Dunham gave up. To this day, his memoirs sit in a box at the University of Michigan, occasionally viewed by scholars, or by undergraduate students seeking research content.

Harold Gray's memoirs were not published until 1934, and Evan Thomas' memoirs did not reach the public until 1974. The reasons why Dunham's memoirs were not published, but Gray's and Thomas' were, are hard to determine. It could be that, as several publishers told Dunham, they were simply too overwhelmed with books on the war to be interested in publishing one more account, especially a set of memoirs written by an unknown prisoner of the carceral state. More likely, however is the fact that Dunham attempted to publish his memoirs in the aftermath of the Red Scare, when the carceral state continued to operate in full swing, seeking out socialists, communists, and IWW members for arrest, incarceration, and deportation from the United States. Furthermore, soon after the war was over, much of the country became disillusioned with America's participation in the conflict. The war did not make the world "Safe for Democracy," nor did it end all wars. Congress rejected President Wilson's plans for a League of Nations, and the election of Warren Harding—a Republican—as the 29th President of the United States, was widely seen as a repudiation of Wilson's conduct of the war. Between an

---

[177] B.W. Huebsch, Inc. to Arthur Dunham, May 26, 1922. Box 24, Correspondence regarding effort to publish "Narrative of a Conscientious Objector," Dunham Papers.

[178] Arthur Dunham to Blanche Knopf, July 18, 1922, Box 24, Correspondence regarding effort to publish "Narrative of a Conscientious Objector," Dunham Papers.

[179] Blanche Knopf to Arthur Dunham, July 21, 1922, Box 24, Correspondence regarding effort to publish "Narrative of a Conscientious Objector," Dunham Papers.

oversaturation of books on the war, Dunham's status as a "slacker" and formerly imprisoned CO, and the Red Scare, it simply wasn't the right time to publish Dunham's memoirs.

The fact that Dunham's memoir was not published in the 1920s was surely disappointing to him, but it may have been a disservice to the country as well. The last chapter of Dunham's memoir is a critical analysis of "The Problem of the Conscientious Objector." Dunham, with his keen eye as a social worker, recognized that solving this problem would not be easy. He saw the issue as "a combination of two age-old conflicts, the conflict of the heretic with the orthodox majority, and the conflict of individual freedom with the power of the state."[180] Though he was somewhat skeptical that the majority were in fact in favor of the war, he was willing to grant that it was for argument's sake, and he could see at least three ways of dealing with COs. The first was "the military method" of dealing with the issue, which was simply to view the CO as a legally drafted solider who became a recalcitrant military criminal who ought "to be shot at dawn." While Dunham was of course not in favor of the military option, he did find that it had one redeeming quality: "It is straightforward and clear cut."[181]

Dunham argued that the government "partially applied" this method, but that it "never carried the military method to its logical conclusion," that of legally executed capital punishment. Instead, the Army sentenced some men to die, but commuted their sentences, and it allowed soldiers to torment, harass, and even torture COs. Two COs, the Wipf brothers, even died from the poor treatment that they received at Alcatraz, but their deaths were not carried out by the juridical decisions of the government, but instead by the carceral state that encouraged

[180] Dunham, 185.

[181] Ibid.

citizen-soldiers to inform on, harass, and otherwise harm those who refused to comply.[182]

The second method that Dunham identified was the "Legal Method," which viewed COs as violators of the Selective Service Act, and therefore, federal civilian offenders who should be arrested, tried, and imprisoned by civil authorities. The government did embrace this tactic to an extent, when it arrested and then incarcerated draft evaders, but then, after their year in a civilian jail was finished, turned them over to the military to be conscripted. Dunham noted that one of the advantages to the legal method was that most civilian prisoners did not refuse to work, as their work did not further the war effort.[183]

The third technique that Dunham identified was the "social case-work" method, which involved a social worker in "the process of adjusting an individual to his environment so that he may function more happily, usefully, and successfully as a member of the community."[184] According to Dunham, conscientious objection was seen in social work theory as a form of "social maladjustment," which should be treatable through scientific methods. Dunham argued that the government applied this method in part, "and probably unconsciously," when it attempted to offer COs different "alternative environments," such as non-combatant service, farm furloughs, and the like.[185]

Dunham did not mince words in his evaluation of how the government applied the social work method. He declared, "The supreme stupidity and inefficiency of the government in dealing with the C.O. lay in the fact that before attempting to apply the principle of alternative environments to the C.O., the government first plunged the C.O. into the military environment

---

[182] Ibid, 186.

[183] Ibid, 186-7.

[184] Ibid, 187-8.

[185] Ibid, 188.

where it was morally certain there would be injustice and brutality toward the C.O. and immense waste of time for the army."[186] Dunham believed that a CO should never see the inside of any type of military facility. Placing a CO in an Army camp, and calling him a solider, in a place where a solider was expected to obey all orders without thinking, could result in nothing but disaster, especially since the COs explicitly reserved their own judgment with regards to what they believed was moral and ethical. Placing a CO in the military ensured that "the C.O. was forced, by his position as a C.O., to draw lines and make decisions," something that would never be tolerated by a regular private solider. Dunham argued that placing the CO, who had to make these decisions, within the military then required the Army to act, because to ignore such conduct would undermine military discipline.[187] Dunham interpreted President Wilson's order regarding the treatment of COs as requiring the Army to practice social casework. However, since Army officers were not trained as social workers, and since many of them did not have the temperament for such work, it was destined to fail. Dunham did note, however, that some officers were able to work well with COs, mostly because of their own "native ability," and not because the Army provided them with training or clear-cut regulations on how to proceed.[188] Dunham argued that if the social casework method had been correctly applied, the Funston Outrages, as well as the torture and mistreatment that many COs suffered, would never have occurred. It also would have also saved the Army much time, money, and headaches.[189]

Dunham also noted that, out of almost 4,000 COs that were finally inducted into the Army, the military court-martialed 450 or so of them as absolutists. Dunham did not believe that

---

[186] Ibid, 189.

[187] Ibid.

[188] Ibid, 189-90.

[189] Ibid, 190.

all of these men were actually absolutists, however. Instead, many of them were pushed, like him, into making decisions that led to being court-martialed, especially since the Army did not offer most of these men alterative service, such as farm furloughs.[190]

Ultimately, Dunham believed that a hybrid of the legal method and the case work method should be applied to future wars where conscription occurred. First, he believed that the government would have to evaluate the sincerity of conscientious objectors to military service. He acknowledged that a board appointed to this task would have a difficult job ahead of them, but he thought it would be less work than a full criminal trial. He also argued that, unlike the military tribunals that only took mere minutes to pass judgement on sincerity, these boards would have to take real time and make real effort to probe the sincerity of COs. He also argued that all COs should be given options for alternative service, and that they should never see the inside of a military camp. He believed this would largely solve the CO problem, except for a small number of absolutists that rejected all conscripted labor.[191]

Finally, Dunham argued that none of the methods would work for absolutist COs. He believed that absolutists should be "exempted from all military and alternative service on the grounds of absolute conscientious objection against war." Dunham recognized that objections would be made to a policy such as this, including the fact that it was unfair to the rest of the men who were conscripted, and that it would "put a premium upon absolutism."[192] Dunham countered with the fact that any type of exemption from combat was "inconsistent with the strict logic and rigid application of the conscription principle. The truth of the matter is, of course, that

---

[190] Ibid, 191.

[191] Ibid, 192.

[192] Ibid, 195.

conscription and personal freedom are exact opposites."[193] Therefore, he saw no real problem with providing full exemption for absolutists if the Army was willing to provide combat exemptions for other COs. As for the contention that granting full exemptions to absolutists would intolerably grow the absolutist pool, Dunham rejected this idea. He pointed to the small number of COs who were actually inducted into the Army, arguing instead that the apparatus of the carceral state, "publicity, public opinion, and social pressure" would keep most men from declaring themselves to be absolutists. Furthermore, he believed, most COs would be more than willing to demonstrate both their sincerity and their conscientious scruples by performing alternative service. Ultimately, however, Dunham argued that instead of fixing the problem of how COs are dealt with, the government should focus on fixing the problem of how COs are created: the act of going to war in the first place.[194]

Since Dunham's manuscript did not see the light of day, his arguments for how to properly treat COs during the next war did not receive a fair hearing. However, while his written words did not appear in public, the sentiment behind them most certainly did. Dunham's ideas and alternatives were in the air. Numerous tracts, articles, and other published sources argued for alternative ways to treat COs. This discourse appears to have had some effect. While the government did not fully embrace Dunham's scheme, it did deal with COs in a more humane manner during the Second World War. The government largely put the Society of Friends—or the Quakers—in charge of COs during World War II, creating Civilian Public Service Corps camps—modeled on New Deal CCC camps—as an alternative environment for COs.[195]

---

[193] Ibid, 196.

[194] Ibid, 196-7.

[195] Mitchell L. Robinson, "Men of Peace in a World at War: Civilian Public Service in New York State, 1941-1946." *New York History* 78, no. 2 (1997): 173-210.

Dunham's written memoirs did not help this come about, but the national discourse of which he was a part most certainly helped implement this more humane alternative for dealing with COs.

The implementation of the carceral state—of neighbors spying on neighbors, of people policing themselves, and of the government using coercion when necessary—became less and less popular in the years after the war. A rejection of pure coercion, or at least, a lessening of it, can be clearly seen in the New Deal in the years following World War I. Historians of the New Deal and the Second World War such as Sarah T. Phillips, James Sparrow, and Meg Jacobs have emphasized the voluntary nature of many of the regulatory programs that sprung up to deal with the Great Depression and then the war.[196] Sarah Phillips argues that FDR—who had been an official in Woodrow Wilson's administration and a disciple of the former President—sought to implement largely voluntary programs in order to ensure that the New Deal would "gain widespread political acceptance." However, she also notes that many of these policies ultimately did not achieve their goals, because there was little to compel people to comply.[197] It may be that the heavy coercive power that Woodrow Wilson wielded during the years that America was involved in Europe's war constrained FDR's political options during the New Deal and during America's second excursion into European warfare. It certainly appears to have done so with regards to COs during World War II. In that sense, maybe the experiences of men like Arthur Dunham, Evan Thomas, and Harold Gray were not fully wasted after all.

---

[196] See Sarah T. Phillips, *This Land, This Nation: Conservation, Rural America, and the New Deal* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2007); James T. Sparrow, *Warfare State: World War II Americans and the Age of Big Government* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2013); and Meg Jacobs, "'How About Some Meat?': The Office of Price Administration, Consumption Politics, and State Building from the Bottom Up," *Journal of American History* 84, no. 3 (December 1997).

[197] Phillips, 82.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archival Resources

Arthur Dunham Papers, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Harold Studley Gray Papers, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan.

Newspapers

The New York Times

Houston Chronicle

Periodicals

The Christian Century

The Outlook

The Atlantic Monthly

Manuscripts and Publications

"Record of Trial by General Court Martial by Harold S. Gray." Camp Funston, KS: United States Army, 1918.

Report of Treatment of Conscientious Objectors at the Camp Funston Guard House. New York: Friends of Conscientious Objectors, 1918.

Who Are the Conscientious Objectors? New York: 1000 Friends of Conscientious Objectors, 1919.

Secondary Sources

Periodical Articles

Casey, Michael W. "From Religious Outsiders to Insiders: The Rise and Fall of Pacifism in the Churches of Christ." *Journal of Church and State* 44, no. 3 (2002): 455-75.

Citino, Robert M. "Military Histories Old and New: A Reintroduction." *American Historical Review* 112, no. 4 (October 2007): 1070-90.

Fowler, Jr., Newton B. "Church and Sect Applied to Early Disciples: Limitations of Troeltsch and Niebuhr." *Discipliana* 56, no. 2 (Summer 1996): 54-64.

Hankins, Jean F. "A Different Kind of Loyalist: The Sandemanians of New England during the Revolutionary War." *New England Quarterly* 31, no. 3 (1987): 223-49.

Jacobs, Meg. "'How About Some Meat?': The Office of Price Administration, Consumption Politics, and State Building from the Bottom Up, 1941-1946." *Journal of American History* 84, no. 3 (December 1997): 910-41.

Jeffery, Joshua Ward. "'A Barbarous Method of Adjusting Differences': Federal Persecution of Conscientious Objectors in the Disciples During the Great War, 1917-1918." *Stone-Campbell Journal* 20, no. 1 (April 2017): 17-33.

Piper, John F. "The American Churches in World War I." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 38, no. 2 (June 1970): 147-55.

Robinson, Mitchell L. "Men of Peace in a World at War: Civilian Public Service in New York State, 1941-1946." *New York History* 78, no. 2 (1997): 173-210.

St. Amant, Clyde Penrose. "Review of *Preachers Present Arms*, by Ray H. Abrams." *Review and Expositor* 68, no. 1 (Winter 1971): 143-44 .

Stout, Harry S. "Religion, War, and the Meaning of America." *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation* 19, no. 2 (Summer 2009): 275-89.

Books and Book Chapters

Abrams, Ray H. *Preachers Present Arms: The Role of the American Churches and Clergy in World Wars I and II, with Some Observations on the War in Vietnam*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1933.

Beaman, Jay. *Pentecostal Pacifism: The Origin, Development, and Rejection of Pacific Belief Among the Pentecostals*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009.

Boghardt, Thomas. *The Zimmermann Telegram: Intelligence, Diplomacy and America's Entry into World War I*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2012.

Capozzola, Christopher. *Uncle Sam Wants You: World War I and the Making of the Modern American Citizen*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Carlson, John D., and Jonathan H. Ebel, eds. *From Jeremiad to Jihad: Religion, Violence, and America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2012.

Conkin, Paul Keith. *American Originals: Homemade Varieties of Christianity*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.

Creel, George. *How We Advertised America: The First Telling of the Amazing Story of the Committee on Public Information that Carried the Gospel of Americanism to Every Corner of the Globe*. New York: Harper Brothers, 1920.

Early, Frances H. *A World Without War: How U.S. Feminists and Pacifists Resisted World War I*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1997.

Freeberg, Ernest. *Democracy's Prisoner: Eugene V. Debs, the Great War, and the Right to Dissent.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.

Gamble, Richard M. *The War for Righteousness: Progressive Christianity, the Great War, and the Rise of the Messianic Nation*. Wilmington, Del.: ISI Books, 2003.

Gorman, James L. *Among the Early Evangelicals: The Transatlantic Origins of the Stone-Campbell Movement*. Abilene, Texas: Abilene Christian University Press, 2017.

Hughes, Matthew, and William James Philpott, eds. *Palgrave Advances in Modern Military History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Jasper, Willi. *Lusitania: The Cultural History of a Catastrophe*. Translated by Stewart Spencer. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016.

Kazin, Michael. *War Against War: The American Fight for Peace, 1914-1918*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2017.

Keene, Jennifer D. *Doughboys, The Great War, and the Remaking of America*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Keith, Jeanette. *Rich Man's War, Poor Man's Fight: Race, Class, and Power in the Rural South during the First World War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Kennedy, David M. *Over Here: The First World War and American Society*. 25th ed. Oxford UK: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Kleppner, Paul. The. *The Cross of Culture: A Social Analysis of Midwestern Politics 1850-1900*. New York: Free Press, 1970.

Koenig, Robert L. *The Fourth Horseman: One Man's Secret Mission to Wage the Great War in America*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2006.

Kohn, Stephen M. *American Political Prisoners: Prosecutions under the Espionage and Sedition Acts*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1994.

Lipscomb, David. *On Civil Government: Its Origin, Mission, and Destiny, and the Christian's Relation to it*. Indianapolis, IN: Doulos Christou Press, 2006.

Moore, R. Laurence. *Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans*. New York: Oxford, 1986.

Niebuhr, H Richard. *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*. Gloucester, Mass.: P. Smith, 1987.

Peterson, Horace Cornelius, and Gilbert C. Fite. *Opponents of War: 1917-1918*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957.

Phillips, Sarah T. *This Land, This Nation: Conservation, Rural America, and the New Deal*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Piper, John F. *The American Churches in World War I*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1985.

Smith, John Howard. *The Perfect Rule of the Christian Religion: A History of Sandemanianism in the Eighteenth Century*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2008.

Sparrow, James T. *Warfare State: World War II Americans and the Age of Big Government*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Thomas, Evan. *The Radical 'No,": The Correspondence and Writings of Evan Thomas on War*. Chatfield, Charles, ed. New York: Garland Publishing, 1974.

Thomas, Louisa. *Conscience: Two Soldiers, Two Pacifists, One Family*. New York: Penguin Books, 2012.

Troeltsch, Ernst. *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

Waterston, Alisse, ed. *An Anthropology of War: Views from the Frontline*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2009.

Witcover, Jules. *Sabotage at Black Tom: Imperial Germany's Secret War in America, 1914-1917*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: Algonquin Books of Chapel Hill, 1989.

Zeiler, Thomas W., David Ekbladh, and Benjamin C. Montoya, eds. *Beyond 1917: The United States and the Global Legacies of the Great War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Conference Papers

Beaman, Jay. "Un-Muting the Genealogy of Peace, WWI." Paper presented at the Remembering Muted Voices Symposium: Conscience, Dissent, Resistance and Civil Liberties in World War I Through Today, Kansas City, KS, October 21, 2017.

Online Resources

Ancestry.com. “Atlanta, Georgia, U.S. Penitentiary, Prisoner Index, 1880-1922.” Accessed July 22, 2018. https://search.ancestry.com/search/db.aspx?dbid=1632.

Jeffery, Joshua Ward. The Glasite Political Theology Project. Accessed July 22, 2018. http://www.glasite.org/.

Yoder, Anne M. "World War I Conscientious Objection." Swarthmore College Peace Collection. October 16, 2017. http://www.swarthmore.edu/library/peace/conscientiousobjection/WWI.COs.coverpage.htm.

Vita

Joshua Ward Jeffery was born in Colorado Springs, Colorado, before growing up in Oregon. After a short first run at college, Joshua entered the work force, working in public safety. He worked in law enforcement, the fire service, and emergency medical response. From 2006 to 2012, He was the Ranger Sergeant in charge of protection of the Bull Run Watershed Management Unit on the Mount Hood National Forest. That experience made Joshua interested in researching the use of coercive power by the federal government. Joshua holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in History from Warner Pacific College, and a Master of Theological Studies degree from Vanderbilt University. He obtained his M.A. in history from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in 2018. Joshua's research interests lie in church and state relations, religion and warfare, environmental history, and American religious history. Joshua is the author of several published essays and articles.