Chapter Two

“Practical Unanimity”: U.S. Quakerism, Hicksite Quaker Albert K. Smiley in U.S. Political Life

[Our] discussions [at LMC] are of a purely non-partisan and non-political nature, our aim being simply to present the present-day conditions and needs of the Philippines [and Puerto Rico] for the information of the general public in this country.

-- Hicksite Quaker Albert K. Smiley

[A] rule laid down [by Mr. Albert Smiley] many years ago provided that no declaration of principle concerning which there was not practical unanimity of opinion should be incorporated in the conference platform.

-- Corresponding Secretary H. C. Phillips

Introduction

Between 1880 and 1912, Hicksite Quaker Albert K. Smiley became an important yet unknown political figure within U.S. progressive national circles by directly engaging in various discourses on U.S. race and overseas insular territorial relations through what I call a *pragmatic Quakerism* approach to managing non-white peoples. Smiley defined the key issues, shaped the strategies and themes of discourse through his Quaker Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Peoples (LMC). Through Smiley’s words and actions we can assess the meaning and significance of Quakerism and racialism on the politics over U.S. insular territorial policies and broader U.S. political thought and development. To make this argument, I draw on Smiley’s writings, notes and speeches as well as his correspondences with U.S. political and elected officials, religious leaders, secular and sectarian educators, philanthropists, legal scholars, journalists, newspaper and magazine editors, and top officials at U.S. insular territorial institutions in Puerto Rico and the Philippines. Many of Smiley’s contemporaries with similar concerns over reform politics were members of his Quaker LMC. Using rarely seen archival materials, along with biographical and other historical
documents, I show how Smiley’s spiritual pragmatism (moral-religious imperative) was rooted in and relied on Quaker principles, beliefs and values – both conservative and liberal dimensions – and methods along with evolutionary racialist assumptions. He identified with and promoted humanitarian and egalitarian notions of social, economic and political justice as related to U.S. relations with non-white peoples yet showed similar paternalistic tendencies as other Anglo-Saxon white evolutionary racialist thinkers of his time. In sum, Smiley’s pragmatic Quakerism philosophy seem to buttress his larger commitments to social justice and peace but without resulting in any real challenge to U.S. asserted national sovereignty over non-white peoples as seen with the acquisition, occupation and administration of Puerto Rico and the Philippines in the late 19th and early 20 centuries.

Chapter two begins with a brief historical discussion of U.S. Quakerism, the theological and ideological foundations of the Christian religious sect and its legacies with the politics over the “other” since it’s founding in the mid-17th century. Then it attends closely to the work and philosophy of Hicksite Quaker LMC founder Albert K. Smiley while placing him and his non-governmental institution (LMC) in broader historical, political and ideological contexts. Finally, the chapter concludes with some remarks about the significance of Smiley’s pragmatic Quakerism at the intersection of religious ideas and racial thought for understanding the political development of U.S. insular territorial politics and race relations. This chapter serves as a prelude to the historical, institutional and intersectional analysis on how and the extent to which Quakerism, and racialist political thought together at and through the LMC shaped U.S. political development in terms of insular territorial policies granting collective citizenship.
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and local self-government or more autonomy to Puerto Ricans and Filipinos in the first half of the 20th century. These are discussed in the chapters 4 and 5 respectively.

**U.S. Quakerism and the Politics over the "Other"**

It is well known that Quakerism or the “Religious Society of Friends” as a radical ideological element of Christianity, and a religious theological and political movement in its own right, has often entered the public political sphere to confront the controversial issues of the day. Quakerism was founded in 1659 in Britain by George Fox who often advocated “industry, frugality, and self-help” for all Quakers. Fox while in his twenties wanted to change the way human beings searched for and obtained Spiritual Truth. Quaker historian James Walvin described Fox as aiming “not to create a sect but to persuade his fellow men and women to worship honestly, not through the intermediary of the priesthood or any religious organization but from within themselves, directly to the Almighty.” Fox's ideas amounted to a conservative Quaker affinity to which he “encouraged [Quakers] to be hard-working, financially prudent and honest in all their business dealings.” Moreover, by participating in meeting houses and working at home “and in the workplace, Quakers sought to train themselves, their children, and each other in those personal and social qualities which were at once a reflection of their living faith and a code of everyday conduct.” More importantly, as Fox claimed, holding on to beliefs, values and methods as a Friend “involved subjecting oneself to possible scrutiny of one’s personal and professional life; those whose [behavior] left something to be desired were visited, questioned, helped – or excluded.” Similar Quaker tendencies and attributes were shown at times by Albert K. Smiley as I show in this chapter and throughout the dissertation project. These Quaker expectations and ideas permeated
Smiley’s life and his LMC politics despite having been removed from Fox’s time by two centuries.

Throughout U.S. history, Quakers, both as individuals and within religious and secular institutions, have often been concerned with the social and economic well-being and political conditions of those deemed “inferior,” “different,” “weak,” “uncivilized,” or broadly categorized as the “other.”¹³ Both humanitarian and egalitarian principles underscore Quaker efforts toward social justice, peace and transcendence. Although these two key principles remained consistent throughout the history of Quaker involvement in the political and social public sphere, some contradictions still existed: many Friends established colonies while owning slaves, yet others led antislavery campaigns, advocated for women suffrage, held campaigns for the abolition of capital punishment, engaged in electoral politics and supported the black civil rights movements of the 19th and 20th centuries.¹⁴ A more active Quakerism in political life was seen in the context of critiquing nation-state organized violence as a means to achieve political ends: “[U.S.] Friends memorialized Congress and President Cleveland commending the effort to persuade Great Britain and Venezuela to accept mediation in their boundary dispute, but expressing the belief that threats were not the way to accomplish such an end.”¹⁵ U.S. Quakers in the late 17th century “oscillated between active participation in government, as in [Quaker] William Penn’s ‘Holy Experiment’ in Pennsylvania, and quietist withdrawal from the compromises and corruptions of political life.”¹⁶ Yet other Friends protested against various wars, and from the late 18th century through the early 20th century, many were active in U.S. Indian affairs.¹⁷ But most notable are the changes wrought by Quaker activism in U.S. Indian affairs that was usually understood within a
civilized-savage framework to which the Quaker usually wanted to "make known…all
men could live the good, peaceful life together and…which savages might be 'convinced'
into civilization." As shown, the national issues Quakers confronted since the 18th
century were vast and disparate.

The racialized point of view placing the Indian subordinate to the Anglo-Saxon
race premised on the civilized-savage binary was made more complex by Quaker
William Penn’s comments to the North American Indians in 1680:

I have great love and regard towards you; and desire to win and gain your love and
friendship, by a kind, just and peaceable life;…I have sent my commissioners to treat
with you about land, and to a firm league of peace; let me desire you to be kind to them,
and the people, and receive these presents and tokens, which I have sent you, as a
testimony of my goodwill to you, and my resolution to live justly, peaceably and friendly
with you.19

Penn’s form of Quakerism was imbued with a profound Christian piety an imperative that
upheld charitable notions of racial uplift. In this sense, his main objective was to
reconcile two different cultures and racialized people by focusing on gifts as a universal
symbol for peace and humanitarianism, while suggesting in a subtle manner that the
white race would generously negotiate land with the unassuming implied savage Indian.
The implication is clear with Penn’s suggestion to the Indian to “be kind to” his sent
friendly commissioners. Later we’ll see how Albert Smiley’s expectations for unity and
universal assent were connected to the historical understandings of 17th century
Quakerism.

**Quietism to Toleration and Inclusiveness: Theological and Political transformation
of a Quaker Spirit**

From 1827 to 1955, U.S. Quakerism had been split into several theological and
ideological divisions.20 Figure 2.0 shows some of the early splits or schisms of U.S.
Quakerism up to the modern period. Much of this division had to do with different understandings of the Inner Light notion in Quakerism as described below.\textsuperscript{21} Also from the mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century and through much of the first half of the twentieth century, theologically conservative Quakers (traditional Orthodox or Quietist, Gurneyites, Wilburites, and Crewdsonites) assumed an evangelical Christian identity making up the anti-Hicks coalition in which historic Quaker pacifism was abandoned.\textsuperscript{22} However, theologically liberal Quakers (Hicksite) held on to the traditional silent worship while welcoming both atheists and non-Christians into their fold. Hicksite Quakers were rationalists and progressive oriented in terms of engaging public activities and advocating for liberal tenets in social, economic and political life: egalitarianism, humanitarianism, individualism, and broader tolerance.\textsuperscript{23} These divisions seemed to prevent politically and socially active Quakers from making any significant strides in the early anti-slavery movement of the 1830s through 1850s in U.S. political development.\textsuperscript{24}
Yet, U.S. Quakers became the first organized religious group to oppose the institution of slavery prior to the Civil War and later during Reconstruction moved on to dealing with the economic and social conditions of the “American Negro” but within the new institution of segregation. These two positions seem contradictory but when examined under a late 19th century liberalism lens, in particular the liberal Quaker conception of toleration they seem reconcilable. Liberal Quakers were tolerant of differences (political, and cultural), ideological perspectives and sociological views as long as the latter two did not amount to or advocate violence, or war. Clearly there were conditions set to taking serious action in public affairs that were usually rooted in Quaker peace and social justice testimonies. These variations of tolerance prevailed throughout Albert K. Smiley’s life and work including his management of Quaker LMC interventionist politics.

In sum, throughout the 17th and 18th centuries, Quakerism was known for its form of Christian Quietism in terms of an intentional non-involvement attitude toward domestic and international public affairs. However, in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, this Quietism position gave way to toleration and more inclusiveness in Quakerism and in terms of social and political activism. “The years from 1850 until the outbreak of World War I may be characterized briefly as years during which Friends’ interest and involvement in the international scene became more inclusive.” Within this broader Quaker toleration, inclusiveness and increased political activism surfaced the thought and work of Smiley that took institutional form with the LMC as discussed in greater detail in chapter 3.
Spiritual Equals seeking the “Inner light”

The Inner Light concept is at the center of Quaker thought and action. Quaker historian David Hinshaw comments, “The core of the Quaker belief was the Inner-Light – that intuition of the presence of God which enabled the individual to learn how to discover and realize what is evil for him by avoiding it to bring himself in harmony with the universal spirit.” Expressing this idea differently U.S. Quaker historian and professor of mysticism Rufus M. Jones said, “So, too, there is an outer way and an inner way and both are one.” It is important to note the one-ness notion referred to by Jones is foundational in traditional Quakerism and also within Smiley’s own pragmatism. Yet even more so is the Quaker concept of Inner light or Spirit of God that fuels the direct engagement of Quakers in the personal, organizational, social and political world. However, the concept of Inner Light has been used along with Inward Light, Spirit of God, and Light Within among others to refer to the same experience: "that of God in everyone." Note the Inner Light concept did not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, sex, or class; it contained a stronger sense of pluralism than the individualism notions found in prevailing understanding of liberalism in American political life.

Quaker historian Pink Dandelion does argue Inner Light and Inward Light have different associations and meanings in Quakerism. Nevertheless, traditionally Quakers, including Smiley and others actively involved in LMC interventionist politics, have "never been precise about theological language, they have often used these terms interchangeably without recognizing the different meanings they might convey." Finally, and more concretely Quaker historian John Moretta states, “The Quakers, took to an extreme the Puritan condemnation of elaborate ritual and church hierarchy, rejecting
all sacraments, liturgies, and paid intermediaries – ministers as well as bishops – for all interfered with the direct communion between the human soul and God” underwriting the Inner Light of Quakerism.\textsuperscript{34}

\textbf{Quakerism and Racial Thought in U.S. Political Culture}

Since the 1870s, Quakers wanted to “teach by example the pure effectiveness of God’s law of universal love, not as a fancied Utopia but as a policy practically vindicated in the past and in the present and slowly but surely winning its way to the confidence of all.”\textsuperscript{35} This gave the impression that Quakerism was divorced of racial thinking. Yet, in the early 1900s in U.S. national political life, religious beliefs and racial thought were bedfellows. Although political historians and some American political development (APD) scholars have previously written important accounts of the significance of religion to politics, not many have taken the intersection of Quakerism and racialism as two co-created ideological and institutional forces seriously for understanding the political and constitutional development of U.S. insular territorial affairs (discourses and policies) in the early twentieth century.\textsuperscript{36} In this context, U.S. Quakerism took various forms, liberal, moderate and conservative. In particular, these were the traditional Quietists, liberal Hicksites, the conservative Wilburites, and more orthodox Gurneyites.\textsuperscript{37} The Quaker LMC embodied elements of all three but the liberal dominated in the composition of its membership, various rules and regulations through to the institutional platforms. Nevertheless, the Evangelical Quaker strand did play some role within the LMC sessions on the "dependent races" in Puerto Rico and the Philippines. The following sections explore the dynamic intersection of these Quaker ideological strands (and other non-Quaker Christian beliefs) along with the underlying racialism of the period that together
structured the political development aspects of insular territorial affairs. In particular, I closely assess the writings, speeches and correspondences of Quaker LMC founder Smiley in order to layout his *pragmatic Quakerism* framework that others associated with him and his institution seem to rely on in their attempts to influence U.S. insular territorial politics and national discourses on the inclusion of “other dependent peoples” into a broadly conceived liberal American polity.

**Albert K. Smiley: Hicksite Quaker Pragmatist Founder of Lake Mohonk Conference**

Hicksite liberal Quaker Albert K. Smiley was the central figure who created the Quaker LMC as a national institutional force for dealing with U.S. Indian relations in 1883 and later U.S. insular territorial politics officially in 1904.38 The idea for a non-governmental forum, which would serve as an intermediary ‘community of discourse’ on U.S. race relations and political development, came to Smiley while serving in the Board of Indian Commissioners.39 In 1879, Republican President Rutherford B. Hayes appointed Smiley to serve as member of this Board in order to investigate the activities of various “corrupt” bureaucrats of Indian affairs.40 Note President Hayes after leaving office became involved in various large philanthropic ventures that may account for his subsequent reengagement with Smiley at Quaker LMC.41 Smiley recalls his experience on the Board in 1906 and his frustrations with the manner in which U.S. Indian affairs was conducted:

> At the first meeting I attended…I was greatly impressed by the short time given to discussion, and after that, year after year, I proposed that we should have more time, but all said ‘You cannot do it. Business men cannot be held in Washington more than one day.’ Not long after, a large number of us who were interested in the Indians happened to have a meeting in Dakota, where we discussed the Sioux Indian question for three days. ‘Now,’ I said, ‘we are going to have this same thing at Lake Mohonk,’ and I invited a number of men of experience in Indian affairs to meet here in discussion.42
Yet later in 1909, the main purpose of Smiley’s Quaker forum at Lake Mohonk was expressed more concretely by one of his colleagues and long-time religious associates concerned mostly with U.S. Philippine policy. He stated the non-governmental institution was created for “the promotion of definite legislation at Washington.”  

However, Smiley’s interest in up-building the character and conditions (political, social and economic) of non-white races extended to other populations outside the continental U.S.: “But if the Indian Question is nearing solution, we have other subjects, – the Philippines, [and] Porto Rico… – to which we are, I think wisely, giving more and more attention. Fortunately we have with us many men who are familiar with the affairs of these recently acquired possessions, and we shall undoubtedly have an informing discussion of these great subjects.”  

Thus it was evident the Quaker LMC assembly was born out of necessity in light of the political and institutional inefficiency (and apathy) toward the “Indian question” at the U.S. national government level but mostly as a legitimate political force for broader national and global change.

Smiley had already owned property at Lake Mohonk prior to his appointment to the Board of Indian Commissioners. In 1869 Smiley purchased property (discovered by his twin brother Alfred Smiley while on vacation) at Lake Mohonk, New York in Ulster County where he dedicated time and money restoring a Mountain House Resort surrounded by the beautiful natural environment that reminded him of his own Puritan upbringing. Smiley created his wealth differently than most of his prominent and influential contemporaries who were involved in public affairs, for instance the Harrimans, Rockefellers, and Carnegies. “While the Smiley resorts [at Lake Mohonk, NY and Redlands, CA] did well financially,” most of the earned resources were
“consistently poured…back into their businesses and philanthropies.” Since Quakerism is also connected to a love of nature, and related to Puritanism in various forms, it was not surprising for the LMC to take hold within this mountainous region. As will be shown Smiley held strong liberal religious beliefs about people’s relationship with the natural world that mirrored his search for Truth in a political sense as an individual working in conjunction with others. Overall, it was more important that his liberalism and pragmatism rooted in nature arose from his personal understanding and application of Quaker principles: simplicity, order, individuality and cultivation.

*Smiley's pragmatic Quakerism, underlying religious liberalism, and the Inner Light*

Smiley employed what I call a pragmatic Quakerism philosophy to dealing with non-white races in the Philippines and Puerto Rico. This approach placed an emphasis upon open dialogue, questioning, and practical lived experience guided by traditional Quaker testimonies of peace, equality, fairness, social justice, and moral-spiritual transcendence. However, his views were often grounded on a racialism that focused mainly on the existence of different racial categories (and hierarchies) premised on an Anglo-Saxon white racial norm. In addition, his pragmatic Quakerism philosophy infused personal, social and political behavior: plainness of habit, speech, and deportment, wisdom based on lived experience, duty to others, and discipline. Moreover, other traditional Quaker values and methods informed his pragmatic Quakerism including understanding the social and political significance of business meetings and social questions; commitment to education; and worship centered on the Inner Light concept to which communion, fellowship and public discourse rely. Quaker historian Rufus M. Jones reminds us that Quaker worship and the Inner Light are seen as “[A] vital
discovery of divine life revealing itself here and now in and through a group of persons who are bent on transmitting that life.” In other words, Quakerism "was a spiritual religion, a way of life in which people learned to cooperate with God" or the divine spirit of the nature of God. At times Smiley showed this affinity to the Quaker Inner Light and natural conception of God as he discussed race relations and national policy options with others.

Smiley's pragmatic Quakerism allowed for broader racial discourses to saturate the various moral perspectives and political debates at the October LMC yearly meetings. This is seen in his 1904 opening address as he officially announces the inclusion of “Other Dependent Peoples” to LMC proceedings:

  It always gives me very great pleasure to see so many people interested in a good cause gathered together, and this year I think we have an unusually fine Conference. We don’t meet here to scold the [U.S. national] Government, by any means. Our object is to discuss conditions in a candid way and to see if we cannot do something to better them. We hope the time will soon come when there will be no need of such a Conference as this on the Indian question, and then we shall give our time to other dependent races – the Filipinos and the Porto Ricans, and any others that we may gather in. However, I hope there won’t be anymore. I think it is the general feeling that we should give a prominent share of our attention at this Conference to our new dependent races, so as to make way for the time when the Indian shall be an American citizen, taking care of himself. I wish that day might come in my own lifetime. In these Conferences we invite discussion by people who hold differing views. The only way to get at the truth is for both sides to be heard fairly, only in a temperate and kind spirit. If once in a while a little warlike spirit breaks out, it generally gets calmed down before the Conference closes.

We see how Smiley’s own words suggest an intersection of race and religion but through his own expectations of U.S. insular territorial policy. Also the moral-religious undertone in his speech show how important seeking the truth within God spirit is to understanding the new non-white races under discussion at Lake Mohonk. Racialistic and paternalistic threads seem to permeate through his speech along with political
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rhetoric based on fundamental liberal Quaker notions of truth, equality, and consensus. This reality allowed Smiley to strengthen his new national forum for more directly discussing U.S. race relations yet under the premise that those considered the "other" were deemed racially and politically inferior and thus needing moral-religious uplifting and educational building-up. He once told U.S. House of Representative Theobald Otjen, (D-Wisconsin) his Quaker LMC was “founded solely for the discussion of the Indian problem, it has within a few years extended its scope to include discussion of present-day affairs in the Philippines, [and] Porto Rico….“53 Through the vision and leadership of Hicksite Quaker Smiley, and despite his constant reminders that “the conference excludes from its discussions the strictly political questions such as imperialism or anti-imperialism,”54 his institution became a respected non-governmental political force on both U.S. domestic and international political debates over citizenship, territorial governance, popular sovereignty and Americanization projects.

Smiley sought to create a non-partisan institution through which participants could discuss regional and national issues notwithstanding their religious or political affiliations or personal and social identifications as imperialists/anti-imperialists, liberals/conservatives, Republicans/Democrats and Protestants/Catholics. Noteworthy was Smiley’s generosity in underwriting most of “the expenses of those who were invited to attend” the Quaker LMC.55 In fact, even though the cost to attend the October Conferences increased from $1,093.40 in 1890 to $2,033.33 by 1910, Smiley made certain to cover each member’s travel expenses and provide accommodations.56

Smiley and other progressives involved in LMC sessions were directly engaged in the national debates between imperialist and anti-imperialist on mostly questions
surrounding what to do with the newly occupied overseas territories and acquired non-white inhabitants.\textsuperscript{57} Yet, Smiley was not considered either an imperialist or an anti-imperialist, which said much about his political and social ideological views and what he hoped to accomplish with his Quaker LMC. For example, in a letter, he expressed such views:

\begin{quote}
The management of the Conference is opposed to any acrimonious anti-imperialistic discussion, and that the Conference has without exception always declared itself strongly in support of the general policy adopted by the United States Government. I mention this that you may not be under the impression that this Conference tends against rather than in favor of the efforts of yourself and the other gentlemen who have so faithfully served us in the Philippines.\textsuperscript{38}
\end{quote}

Without intending to purport U.S. national power over non-white races, Smiley's \textit{pragmatic Quakerism} seem to guide his focus on the long-term well-being of the Filipino almost altruistically while avoiding political controversy with an imperialist from the Roosevelt administration in charge of U.S. insular territorial policies in the Philippines. Thus, it seem evident the LMC’s \textit{pragmatic Quakerism} framework informed the decision to allow discussion only by rational not rancorous anti-imperialistic views but to a limited extent. In more general terms, the Quaker forum made room for altruism on the part of U. S. imperialists, which can be seen most effectively in the Philippine sessions as chapter 4 demonstrates.

However, there was little doubt that the Quaker LMC became a battleground for both imperialist and anti-imperialist elements in the U.S. government as the following private exchange suggests. In a letter from Paul Charlton of the Bureau of Insular Affairs it was argued,

\begin{quote}
With further relation to the anti-imperialist side of our government…if either Mr. Fisk Warren, Mr. Erving Winslow, or Mr. Moorfield Storey, all of Boston, are…invited to speak, I would regard it as most important that Mr. Snow be given an opportunity to reply from the view-point of our colonial government and administration…the attacks of the...
three gentlemen I have named…have been so continuous and bitter in the press and through pamphlets and magazine articles, that, if they are to be given an opportunity to speak, it would seem fair that an adequate reply should be made.\textsuperscript{59}

Yet, Smiley staying within the Quaker tradition of tolerating differences found a middle ground by deciding to keep the peace and cautiously arrange the LMC sessions as fairly as possible. He stated, “We do not desire… to stifle discussion of those who consider our occupation of the Philippines unfortunate, but we do decidedly wish to exclude such bitter attacks as would be sure to be made by any of those gentlemen. Our only hesitation about Mr. Snow arose from your statement that he is more or less a radical imperialist and it might be unwise to give our Boston friends an opportunity to accuse us of inviting one radical wing while excluding the other.”\textsuperscript{60} Note Smiley did not consider his colleagues in Boston (Quakers and non-Quakers alike) radicals either way.

Despite his liberal modernist views, at times Smiley invoked traditional Quakerism in his LMC addresses. For example, quoting Society of Friends founder George Fox in his opening speech at the 1895 LMC, Smiley attempted to raise the national debate on territorial occupation and management to a moralistic, non-partisan, deontological standard by focusing on the discrepancy in social and economic conditions of non-white races under U.S. national sovereignty. Yet he sidesteps challenging directly the imperialistic policies that may have caused those conditions in the first place: “Be faithful to God, and mind that which is committed to you, as faithful servants, laboring in love; some threshing; and some ploughing; and some to keep the sheep, he that can receive this let him, and all to watch over one another in the spirit of God.”\textsuperscript{61} This use of Fox as an authority figure in Quakerism reveals Smiley’s willingness and openness to incorporate theology into his political positions and policy preferences. Moreover, by
using Fox, Smiley seem to point at some divine providence created "natural" hierarchy of human races with the Anglo-Saxon white race responsible for improving but not causing the conditions of "other" non-white peoples. Smiley presumes a U.S. national character defined in both racialist and moralist-religious terms. His concern for the proper treatment of non-white races under an asserted U.S. sovereignty seems to justify his support for a tutelage policy in accordance with God's will.62

However, Smiley was not religious but spiritual in his liberal theology. By spiritual I mean he was concerned with God as a notion of lived practical experience defined by good moral deeds (guided and inspired by Quaker testimonies and the Inner Light) as opposed to the scriptural or doctrinal God. As Smiley biographer Larry E. Burgess points out, “The Smileys [Albert and twin Alfred] were first and foremost men of action.”63 Invoking Fox also shows how Smiley mostly desired to pursue the Truth about U.S. relations with dependent peoples. Accordingly, and as shown, with every opening statement, Smiley instilled his pragmatic Quakerism philosophy both directly and indirectly into everything associated with the LMC, including speaker invitations and committee appointments. Throughout his LMC tenure and beyond, it was the Quaker spirit and the broader moral-religious foundations that directed its public interventionism and discussions of race and politics far removed from the bureaucratic and corrupt national mostly secular government institutional politics he abhorred.

Another example of some Christian evolutionary racialist elements seem to arise in a letter by Quaker LMC Secretary Henry S. Haskin in regards to the 1911 LMC schedule. Haskins talks about the Smileys' expectations:

The Smileys have not indicated any definite policy to be followed next year, but as I look the situation over, there seems but one thing to do. The Indian contingent at the recent Conference composed of 75% of those present. Porto Rico is going to continue as an
American dependency for sometime. So, as far as I can see next year's Conference will be along the lines of the recent meeting. It may seem desirable a little later to plan to introduce a discussion of other 'American dependencies.'"  

This was the underlying Quaker LMC intention for future topics including those U.S. territories and non-white races designated under the category of "other dependent peoples." Note creating such a category implies the LMC would continue to pursue more discussions on U.S. paternalist views and policies concerning non-white peoples.

The LMC pragmatic Quakerism framework was also informed by Smiley's ability to connect with non-Quakers. To demonstrate, let us look at some comments made by a LMC member in 1908:

To see all that we saw was a succession of wonders and of beauty; of natural beauty…and it was through your unbounded generosity to us perfect strangers, that such a feast was spread before us. And then your horses and carriages at our disposal every day, as if we were princes, for the marvelous drive along the edge of the precipice…fourteen miles and back to Lake Minnewaska…and for a constant procession of wonders to that place, and at it, and back to Mohonk House….Surely there is not another man in the whole world that would do all this; that would go to that immense expense, and put all this freely, horses and carriages and drivers, and everything, at our disposal, but only Mr. Smiley. And then what we saw and participated in, inside the house! The truly delightful and most worthy company, the like of which would be found nowhere, so far as I know, but in Mohonk House…What you said, wherever for a moment you intervened, had a greater weight than all that others said, and when you leveled up things a little … all felt that just the right word had been spoken.

Clearly Smiley was held in high esteem, respected for his high “moral influence” that allowed him to create the Quaker LMC and gain enough recognition to place the latter on par with some national government agencies (i.e., Bureau of Insular Affairs). As one Quaker historian noted, the LMC forum resembled “a hotel, a home and a church…in such a way that no one can tell where one ends and the other begins.” What is noteworthy, however, is Smiley's character and cooperative reputation made others feel at home in his presence knowing he was a champion of liberal pragmatic politics yet
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tolerant of those who had different more conservative views.67 This made his adoption of
an ambitious yet seemingly moderate program at the Quaker LMC appear more feasible
at times.

Smiley’s Practical Unanimity as LMC Universal Objective

The Quaker notion of unity also underwrote certain norms and testimonies that
were incorporated into Smiley's pragmatic Quakerism approach to shaping U.S. national
discourses on “dependent peoples.” Quaker historian Larry S. Burgess commented,
“The verbal exchanges, the maneuvers, and finally the compromise that marked the
closing hours…of the…Lake Mohonk Conference…was a triumph for Albert Smiley’s
principles. It was also a prime example of how he handled his conferences, emphasizing
the Quaker tradition of seeking agreement through unity.”68 Because of his pragmatic
Quakerism Smiley was able to produce useful suggestions on public policies and provide
guidelines for shifting public opinion on difficult national issues that Congress later
followed.69

As I noted earlier Smiley was a Hicksite Quaker, which meant that connected to
his various modern liberal beliefs, and often conservative moral-religious imperatives,
was the idea of constructing practical unanimity in order to “move forward in unity.” All
LMC members and participants had to come to term with this unanimity principle
especially when engaging national political issues but also internal organizational norms
and practices. Smiley saw the practical unanimity objective as one way to legitimize the
work of his Quaker LMC and elevate the institution’s stature in the private, public and,
most importantly, policy spheres. For him it demonstrated Quaker-style unity in action
and universal consensus on difficult issues. Also it allowed Smiley, politically oriented
Quakers and other Christians (and non-Christians alike) to apply traditional Quaker principles to U.S. insular territorial policy debates on citizenship, self-government, and territorial sovereignty not often dealt with by Democrats, Republicans, lobby groups, or other state level organizations working within national governing institutions. In a book titled *Silhouettes of My Contemporaries*, Lyman Abbott confirmed this point with a personal testimony:

> The attendants were not delegates but invited guests of Mr. Smiley. They included men and women of every variety of temperament and opinion. Roman Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, High Churchmen and Friends, Republicans and Democrats, government officials and newspaper critics, Radicals and Conservatives met to engage in a perfectly free Forum, not to win a victory over each other, but to comprehend each other. Factions were difficult and factional victories were impossible. For from the first it was agreed that no opinion should ever be affirmed to be the opinion of the Conference except by unanimity.70

These comments originally appeared in Henry Ward Beecher’s *Christian Union*’s new department “The Outlook” that focused on shining the spot-light on current events and instrumental national leaders (established by Abbott shortly after becoming associate editor).71 The purpose of “The Outlook” department “was not merely to report current events, but to interpret them.”72 More importantly this department aimed to “forecast [these events and people’s] relation to the future and the probable effect of their lives upon it.”73 This “department was definitely intended to be, as far as practicable, prophetic both of peril and of promise.”74 Thus Abbott via the “Outlook” revealed the religious-racial-political nexus also found with Smiley’s Quaker LMC: Concepts such as unity, tolerance and universal assent were intertwined with categories such as religion, race, and gender in the political development of various insular territorial policies but through the power of public opinion making.
Smiley’s Quaker LMC resembles Traditional Quaker Meetings and One-ness

Smiley’s Quaker LMC became a national institutional space allowing a community of experts and non-experts to closely and rigorously discuss U.S. insular territorial policies in a collegial setting where all voices, political and economic perspectives, secular and sectarian views were heard and seriously considered. The LMC, through Smiley, incorporated the Quaker Inner Light in order to achieve a "democratically" established consensus on national issues. In many respects, the LMC served as a moral guide to the often-heated political debates at national organizations and government institutions.

What made the institution unique was its close conceptual relation to Quaker Business Meetings. These Meetings sometimes "draw out the highest and best that is potential to the group" within a society or democratic order.75 “In all…Meetings, Friends openly discussed matters and required near unanimity to make a decision, a method they called the sense of the Meeting.”76 Moreover, “[T]he belief in unanimous decisions…attested to the democratic spirit of the faith,” which at the LMC was understood as “practical unanimity.”77 But although the LMC “format was not totally identical to the makeup of a Quaker meeting [either the monthly, quarterly, or yearly forms]…the basic elements were there: unanimous votes were taken more to formalize the agreements than to secure it.”78 Likewise, “The most effective examples of the Quaker concept ‘going forward in unity’…were seen in the spirit of the Conferences.”79 However, in this case, Fox's Quaker spirit ("Spirit of God") was not clearly defined but rather described in a broader sense by Quaker James Rhoads who spoke at the 1885 LMC. Rhoads observed, the “great importance of unanimity on the part of the Conference…, both as to principle
which should guide their action and as to methods, so far as possible." As suggested Smiley's practical unanimity objective was closely associated with the Quaker notion of one-ness.

Some Quaker historians suggest that Quaker Meetings may in fact "be applicable to larger assemblies…and…have repercussions upon the whole spirit of democratic discussion." In fact, Smiley by integrating the Quaker one-ness notion (through practical unanimity) in all circumstances, expected “the Conference [to speak] with authority and practically… dictate the government’s [insular policies].” Smiley’s pursuit of “practical unanimity” in all LMC activities and positions also seem to prevent any substantive or normative challenges to the dominant Anglo-Saxon racial understanding of U.S. national character. Rather the racial discourse was embedded within the idea of Christian community. For example, he expected various religious, social and political groups represented at the yearly assembly to cooperate and almost without much contention reach assent unanimously, despite the presence of divergent pro-expansionist and anti-expansionist camps. Both these ideological – political camps used similar racial grounds (both viewing the Anglo-Saxon as the superior race) along with a moral or religious tenor (missionary or redemptive imperative) in which to support their respective arguments for and against U.S. imperialist policies. Thus the LMC's pragmatic Quakerism seemed to afford a voice for both sides of the ideological and cultural divide on U.S. imperialism while accepting the notion of Anglo-Saxon race superiority. This was made possible because of Smiley's practice of screening LMC membership lists, selected topics, and desirable speakers that often prohibited any substantive challenges to the dominant Anglo-Saxonism of the period.
To summarize, Smiley’s LMC was committed to the Quaker one-ness notion presumed in the practical unanimity objective and guided by his *pragmatic Quakerism* philosophy. Smiley had three specific goals that would allow him to achieve his objectives: (1) the fusion of diverse views and ideas in the hopes of articulating a single vision on each issue, (2) the convening of various communities and industries to engage the hard issues of the day surrounding U.S. relations with non-white races, and territorial peoples under their sovereignty, and (3) the marrying of the public and private spheres under a common goal: creating a public opinion strong enough to persuade national policy changes.

*Smiley’s Quaker practical unanimity not quite liberal democratic*

The historical and archival data reveals that Smiley’s pursuit of “practical unanimity” objective seems to contradict a basic liberal democratic value, individual liberty. It was “among the hallmarks of the meetings [at Lake Mohonk]” in which consisted of “the blending of expert and non-specialized discussion; concerted attempts to influence government policy, and other organizations; and a persistent effort to provide an environment for open discussion under the influence of ‘the Mohonk spirit’.”

However, this “Mohonk spirit” seemed compromised at times when we look into how Smiley and later his younger brother Daniel Smiley guarded and screened topics, speakers, and approved the language of yearly platforms. On various occasions prominent potential speakers were prohibited or limited from contributing substantially to topic discussions by one conspicuous rule or another although it may have fallen under his field of expertise. For example, it was clearly stated that a writer had to present, with some limited exceptions, his own speech; that is, he could not assign someone else to
read it. Ironically, Smiley’s pursuit of his “practical unanimity” objective both enhanced and constrained liberal free speech simultaneously, putting in question the assertion that the Quaker LMC always achieved “an environment for open discussion under the influence of ‘the Mohonk spirit.’”

Furthermore, undermining the “moral purity and cheerful restfulness of Mohonk” was the fact that Smiley organized the institution’s meetings, and committee work around three precepts – Civilization, Christianity and Citizenship but with a strong discrete hand. To illustrate, at the 1894 LMC Merrill E. Gates from Indian Services asserted, "Mr. Smiley has a way of arranging everything here for our pleasure, and his way is an approach to that dangerously attractive rule of the benevolent autocrat which, for the most part, lulls into placid acquiescence the well-pleased subjects." He carefully selected all his guests, appointed chairs, and composed all LMC committees while remaining vigilant throughout the assembly by “always [attending] the morning and evening meetings.” Thus, in regards to selecting LMC participants, Smiley was the primary decision-maker.

The manner of narrowing down topics and speakers for each LMC session was instrumental to understanding how Smiley arrived at his practical unanimity objective. The selection criterion mostly consisted of letters sent to political and social leaders of certain communities by either Smiley himself (later half brother Daniel Smiley after 1912) or his appointed Corresponding Secretary: H. C. Phillips (1900 – 1910; 1913 – 1917) and Quaker Henry S. Haskins (1910 – 1912). They sought ideas, feedback and names from potential invitees. These letters served as mechanisms in which to control who attended and why, what was to be presented or discussed, and when it could be
presented. Smiley basically micro-managed his institution at all stages. He played an active role in selecting members, participants, speakers, and topics. The logic behind the personalized selection process is as follows: if you select an individual who could reasonably account for political, social, and economic conditions in the territorial possessions, has a similar or supportive understanding of what the Quaker LMC is trying to accomplish, and had a non-resistant, reformist yet conformist attitude, then it became much easier and efficient to arrive at practical unanimity on issues, policy positions, and recommendations in the long-term. This process, however, was tied to an Anglo-Saxon white conception of liberal citizenship that constituted the core of American civilization. By focusing on the intersection of Quakerism and racialist political assumptions in Smiley’s work all three themes discussed earlier seem to be illuminated – Civilization, Christianity and Citizenship.

In large part, Smiley hoped to create an institutional environment that would flourish both domestically and abroad framed by the three C’s but fueled and guided by his \textit{pragmatic Quakerism}. His aim with the Quaker LMC was also to unearth the various social, political and economic problems facing white elite society in light of the collective non-white races it inherited (at times constructed):

\begin{quote}
It is a great pleasure to feel that for generations to come streams of high-minded, distinguished philanthropists will gather at this mountain top to discuss great national and international questions which will help to solve the great problems of society, and make Mohonk…known in the remotest corners of the world, for its high aims and warm interest in every moment for the betterment of mankind.\textsuperscript{93}
\end{quote}

Smiley’s humanitarian and egalitarian posture was an extension of the liberal and evangelical moral-religious strands within his \textit{pragmatic Quakerism} philosophy. The liberal side focused on lived experience, structural forms of reality and practical methods of resolving issues over time. In connection to this was his Hicksite Quaker identity,
beliefs in personal, partial, provisional Truth, and theology as forthcoming (‘toward’ a kind of personal activity), along with politically liberal ideas. And the evangelical side centered on belief as opposed to methods; spiritual and Scripture experience as primary; Christian identity before Quaker; realist thinking; the possibility of absolute Truth; theology as true, more inclusiveness, and finally, Christianity understood as salvific. The intersectional-historical approach taken here shows the manner in which Smiley’s pragmatism represents variations in power, influence, and institutional constraints in the shaping of U.S. national political discourses on race relations in the context of insular territorial policies.

Finally, Smiley created the Quaker LMC as an ideal forum in which to construct a liberal democratic community guided by the Inner Light or God spirit in the hopes of unifying the many voices, ideas and perspectives into a unanimous political force for re-directing U.S. racial politics by transforming public opinion, shaping institutional arrangements, and shifting Congressional policies in the context of a rising U.S. imperialist state. In a U.S. political development sense, the LMC’s racialism and pragmatic Quakerism served as two ideological pillars that accorded the non-governmental institution an ecumenical space for national conversations on race and politics in the early 20th century.

Conclusion

Smiley briefly articulated his unique pragmatic Quakerism philosophy in several of his short speeches and private letters in order to enter, in a subtle manner perhaps, the complex politics of engaging the “other” as Quaker tradition shows. His business acumen and philanthropic spirit informed his thinking and political action. Still Smiley’s
approach to U.S. national politics through Quaker LMC interventionism in the late 19th century is best and more accurately understood as an expression of deep pragmatic moral-religious thoughtfulness. His *pragmatic Quakerism* approach to up-lift ideology and broader race relations framed the larger shifts toward attending to the newly acquired territorial non-white peoples. This was accomplished within and outside of the on-going debates between imperialists and anti-imperialists at the government institutional level. Such an approach was unique in its time since it embodied elements of traditional Quakerism, liberal democratic idealism, and prevailing racialism.

The insular territorial political discourse that provided much of the context in the early 1900s was more nuanced than that over the “Indian question.” Although the Quaker spirit undergirded much of the debates over the “other dependent peoples” at Smiley’s LMC and beyond, most focused less on assimilation strategies and more on creating civilized U.S. citizens over time. Nevertheless, paternalistic and tutelary policies served as the same means to that distinctive end. This was an important difference in how Quakers have traditionally dealt with the cultural or racial “other” in the past. In this broader sense, Hicksite Quaker Smiley recognized an expansionist U.S. national government and the need to improve its political position, international reputation and insular territorial relations. Thus Smiley wanted to construct an institutional space that melded his values, principles and beliefs as defined by his *pragmatic Quakerism*. He achieved, although in part, his non-partisan, semi-political objectives by concerning himself with the improvement of various conditions facing the newly acquired territories and non-white races yet without challenging directly the precipitous rise of the U.S. imperialist state.
As the next chapters will further explore, Smiley created the LMC to be an ideal forum in which to construct a liberal democratic community guided by a pragmatic Quakerism philosophy in the hopes of unifying the many voices, ideas and perspectives into a unanimous political force. This political universal assent would re-direct U.S. racialized insular territorial politics through the constructing and reconstructing of public opinion and the shaping of institutional arrangements (and legislative actions) in the context of an emerging U.S. imperialist state regime. Understood in political development terms, Smiley's pragmatic view yet racialism (assuming an Anglo-Saxon white norm to shaping U.S. insular territorial politics) had to mesh well with his liberal Quakerism in order that his LMC would gain legitimacy at the national level. As no other Quaker or pragmatist in his time, Smiley’s innovations brought about an institutional, and political space affording a national conversation on the role of religion beyond missionary work and race relations in the political development of overseas territorial citizenship and self-government although to a limited extent. As Vice President James S. Sherman proclaimed, “Bad men – and men of genius are frequently bad men – have always attempted to get the better of their fellows, whether red or black, or white or whatever race or nationality. And I expect it will so continue as long as I stay in the world. After I have left, possibly, Mr. Smiley will be able to work out the millennium so that the condition will no longer exist.”

1 Letter, Lake Mohonk Conference (LMC) founder, Albert K. Smiley to Rev. J.H. Sutherland, 28th U.S. Infantry, August 17, 1906. On the meaning of Quaker-pacifism, Swarthmore College Philosophy professor (and Quaker) Jesse Holmes commented in the context of WWI: “The pacifist does not deny that wars are inevitable at the present; but he believes that it is the spirit of suspicion, hatred, panic and fear that makes them inevitable. He would, therefore, spend his effort in removing this spirit rather than preparing for war. Such preparation may be safely left to those who believe in it, since it is their belief which makes it necessary.” See Jesse Holmes, Friends Intelligencer, 73, (1916), pp. 610 – 611. For more on the ‘Hicksite’ liberal Quakers, see Hugh Barbour and J. William Frost, “The Liberal Transformation,” The Quakers.

Both conversion and missionary work were part of the broader method taken by most Christian progressive reformers participating in Quaker LMC discussions over the civilizing of non-white races in Puerto Rico and the Philippines (immediately following the similar policy involving native American Indians). Yet this was not the only option available for Quakers at the LMC.

According to Quaker historian Larry E. Burgess the Smiley brothers, “twins Alfred and Albert and their half-brother Daniel” held a strong “record of humanitarianism” and were concerned with “education, business, grounds adornment and land use, Indian affairs, international arbitration, negro affairs,…religious endeavors” and insular territorial affairs in over 50 years of public service. See Larry E. Burgess, The Smilesys: A Commemorative Edition, (Redlands, CA: Moore Historical Foundation, 1991), p. v. In terms of egalitarianism, Smiley was an advocate of equality for all people particularly in political, economic, and social life, as his pragmatic Quakerism philosophy seems to suggest.

I discuss the importance of the Philippine-American War (1899-1902) to understanding the role of the Quaker LMC in U.S. political development and life in chapter 4.

Friends” name did not officially appear until much later in the early 19th century. A. Lloyd, Quaker Social History, 1669 – 1738, (London, UK: Longmans, 1950), pp. 145. The first to call them “Quakers” was Justice Bennet the man who convicted founder George Fox in the mid-17th century for challenging a resident cleric’s bible interpretation in public. The reason for the name was, according to Fox, “because we bid them tremble at the word of God.” See quote in James Walvin, “George Fox and Friends,” The Quakers: Money and Morals, (London, UK: John Murray Publishers, 1997), p. 11.

10 Ibid at 11
11 Ibid at 18
12 Ibid
13 At times Quaker public leaders upheld similar racialist assumptions as other non-Quaker public leaders who often maintained as hegemonic an Anglo-Saxon white national character as the dominant racial, cultural and civic underpinnings of U.S. citizenship and larger "civilized" society. For an historical account on Quaker involvement in the civilizing of the Indian in North America, see Roy Harvey Pearce, The Savages of America: A Study of the Indians and the Idea of Civilization, (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University, 1965)
15 Robert O. Byrd, Quaker Ways in Foreign Policy, (Toronto, CN: University of Toronto Press, 1960), p.140
16 Wilson, (1975), p. 3.
17 For three valuable accounts on U.S. Indian policy and the role of Christianity, see Francis Paul Prucha, Indian Policy in the United States: Historical Essays, (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1981); The Churches and the Indian Schools, (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1979); United States Indian Policy: A Critical Bibliography, (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1977). For an account on race, and reform politics reference U.S. Indian policy, see Lucy Maddox, Citizen Indians: Native Intellectuals, Race and Reform, (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005). Many Quakers are still active politically and socially through their involvement with the American Friends Services Committee (AFSC), a Quaker organization founded in 1917 by several former LMC members. Or with the Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) since 1943 whose sole purpose was to lobby Congress (as the first registered church lobby) but also played a role in the establishment of the Peace Corps and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. For more on these two Quaker national organizations, see Thomas Hamm, The Quakers in America, (2006). For a comprehensive historical account of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, see E. Raymond Wilson, Uphill for Peace: Quaker Impact on Congress, (Richmond, IN: Friends United Press, 1975) Another Quaker lobby group is the Friend World Committee for Consultation (FWCC) founded in 1937.
21 Other areas of conflict were over issues of evangelical doctrines, the authority of elders and the discipline and finally, anti-slavery tactics. See Pink Dandelion 2007, Thomas E. Hamm 2003, Larry Ingle 1986, Davis 1966, 1975
Quaker historian and activist E. Raymond Wilson noted, “[D]uring the twenty years before the outbreak of the Civil War, Friends were divided between the activists and the conservatives, and between the cautious and complacent city dwellers and the more radical rural people. There was no overall united strategy developed for the political emancipation of the slaves without violence. The dilemma was never resolved and the nation floundered into war over the Union and slavery.” See E. Raymond Wilson, Uphill for Peace: Quaker Impact on Congress, (Friends United Press, 1975), p. 5.


Rufus M. Jones, Later Periods of Quakerism, Vols. II, (London, UK: The MacMillan Company, 1921), pp. 609 – 617; Robert O. Byrd, Quaker Ways in Foreign Policy, (Toronto, CN: University of Toronto Press, 1960), p.141. Robert O. Byrd notes U.S. Quakers became engaged in more international relief activities from the late 19th century through the early decades of the 20th century: “Following the termination of the Franco-Prussian War programme, the relief activities of Friends took them into an almost unbroken series of places of suffering: 1876-8, Bulgaria and Bosnia; 1878-80, Mennonite relief in Russia; 1881, Irish relief; 1891-3, Russian famine relief; 1891-3, Armenian relief; 1895-1905, the most active period of Doukhobor relief, the Doukhobors being assisted to migrate from Russia to Canada; 1899-1908, Boer War relief programme at its height, although it continued until the 1930’s; 1900, famine relief in India; 1905, relief in Macedonia; 1908-09, Russian famine relief again; 1910, Armenian relief again.” (143).


Rufus M. Jones, The Inner Life, (MacMillan Publishers, 1916), pp. viii – ix. According to Quaker historian Thomas D. Hamm, Jones was the “central figure in American Quakerism after 1895” during the major shift toward modernism – progressive idealism and social reformism – of the 1890s. Hamm points out “God had ‘direct relations and dealings’ with everyone, dealings Jones identified as the Inner Light. God was a spirit, a light that illuminated the world and everything in it. Jones held God needed human beings just as much as they needed God, and God revealed himself to them in Jesus Christ.” Most importantly, Jones’s modernist Quakerism by 1901 took “the form to which it would hold for the rest of his life…it [had] three major elements: progressive revelation, mysticism, and the social gospel.” Note these elements were melded while Jones studied under Harvard Divinity School professor Francis G. Peabody who was “a committed modernist and pioneer of the social gospel.” Moreover, Jones believed the essential truths of Christianity were “the need for a spiritual, personal religion.” Finally, Hamm asserts, Jones saw religious experience as personal and private but “while God commanded that individuals experience union with him, he also commanded that they help to realize his kingdom on earth by wiping out the evils that plagued it. Those evils could be eliminated in a variety of ways.” Jones recognized four ways: “by a political method, or a legal act, or by a campaign of education or on a definite religious basis.” Hence, Jones “was drawn toward the social gospel in religion and…the Progressive movement in politics.” See Thomas D. Hamm, “The Rise of Modernist Quakerism, 1895 – 1907, The Transformation of American Quakerism, Orthodox Friends, 1800 – 1907, (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988), pp. 147 – 151.


Pink Dandelion, An Introduction to Quakerism, (2007)


Friends Historical Library, Record Group, Letter, S. Averill to B. Hallowell, February 26, 1869.

Richard J. Bernstein has argued the twin pillars of traditional pragmatism (William James and John Dewey forms) consists of “community of inquiry” and “social action.” In old pragmatism there were no certain truths to be sought or understood but rather workable, contingent truths. These seem to fit well into Smiley’s own pragmatism at least as his writings, speeches, and work with and through his Quaker LMC reveal over time. Richard J. Bernstein, (1993)
In the broader context of U.S. political thought and development, most of the Quaker LMC participants were part of the same group of progressive reformers, politicians, jurists, teachers, farmers, businessmen, ministers, journalists, writers, and military men who Robert Mardock characterized as “middle-class idealists who believed in the basic right of all men to freedom from oppression and who felt an obligation to bring this belief to reality.” In fact, most LMC members understood the complexities behind short- and long-term transformations without the “desire to overturn the basic social, political, or economic structure of the nation” because “most were too experienced and too realistic to expect social perfection.” See Robert Winston Mardock, *The Reformers and the American Indian*, (University of Missouri Press, 1971), p. 1.

This was closer to what Christian evolutionary racialist Lyman Abbott believed. Abbott was not a Spencian Social Darwinist but believed that God had a purpose for Anglo-Saxon whites to uplift non-white peoples. Thus there was no randomness or “natural selection” mechanism in his evolutionary thought but rather some purposeful design by God that guided race relations (“God’s way of doing things.”).  


Benjamin Trueblood 1897: 454

Smiley’s hospitality perhaps inspired by the Quaker Inner Light was noted by LMC member and editor of the *Methodist Review* William V. Kelley in a letter to Smiley, “Language seems insufficient to do justice to the range of your beneficent purpose toward the needy and neglected, or to the magnificence of your hospitality to your invited guests [at Lake Mohonk]. That the questions you convened the Conference to consider are in the frontline of urgency is indicated by the subject [“The Relations of the Advanced and the Backward Races of Mankind”] which Mr. James Bryce chose for the Rowan Lecture at Oxford last June and by the statements made in that lecture.” Letter, William V. Kelley to Albert K. Smiley, October 27, 1902

Larry E. Burgess, (1972), p. 70.

For instance, Senator Dawes (D-Michigan) praised the institutional vigilance of the Conference on U.S. Indian relations and policy. He stated the Dawes Act was passed in 1887 with the help of the Lake Mohonk Conference. “The Dawes Act emphasized individual holding of land, a radical step for both Indians and whites. The Act conferred citizenship upon allottees and provided that an allotment of reservation land should be held in trust by the Government for twenty-five years, when a patent in fee would be given the allottee...[thus] the Indian as a citizen was free to make his own destiny in the context of American society.” See unpublished dissertation manuscript, Larry E. Burgess, 1972, p. 51.

The success of the LMC in advocating for Indian citizenship prompted Senator Dawes to comment:

All I desire, and all the anxiety I have, is that this great and noble organization which has brought about this thing shall also realize what the change is. The Law has only enacted an opportunity
and nothing more. Shall we so realize this new situation that we shall make the situation much better than it was before. Two hundred thousand Indians have been led out … to a new life; they do not know whether it leads or how to travel it… And it is not too much to say that there would never have been such a law had it not been for the Mohonk Conference – and the Mohonk Conference is responsible today for what shall take place in consequence of it. (Quoted in Larry E. Burgess, 1972: 53 quoting the Indian Commissioners, 1887:64)

Moreover, in 1894 at the LMC Supreme Court Justice William Strong stated, "Under God, I think we all feel thankful, or ought to, for Mr. Smiley's organization of the Mohonk Conference. It is impossible for any person to describe, or for any of us to conceive, the extent of good the Conference has done during its short existence. It has created a sentiment throughout the community that I think could have been created in no other way. It has united Christian men and women of all religious denominations in a common work for the benefit of the race. It has had its influence upon Congress. Its efforts have resulted in legislation for the benefit of the Indians, manifestly effective in lifting them up to respectable and orderly Christian society. That is not all. The publications, the annual reports, of this organization go abroad all over the country. They are read by persons who had felt no particular interest heretofore in the work of the Conferences; and they call forth the sympathy and co-operation of persons who, without the existence of these reports, would never think of lifting a finger to elevate the Indian above the low plane on which he has been living for generations. [The LMC] will live until the last [dependent peoples] shall be lifted up to the civilization on which we now stand, and until they shall be gathered into Christian churches in as large proportion as the whites are gathered now" (LMC Annual Report, 1894, p.39). [Emphasis mine]
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LMC Annual Report, 1885, p. 27


Benjamin Trueblood, (1897), p. 460.

The Philadelphia Inquirer in 1909 noted the diversity of political leaders appointed by Smiley to LMC committees: “Vice President Sherman was named as chairman of the Business Committee of the conference. Elmer Ellsworth Brown, Commissioner of Education for the United States, was chosen president; Dr. Charles F. Meserve, of Raleigh, N.C., secretary; H.C. Phillips, Mohonk Lake, corresponding secretary; E. M. Wister, of Philadelphia, treasurer; Daniel Smiley, of Mohonk Lake, chairman of the Publication Committee, and Dr. John Bancroft Devine, of New York, chairman of the Press Committee.” For more on this topic, see “Indian Problem Near Solution: Dr. Smiley Tells Lake Mohonk Conference of American People’s Attitude,” Philadelphia Inquirer, Vol. 161, Issue 113, (October 21, 1909), p. 2.

Allen H. Merriam (1978:369) asserts, “The controversy over United States expansion in the years immediately surrounding the Spanish-American War provided considerable evidence of the racism pervasive in the nation at the close of the nineteenth century.” He examines the “racist rhetoric of three
representative spokesmen on each side of the expansionist controversy of 1898 – 1900,” which was over U.S. territorial expansion policy or whether the U.S. should pursue other overseas territories outside of the continent, policies of territorial acquisition, occupation, and governance (369). He defined racism “as the belief that non-white, non-English speaking, non-Americans are innately inferior people” (371). This is connected to what I refer to as racial thinking. Merriam argues that both pro-expansionists and anti-expansionists advocated diametrically opposing views about U.S. non-continental territorial policies (imperialism) yet shared “and promoted” a common racism with the Anglo-Saxon white race as superior over others (379). He claims “American history is steeped in contempt for non-whites” (380). This was clearly the case at times with Smiley and the Quaker LMC.
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89 On the three C framework and U.S. Indian reform policies, see Larry E. Burgess, The Lake Mohonk Conferences on the Indian, (Ph.D. Dissertation, Claremont College, 1972), p. iv. Burgess quotes Albert Smiley in this regard, “In consideration of [the Indian] question, we are to set ourselves, not to the righting of specific wrongs, not to the administration of details, not to the discussion of particulars, but to the settlement of great general principles…We concentrate our interest on the work of Indian education, civilization, and redemption.”
90 LMC Annual Report, 1894, pp. 7 – 8.
92 Note Corresponding Secretaries also edited the LMC Annual Reports that was distributed widely across various sectarian and secular organizations, private and public institutions.
94 Pink Dandelion, 2007, p. 243. Quaker historian, Paul A. Moretta discussed the Christian Quaker salvific notion in historical and theological terms: “The close relationship between the human soul and the divine being in the Quaker creed diminished the role of not only the clergy but Christ himself. Although professing to be Christians, the Quakers attenuated the concepts of original sin and salvation through Christ. More than a remote deity or ancient person, their Jesus Christ was omnipresent and eternal, a living symbol of salvation but not a necessary agent, and he certainly did not rank on a Trinitarian par with God. This notion led more orthodox Christians to accuse, condemn, and promote the persecution of Quakers for being Unitarians – those who believed in the humanity of Jesus rather than in His divinity, and thus denying that God the Father, Jesus the Son, and the Holy Spirit were one sacred personage. Although the charge was not completely true, the Quakers' Christ was nonetheless not part of the same holy trinity of both Catholic and Protestant orthodoxy.” See Paul A. Moretta, William Penn and the Quaker Legacy, (New York, NY: Pearson Longman, 2007), pp. 15 – 16.
95 Speech, LMC Annual Meetings, October 20, 1909. LMC Annual Report, p. 76.