Quaker Higher Education QHE

A Publication of the Friends Association for Higher Education

Volume 13: Issue 1 ***April 2019***

In this issue, we examine the meaning of community in the Quaker tradition. Our inquiry takes us into two distinct settings: institutions of higher learning in the contemporary era and the work of Quaker reformers in 19th Century America. These seemingly divergent contexts share a common thread. Both highlight issues concerning the integrity of the individual and the value of social equity, matters that go to the heart of the identity and testimony of the Society of Friends. The featured authors originally presented workshops at the FAHE annual conference at Wilmington College in the summer of 2018, and we are pleased to share their thoughtful work in this forum.

Nelson Bingham's essay, "Community, Diversity, and Respect," stresses the tension between broad institutional imperatives -- such as the pursuit of efficiency or cost containment -- and the need for meaningful personal interaction in the classroom and a variety of other community settings. Using examples from his own family background as well as his interactions with first-generation students at Earlham College, he urges us to resist institutional dominance and anachronistic social associations by reaching out to others who differ from ourselves in order to develop "wider circles of identity."

Laura Rediehs's essay, "Keeping the Candle Lit," examines the dehumanizing forces that threaten critical reflection and engagement among students in contemporary educational institutions. She identifies three forms of idolatry -- economic, technological, and bureaucratic -- that together comprise an assault on the culture-preserving and culture-criticizing mission of institutions of higher learning. She envisions remedies that keep core values at the center of major conversations and that facilitate treating colleagues with respect. She also advocates participating in conferences such as those sponsored by FAHE that encourage cross-disciplinary reflection and discussion.

In "Quakers and Freedmen in Southwestern Ohio," D. Neil Snarr explores three settlements of emancipated slaves freed in 1815 under the terms of the estate of Samuel Gist, a wealthy plantation owner in colonial Virginia. Although the liberation of these 315 slaves represents one of the largest and most significant emancipations in antebellum America, the Gist freedmen encountered unforeseen legal problems pertaining to the management of the Gist estate itself. These problems included Virginia laws, which required the reversion of emancipated slaves to slave status if they remained in Virginia more than one year. Further, after the freedmen relocated in Ohio, the laws of that state mandated that settlement residents pay property taxes even though they were not record owners of the land. Despite help from local Quakers, these legal issues ultimately presented insurmountable obstacles for the freedmen, nearly all of whom abandoned the Gist settlements over time.

Analysis of the role of Quakers in 19th Century social reform continues in Cathy Pitzer and

Jean Mulhern's essay, "A Rebel for Social Change," which traces the life and ideals of Lucretia Coffin Mott. The authors emphasize the role that individual conscience, moral suasion, and the Inner Light played in Mott's public speeches about slavery and women's inequality during her long career. They also document Mott's opposition to several Orthodox Quaker practices of her day, including forms of church hierarchy, quietism over issues of slavery and social inequality, and the primacy of the *Bible*. Mott's critical reflections on these practices eventually led her away from Orthodox Quakerism in the direction of the Hicksite Quakers. Her contributions to the abolitionist, suffragist, and early feminist movements were legendary.

The final contribution comes from sculptor Nicolin Haines, whose work, "Madormality," features surreal representations of mutated seed pods, raising awareness about toxic stress and the increased likelihood of dystopian natural environments in the coming decades. Viewed in light of the themes addressed in the current volume, Haines's work provides a stark reminder of the adverse consequences of uncritical acceptance of the dominant culture, technological idolatry, and closed circles of identity in contemporary society.

Taken together, the works included here encourage us to recognize the value that diversity, critical thinking, and social consciousness play in Quaker concepts of community. Whether our interactions with others take place in simple or complex settings, these core principles are worth remembering.

Paul Moke
Wilmington College

Submissions: *QHE* is published twice a year, in the spring and the fall. Articles submitted for possible publication should be sent as Word documents to either:
mailto:michael_snarr@wilmington.edu
or mailto:paul_moke@wilmington.edu.
QHE is not wed to any particular referencing format; you may use the professional style of your choice. If you would like to discuss an idea that you have for an article, our telephone numbers 937-481-2436 x 436 (MS) or 937-481-2415 x 415 (PM).

FAHE ANNUAL CONFERENCE
June 13-16, 2019

Hoping to see all of you June 13-16, 2019! FAHE will meet at Swarthmore College and Pendle Hill, exploring the conference theme "Truth and Inspiration," our disciplinary theme of Quakers, Social Work, and Justice Concerns (for our next book), and other topics of Friends testimonies in education.

The deadline to reserve housing is April 30. More information and registration at this site. Call for papers with queries and conference registration is available at this site.

FAHE

FCNL Lobby Weekend Curricular Materials Now Available

Every year the Friends Committee on National Legislation hosts a Spring Lobby Weekend to introduce college students and other advocates for peace and justice to the work of lobbying in Washington, DC. In 2019, together with Dr. Welling Hall, Research Professor of the Liberal Arts at Earlham College, FCNL published a curriculum for faculty who would like to embed the Spring Lobby Weekend experience into a credit-bearing course.

The curriculum, which is available for free on the FCNL website, is tied to political science learning goals and objectives as well as the American Association of Colleges and Universities' VALUE Rubrics in Civic Engagement and Critical Thinking. The curriculum includes lesson plans, handouts, assignments, and evaluation tools.

Dr. Hall taught political science for 31 years at Earlham College. She also served as an American Political Science Association Congressional Fellow and as a Franklin Fellow at the United States Department of State. The lessons in the curriculum include: Using Congress.gov; Researching a Member of Congress; Using Social Media in Lobbying; and more. Friends are warmly encouraged to use the curriculum and provide feedback to FCNL.

Community, Diversity, and Respect

Nelson Bingham
Earlham College

Probably, there is no word that is used more often to describe the distinctiveness of Quaker schools than "community." I want to argue that any discussion of community necessarily must encompass the related ideas of diversity and respect. Definitions of diversity seem to presuppose both commonality or shared interest and individual differences or variety. In our individualistic culture, it is generally thought that these two – the individual and the community inevitably exist in a state of tension, if not conflict.

Wikipedia describes the German concept of *Gemeinschaft* – "a tight-knit and cohesive social entity…[involving] a unity of will." This contrasts with *Gesellschaft*, which may be loosely translated as "society" or "association," but I would argue may be better seen as "institution." This distinction seems directly relevant to what has been happening in colleges over the past several decades, a progressive shift toward functioning as an institution. Of course, any college, necessarily operates as both Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, both community and institution.

Institutions may be defined as serving some external purpose while communities are ends in themselves. Institutions function (or should function) according to a set of formal rules – policies and procedures. These provide a protective framework for the individuals who comprise the institution and for their self-interest, but that is not their institutional purpose. Institutionally speaking, such policies and procedures exist to further the external mission or purpose of the institution, to promote effectiveness and/or efficiency in achieving that mission. Though such formal agreements do protect individual rights and interests, such protection is only rationally justified in terms of how it serves to better pursue the mission. Within an institution, process may be viewed as important but only to the extent that it serves the externally-based purpose of the whole.

People often mention the idea of "trust" when talking about community. There are many meanings of the word trust. One important meaning has to do with integrity, with being able to count on a person to live out her or his values consistently. Being able to predict and rely upon another's behavior is certainly an instance of trust. Another meaning grows out of the emotional quality of care so that one will not betray or intentionally hurt another person.

Now, my point here is that these elements of trust actually have no place in an institution. Individuals in institutions play <u>roles</u> and their roles determine their actions. Therefore, their personal relationships with others have no legitimate place in the way they enact that role. Accordingly, the interests of individuals must rely upon the protection of formal policies and procedures. A community, in contrast, exists at a more informal level of person-to-person interaction. It need not justify itself in terms of any external purpose; rather its function is to serve the needs of its members.

One of my key claims is that there has been a steady shift toward a college as an <u>institution</u>. I am not arguing for some simplistic, utopian community with no regard for institutional formalities. Of course, colleges must have a mission statement, policies and procedures, risk management, compliance with laws and regulations. My point is that there is a zero-sum game operating here. Every time we (for

seemingly good institutional reasons) impose a new policy or procedure that formalizes restrictions on our individual behaviors, we experience a correlated reduction in our sense of community. It is common now to speak in terms of consistency, fairness and standardization.

Community is not, by any means, dead at Earlham! We see it at vigils that give witness to our anguish over certain tragedies or situations involving injustice. I see it in student activities, and indeed even in Faculty Meeting. But, I say again that this lived spirit of community exists in a different, diminished balance with the growing presence of institutional Earlham. If we value the sense of community that is such an important part of our Quaker identity, it may take more intentional effort to preserve that reality in the face of ever-increasing pressures to move toward the college as an institution.

I want to address the issue of diversity and community. Earlham has a distinctive statement entitled the "Diversity Aspirations Vision Statement," which may be found on its Web site. That vision statement affirms that Earlham "welcomes the contributions of divergent voices as we seek to foster a deep, shared sense of purpose." This is not only a matter of social justice, but equally, of effective liberal education.

As I noted earlier, individuals and community are often viewed as existing in a state of conflict. For those who see things this way, an increase in the diversity of individuals and groups in a community is associated with an increase in such conflict. Such a view tends to speak of "the problem of diversity" in relation to community. I want to suggest that, while increasing diversity in a community does bring about changes in the way that community functions, it is more appropriate to refer to our diversity as an <u>opportunity</u> for learning and growth through the challenge of engaging around differences.

The mere <u>presence</u> of diverse individuals is not sufficient to promote positive learning experiences. Diversity must be an active <u>process</u> – a process of living together every day. I want to use the example of socioeconomic differences to examine how that process does and should operate.

In doing this, I feel that it is important to acknowledge, first, my own history as a first-generation, working class student educated in elitist institutions of higher education with little socio-economic diversity. Why is it important to include socioeconomic class as part of the diversity that is sought at a Quaker college? I believe that we all stand to gain from engagements across socioeconomic lines. In a society and a world where socioeconomic differences are increasing, where the gap between rich and poor is expanding, it is vital for all of us to understand each other better. And where better to do that than within an intentional Quaker community? Post-college life is very likely to be far more economically segregated – in jobs, neighborhoods, churches, recreational groups. Development of relationships with those of varying socioeconomic background, perhaps especially with those of more advantaged backgrounds, is an important facet of the educational experience we can offer.

There may be some important lessons we can learn from examining the challenges faced by first-generation students, Those challenges may be similar to those encountered by persons of color or those who are not heterosexual or those with disabilities. What does it mean when we "welcome" those who are, in some way, different from the norm into "our" community?

There is one thing that is common in the experience of those who are marginalized in a community – namely the feeling of a lack of respect. One familiar meaning of respect is to show "polite, deferential treatment" to another person. The term respect may also refer to feelings of high regard or special esteem that we hold for a person because of some special gift or talent that they possess.

There is a deeper meaning to the word "respect," however, that has to do with our feelings about someone as a person. Quakers speak of the idea of "That of God in Every Person." Regardless of whether one sees this as a reflection of Divine presence or whether one stands in awe at the spirit of humanity that lies in each of us, this way of thinking about respect leads us to honor each and every person's inner being. It involves loving all other persons and acting accordingly. I think this may derive from the distinctively human trait of empathy, of understanding our common humanity and, consequently, of sharing emotionally what that person feels.

I'd like to talk a bit about what has led me to this sense of respect. Ironically enough, it was one of my father's greatest gifts to me. Let me tell you about my father. He spent his life as a carpenter and laborer. He was married to my mother for 51 years when he died at the age of 71. In describing my relationship with my father, it is important to note that I built my identity around academic success, always among the top students in my class. I could hardly be more different from my father. I loved my father without reservation, but I did not respect my father.

As an adult, I gradually came to see my father in a different light. I came to appreciate his ability to envision and construct things, ranging from a cabinet to an entire house. But, only as I, myself, approached the age of 50, having been married at that time for 30 years, did I come to understand the most valuable legacy my father had provided to me – his capacity to deeply and unconditionally love his life partner. He modeled this most precious trait in his behaviors even though he never described it to me verbally (nor could he have done so). And so, in what would be the last summer of my father's life, I was, at last, able to share with him the fact that not only did I love him (which he knew), but that I respected him for his distinctive gifts.

Respect must be distinguished from tolerance. We often hear people speak of a need for "tolerance" of differences, suggesting that we must "put up with" some feelings, thoughts and behaviors of another that we truly do not value or appreciate. This does not make for a healthy relationship. Who wants to merely be "tolerated?" Respect means taking another person seriously as a person, seriously enough to engage in honest dialogue, even when you have hard things to say. Disagreement is not antithetical to respect; rather it can be an expression of respect.

When we do enroll first-generation students, we may tend to see them as needing to overcome their social class background. In short, we may not convey to first-generation students that their distinctive experiences and perspectives bring richness to the college community both within and outside of the classroom. And, if we do not feel sincere respect for those who do not fit our socioeconomic norms, what are our feelings toward those who represent other forms of diversity?

Where does all of this leave us in terms of the interplay of community, diversity and respect? Let me attempt to extract some lessons from what I have said.

First, if the idea of community is attractive to us, we would do well to think more fully about what we mean by "community." For

me, a human community is somewhat like a biological eco-system, in which a diversity of species interacts in mutually sustaining ways.

Second, diversity is not inherently a problem for a community. Diversity can enrich the sense of shared experience that binds persons into larger wholes. Our sense of belonging need not rest upon membership in a homogeneous group; it can expand to include wider circles of identity. We can see diversity as positively transforming the community we all share into something better. Our traditional values are not lost in this process; they are assimilated into a new form of community.

Third, a key element in a healthy community is genuine respect for differences. It seems essential that we commit ourselves to knowing other persons. In short, we must invest our time and take the risks of reaching out to others who are different, to others whom we do not know. We must become more familiar with one another, build relationships with one another.

Is community still important to us? Or are we content to allow our Institutional roles to categorize us (and to categorize those who represent diversity within the college)? Are we satisfied with providing for individual interests through more and more formal policies? Can we imagine a richly diverse community actively engaging with each other in respectful ways even when we disagree fervently? Or are we content to withdraw into ever more fragmented sub-communities of persons who are enough like us that we don't have to feel too uncomfortable, while assuming that divisiveness is natural and inevitable?

Do we care enough about the experience of community to invest ourselves in seeking to create a vital, pluralistic community for the 21st century? I believe that we have falsely dichotomized our choice as either working to re-create the community of the past or giving up on the ideal of Community and accepting the dominance of the Institution. I hope that we will not feel constrained by such a dualistic choice. We can imagine a middle path, a path toward a new sense of community that truly respects and honors many forms of diversity.

Keeping the Candle Lit: The Challenges to Higher Education and How to Meet Them

Laura Redeihs
St. Lawrence University

Introduction

Education has two roles in relation to the wider culture. One role is to keep our current culture alive: to teach young people its ways so that as they enter adulthood they carry it forth. The other role is to stand in critical reflection on that culture. All cultures change over time. All cultural practices and ways of knowing benefit from reconsideration leading to renewal or revision. Allowing a continuing process of critical self-reflection allows cultures to change for the better. Education institutionalizes this reconsideration, renewal, and revision.

It is helpful to remember the philosopher Plato's understanding of reality and the role of education within it: he said that there are two worlds that live together within this one world: the visible world, and the ideal world. Plato believed that the ideal world is just as real as the visible world, and even in some sense more real, although it is not easy to see. It requires a special kind of vision. He further said that ultimately education is all about cultivating this kind of vision, which he called "wisdom." He defined wisdom as *perception of goodness*. Plato's ideas got carried through into Christian thought by describing the ideal world as *the Beloved Community*, and calling the special vision *prophetic vision*.

We need to teach our students not only what is what, but what should be, inspiring them to positive world-changing action. This is the candle we need to keep lit. It is not easy, though, because the dehumanizing forces that seem to be gaining strength in our world threaten this vision of higher education.

Dehumanizing Forces

One way that dehumanization manifests itself is through economic idolatry: the way that we have been pushed to honor the false god called "The Economy." We tend to make decisions and organize our world along economic lines rather than ethical ones. If we were working from an ethical perspective, we would be caring about each other and our collective lives together, working for the common good and not just for ourselves and our close inner circles of family and friends. When instead we are repeatedly told that there is not enough money, we become anxious; in such anxiety, ethics seems like a luxury we cannot afford, and so we revert to a defensive mode of protecting ourselves and our loved ones. In this way our anxiety tricks us into abandoning ethics, instead serving that stern and demanding god called "The Economy," believing its dictates to be absolute and inviolable.

This version of dehumanization affects higher education in its chronic worry about money and how that worry has led to the increasing commodification of education. Money has become everyone's problem. Everyone is forced to worry about it: not just administra-

tors and trustees, but also students and their parents who see their tuition and fees go up every year, department chairs and professors who constantly try to fill their classes and defend the existence of their departments, and pre-tenure and contingent faculty who have to constantly defend their own existence within the institution.

In the commodification of education, our colleges and universities mimic businesses in pressing for more "efficiency." But since efficiency means doing more with less, it puts pressure on people to work ever harder, for less. We feel we have to keep meeting the ever-increasing demands, and that makes us all too busy. There is no longer any true contemplative time, for students or professors. The students are being groomed to keep producing under pressure, because that is what the workplace demands. The professors become engaged in a kind of arms race, competing to capture their students' attention, not only increasing the stress on students but increasing their own busyness as well. Prioritizing quantity over quality, everyone works harder and harder to justify their existence because this unquestioned principle of "efficiency" has revealed the sad "truth" that people are too expensive.

Technological idolatry amplifies this dehumanization. Our technologies are quite impressive, and they can often be helpful. But in many ways, we are letting our technology get the better of us. The machine has become a metaphor for the ideal worker. Even though even our machines themselves do not actually live up to our idealism about them (they are expensive, they break down, they let us down in many ways), technology is often seen as the solution to the problem of humans being too expensive. We see this technological idolatry in education in the proliferation of online courses as a way of saving instructional costs—a shift that fundamentally devalues the power of face-to-face interaction in the teacher-student relationship.

The devaluing of human teachers and universities goes even further: the new emerging vision of today's intellectual hero is the brilliant high-tech young man who drops out of college to launch his technology start-up, becoming rich and famous. Making it in this world is more and more seen as the mark of true success. These entrepreneurs do not even need teachers or colleges. They develop their brilliance through online self-education, and then create companies that are the new trendy places where the ideas that change the world are generated. Yet the thinking generated within for-profit companies is not likely to be the kind that serves the common good. When such companies do this work, they do so from a money-making motivation, a motivation that can release dehumanizing forces into the world. Colleges and universities, in contrast, are centered in ethics, idealism, a vision of true justice, and concern for the well-being of the entire planet; from such a motivation, they rehumanize the world. But economic idolatry has fooled us into thinking that the only ideas that really matter are those that make money.

The control of human thought is also aided by how the internet has evolved. The internet has shifted from, first, a shareable information

source to, second, an interactive space we used to be able to shape to serve our needs and purposes, and now, third, to the increasing loss of our ability to control and organize that space in favor of its controlling and organizing that space for us by using artificial intelligence algorithms. In that way, it acquires the power to control collective thought. In doing so, it has also aided the growing divisiveness we see. We used to tolerate disagreement and try to work through it, but increasingly we see disagreement, especially online disagreement, turning into hatred.

The divisiveness has, in turn, spurred the free speech attacks. There is an organized effort to try to bring alt-right speakers to campus, not to engage in dialogue as part of the sincere quest for truth and understanding, but as a power move meant to disrupt and discredit institutions of higher education, because there is no right way for institutions to respond: allowing them to speak gives them a forum for promoting hatred; not allowing them to speak is seen as stifling free speech. Reciprocally, there is the parallel trend of targeting and persecuting professors who dare to speak truth to power.

Healthy disagreement and debate are crucial in education, but the sharpening divisiveness has encouraged educational institutions to become wary of conflict, which then in turn fuels another version of dehumanization: bureaucratic idolatry, a kind of mechanistic way we organize our institutions, inspired by technological idolatry. Just as we prize the machine as the epitome of the highly productive worker, we prize mechanistic processes as the key to the efficient running of our institutions. Instead of governing our colleges and universities by letting human beings, in relationship with each other, employ compassionate judgment, we govern our institutions through roles, policies, and procedures. We are encouraged not to use compassionate judgment relevant to the uniqueness of each situation, but to learn the rules, stay in role, and strictly follow procedures. Such an approach may be comforting to those afraid of conflict, allowing them to hide behind procedures that tell them what to do, but it is also dehumanizing because in this approach we think that roles, policies, and procedures are better than living, breathing humans responding to the realities unfolding in real life around them.

All of these dehumanizing forces severely diminish education's culture-preserving role, and threaten to completely eliminate its cultural-critique role. Those colleges and universities that disobey this pressure to serve these interrelated idolatries, instead upholding higher ideals and unapologetically playing education's critical role in relation to the wider culture, are seen as a threat, and various delegitimizing forces come into play. In questioning the rising costs of higher education, there is pressure to narrow the vision and focus on the practical studies, as these are seen to be the ones that best serve The Economy. The value of the liberal arts is questioned, and not coincidentally it is especially the *humanities* in these *de*humanizing times that get denigrated!

In all of this, the net result is a devaluing of humanity. Instead of our money, our technologies, and our institutional structures being

used to serve the common good, we sacrifice human well-being again and again to serve the economy, our machines, and our systems and structures. This dehumanizing, as is true of all idolatry, is rooted in fear and anxiety, and so these dehumanizing forces reveal a spiritual crisis: a loss of faith, a loss of understanding what faith is and how important it is. The net result is a diminished life. As is true of all idolatry, this is a life of enslavement to something that is never going to fulfill us. Paul Tillich defined faith in terms of ultimate concern: do we rest our faith in that which is capable of carrying the weight of the ultimate? Many do not: they rest their faith on something else: money, worldly versions of "success," the belief that technology will save us, the belief that forcing people into rigid roles and strictly following policies and procedures will ensure that nothing bad ever happens. But none of these idols can actually fulfill those promises.

Keeping Our Candle Lit: Towards Solutions and Strategies

What We Want for Our Students

As we try to clarify how to respond to these challenges, we must start with a clear vision of what we want for our students. While of course economic survival is a necessity in our world, it is not all that life is about, and it is important for us to keep reminding students, their parents, and the wider world that life is about more than money, and that education is about preparing students to live life well. Making money is a means, not an end in itself. What are our ends, and are they worthy?

We want our students not just to understand the world as it is, but to attain wisdom: to be able also to perceive that other world of ideals. Such perceptiveness inspires a commitment to try to actualize those ideals. We want our students to understand how truth itself carries a kind of power, not coercive power but loving and persuasive power that strives for what is best for everyone. What is best for everyone really is possible. The philosopher Immanuel Kant showed how goodness is ultimately self-consistent, a concept he captured in his discussion of what he called "the kingdom of ends." There will never be a contradiction between what is truly good for one person and what is truly good for another. Where it appears that there are irreconcilable conflicts, that just indicates that positions, strategies, or desires have been confused for needs.

The word "liberal" in "liberal arts education" means liberation from an unreflective acceptance of society's demands. That is, it represents liberation from being enslaved to idolatries; it means becoming able to be live into one's full agency and freedom, no longer manipulable by fear. If our students could really claim their full freedom and learn to live from positives rather than negatives, they would become persons of integrity. The word "integrity" is related to strength (as in the "integrity" of a well-built house) and to wholeness (as in the concept of "integration").

How do we ensure our students learn these principles, so foundational to a well-lived life? Learning such principles well requires both study and experience. The most powerful kind of experience that can integrate this kind of

learning is the experience of true community. Many of our colleges try to be more than an institution—they try to be genuine communities as well for exactly this reason. When students feel that they have become part of a true community, they see what is possible in our world. They see how their individuality can be harmonized with their responsibilities to others. They see how the most fulfilling self-development is the kind of development that happens when others see them, value them, care for them, and inspire them to become their very best selves. They learn how satisfying it is to offer such support to others as well: how enriching it is to value those who are different from themselves, to celebrate their successes, and to console and encourage them in times of difficulty. They see that within a framework of mutual respect, conflicts can be reconciled. They see how the relationships that have triumphed through struggles often become the strongest and most important relationships of their lives. When our students have experienced the value of true community, they will keep trying to find it, or create it, even in their lives beyond college. A residential community of learning thus provides a holistic kind of education that can be replicated in no other way.

Institutional Response

While colleges and universities, to survive economically, do have to pay attention to finances, it is important always to keep in mind that money is a means, not an end. It is important to be careful not to let finances force changes that undermine the true integrity of the institution's mission. It is important to keep the institution's values at the center. Keep educating everyone inside and outside the institution about the institution's values and mission by discussing them in every conversation about the institution. Also, maintain a proactive orientation, anticipating pressures, challenges, and disruptive forces, being ready to respond from a reassertion of values rather than being forced into a reactive, defensive stance.

We must further recognize that it is people, not money, who are the true "resources." People are not just interchangeable cogs in the great machine called The Economy. People have agency: each brings unique gifts and possibilities, and each contributes uniquely to the character of each institution.

Valuing people also requires remembering never to conceptualize particular people as problems. When people's behavior appears problematic, such behavior is often a symptom of larger structural problems, and the people who manifest such behavior, being caught in the nexus of those problems, are victims of these problems too even if they also have hurt others. We are fortunate in Quaker subculture to have access to effective strategies for such situations: we have developed practices of looking for and repairing the structural problems that are at the heart of such difficulties, and then invoking restorative processes to repair the relational harm and restore community. Whether we are at Quaker colleges or not, we can try to bring such practices into our own colleges' processes, policies, and procedures.

In all of this, our colleges and universities can become visionary and prophetic. We can additionally make our prophetic vision more powerful by ensuring that our curriculum really does reflect our values. We must on the one hand refuse to accept sources of funding that push our curricula in directions that run counter to our values. On the other hand we need to develop and support programs that positively reflect our values of peace, environmental sustainability, diversity, and social responsibility.

We also need to make sure that our research is genuinely beneficial. While there is a place for specialized scholarly work and the testing and honing of those ideas in highly focused disciplines and subdisciplines, we also need to make a place for weaving these specialized threads back into a larger holistic vision. We need to create a place for strategizing about how to get this larger vision to engage the world and address its problems.

FAHE itself manifests this expanded vision of academia. Our conferences are organized around carefully-chosen themes, challenging each of us to bring our research to bear on an important issue in our world. While some people do present specialized papers and receive feedback from others immersed in the same specific subdiscipline, they also receive feedback from those outside the discipline, and this wider perspective helps weave the thread into the larger tapestry. As we each attend sessions often outside of our specialized areas of research, our horizons are expanded. We are invited to engage our whole selves, a process demanding integration. This process not only makes each of us better able to connect to wider audiences, but also recharges our motivation, renews and revises our vision, and reawakens our sense of vocation. All of this exemplifies the beloved community of scholars engaged in a deeper quest of employing the best of human thought to better the world.

How to Respond as Individuals

Finally, we need to consider how each of us as individuals can help keep the candle lit. We must continually work on developing our own vision for a better world, and keep alive a sense of how our work is helping to bring that world into being. We must keep inviting others to join with us in this task. We must nurture a sense of community among our colleagues and within our classrooms. We must hold fast to the spiritual discipline of living from positives.

More specifically, we can accomplish much of this by being careful about how we use language. Instead of unthinkingly participating in speaking the languages of economic idolatry, technological idolatry, or bureaucratic idolatry, we must constantly work to recognize, translate and shift that language back to a language of values and aspirational ideals.

We must also recognize and interrogate our internalized language of "shoulds" that is fueled by anxiety. Anxiety and fear are primary manipulative devices of coercive power. Keeping people scared is the most powerful way to undermine ethics. Fear is not all bad, and that is how it acquires its power: it genu-

inely tries to protect us. But it can become habit-forming. While it might be unrealistic and undesirable to banish it completely from our lives, we must learn to live in a critical relationship towards it, ever alert for how it tries to insinuate itself into our motivations; we must call ourselves and others back again and again to living from positive motivations based on values rather than negative motivations based on fear.

In all of these uses of language, we activate the alternative source of power: the source that can ultimately manifest the beloved community, making it real in this world. We must recognize our agency, our power to do this. It is real. We must also support each other in this way of living from a positive relationship with goodness and love. This way of "answering that of God in everyone" creates beloved community.

We in FAHE have been fortunate enough to catch real glimpses of beloved community, hopefully in FAHE itself, but also perhaps in other Quaker gatherings, within our families, and at least at moments in our colleges and universities. We know experimentally what is possible. If we keep this awareness alive in our souls, we can help manifest it elsewhere too. Of course it is not always easy. But my own ultimate reason for hope is my faith that the ultimate source of this candle can never be extinguished. As long as we care, the candle still burns because it is love, and God is love.

QUAKERS AND FREEDMEN IN SOUTHWEST OHIO

Neil Snarr
Wilmington College

On June 22, 1808, Samuel Gist wrote his last will and testament. He moved to the Colonies from England in 1739, and become wealthy as a plantation owner in Virginia. He did not support the war for independence that was raging at the time and subsequently returned to England in 1765. Through the employment of surrogates, he maintained his plantations and continued to grow his wealth. He started out as an orphan on the streets of London but, through a variety of channels, was able to advance his position and become a successful plantation owner. His various employments included the support of the slave trade, which necessitated his knowledge of this evil institution and its consequences.

Still, for some reason Gist wished to free his slaves, and although the exact reasons are unknown, it could have been due to his experiences on the streets as a child or his employment in the slave trade. Then again, it might have been that his two daughters did not produce any offspring. He passed away in 1815, and the content of his will became known. At that time, he owned 274 slaves, and in 1800, it is reported that he owned 8,000 acres in Virginia (Trotti 1996, 459). His will carefully addressed the future status of his slaves; he: "...endowed them with all of his properties in Virginia - land, stock, and equipment of all sorts. He had a utopian vision for his laborers: they would remain on his plantations and continue to work them, and his trustees would 'take upon themselves the management and Cultivation of my said Estates and yearly and every year (after deducting all necessary or proper expenses included and also a reasonable annual allowance for their trouble in managing and cultivating the same) to divide the surplus Rents and profits thereof to and amongst all and every of my said slaves' (Trotti 1996, 459)."

The will also made it clear that the slaves were to be instructed in the Protestant, Christian religion as practiced in England. This was certainly one of the largest releases of slaves in Colonial history, if not the largest.

One detail in all of this planning was overlooked - Virginia law stated that if manumission slaves remained in Virginia for over a year, they would return to slave status. Although it was possible to petition the legislature to contravene this law, these numbers were simply too large for the legislature's consideration. In Gist's efforts to find a solution to this dilemma, he even mentioned the possibility of returning the slaves to Liberia, an option that was later considered.

Gist selected John Wickham and Matthew Toler as trustees of his wealth. Wickham was an established and well-known lawyer in Richmond, Virginia. Soon after Gist's death, Wickham passed the responsibility to his son, William. All of these men were well known and established lawyers, the younger Wickham having served high status clients such as Aaron Burr. Toler died in 1811 and was replaced by Carter Page, William Wickham's father in law. In all of these actions, it was a case of white men determining the fate of hundreds of African American men

and their families, yet it appears that the trust was administered as intended. Trotti observes that, "nothing in the records shows any clear or egregious misuse or diversion of funds" (1996, 463).

Wickham was serious about the future of Gist's former slaves and even wrote a letter to the well-known abolitionist Captain Paul Cuffee asking his advice with reference to their future. Cuffee was a wealthy, mixed-race New England ship owner and Quaker. His advice was clear – return them to Africa. (Cuffee was known as the first proponent of 'Back to Africa' for slaves in the Colonies.) Although this option emerged several times in these discussions, it was obviously not selected.

After the estates' debts were settled and the court cases were adjudicated, the plantation lands were sold. In 1818, agent Wickham purchased 350 Certificates of Emancipation and selected southwest Ohio as the future location for the slaves. The slaves were removed in three waves accompanied by officers. There seems to be little agreement on the numbers, but the largest group was moved in 1819. Two more removals were undertaken in 1821 and 1831. The first two moves were to Brown County, Ohio, some 40 miles east of Cincinnati and a few miles north of the Ohio River. The final move was to Highland County, Ohio, some 40 miles north of the Ohio River.

The 1819 move included 113 ex-slaves. This 'upper settlement' was located in Eagle Township and contained 32 parcels of land on 1,197 acres. Unfortunately, only the first names of the slaves were recorded and there was no delineation between the lots, resulting in conflict among the residents. The second settlement in Brown County was in Scott Township, not far from the upper settlement, and consisted of 1,120 acres. Settled in 1821 and referred to as the lower settlement, it contained 32 lots. In all cases, the size of the lots corresponded to the number of land recipients.

Although the Ohio Constitution of 1803 did not allow slavery in the state, persons of color were not treated as equals. In 1807, a series of laws, known as black laws, were passed to discourage colored migration to Ohio (Wright 2013, 27). To follow these laws, persons of color were required to prove that they were not slaves and identify two people who would guarantee a surety of $500 for the person's good behavior. Among the other stipulations of these laws was the prohibition of marrying white people and limited gun-ownership. These black laws were later expanded to prohibit service in the militia or on a jury. In addition to these laws, the appearance of angry letters to area newspapers left no doubt that southwest Ohio was generally not a welcoming place for freedmen. Worth noting, also, is the fact that the largest group of early white settlers in Brown County came from Kentucky and Virginia – slave states.

Ironically, just forty miles west of these settlements on the Ohio River and in the midst of this unfriendly territory was the village of Ripley, the home of John Rankin, a widely known 'conductor' on the underground railroad." In Brown County, was located the headquarters, not only of a strong Abolitionist movement, but of that mysterious organization known as the

Underground Railroad" (McGroarty 1941, 224). There was no known contact between Rankin and Gist.

Beyond the social relationships that impacted the settlers were two additional problems. First, in Gist's will it was declared that the freedmen would not receive title to their land due to the fear that they would sell their land or that white men would swindle them out of

it. This ownership without the power to sell became a serious issue, and the Brown County residents eventually took the situation into their own hands. "In 1858 the freedmen of Brown County brought civil suit against Wickham to gain their land titles. This suit received no response from Wickham and was successfully pushed forward the following year, when the lands were formally assigned to the freedmen and titles were given them. In the following years, many Gist residents either sold out and moved on to more promising locales or lost their land because of nonpayment of taxes" (Trotti 1996, 473). This assignment of titles was followed by a significant population drop in both settlements – over fifty percent left the settlements between 1860 and 1880. Currently, all that is left of the two Brown County settlements are two historic markers.

The second inhibitor to making a successful adjustment in this area was the quality of the land they were given. As one writer states, "This was perhaps the land least suitable for the purpose for which it was intended that could have been found in the county" (McGroarty 1941, 217) Or, again, "…these lands were covered with thick under-growth and sloughs of stagnant water, and were almost valueless at this time for any purpose other than pasturage" (McGroarty 1941, 225).

In spite of the generally unfriendly social environment, the quite near, but apparently unrelated enclave of potential support, the poor-quality soil, and the absence of legal ownership of the land, there were the Quakers who played a very important supporting role for the freedmen. Early on, to oversee the new arrivals, Wickham selected and bonded three Quakers in southwest Ohio to care for their needs. "These three agents were instrumental in helping with the transition to freedom for the ex-slaves in the beginning, but by the mid-forties their power and authority was greatly diminished" (Wright 2013, 14). Other Quakers were also selected to serve as agents in later years. Wright also says, "There was also, however, the positive influence the nearby Quaker families had on the freed slaves of Samuel Gist" (2013, 11).

The third group of ex-slaves arrived in Highland County in 1832 and received one hundred acres of good farmland. That group, numbering forty-four, had been taken to the Sandusky, Ohio area earlier, but the land there was worse than that in Brown County, and the freedmen walked back to Virginia. This Highland County setting proved to be quite successful initially, but it was soon reported by the settlers and local Quakers that some agents were failing the freedmen. In 1835, an additional 107 acres were purchased under the authority of two local Quakers.

Aside from the Quaker families who lived in the area and befriended the ex-slaves, two meetings established committees to support them. Although extant materials are limited, there is sufficient documentation to give a general outline of their intentions and work.

The meetings were Fairfield (Indulged 1807) and Center (Indulged 1805). The distance between these meetings and the two Brown County settlements is approximately 60 miles and less to the Highland settlement. The available material is from the Fairfield Branch of the Committee on Concern for the People of Color. The explicit purpose of their concern which is iterated in each of the dozens of meetings with the settlements between April 1855 and October 1868 is the "Moral and literary improvement of the people of color among us." By literary, it is clear that they mean education via schooling. (Book B).

To a great extent, the notes are repetitive, but their concern for these people is clear. Reference to the Center Meeting is regular, but the implication is that the Center Branch is either inactive or sporadically active. The typical monthly report would give an over-all assessment of the moral state of the two Brown County settlements and the status of the local school – number of students and the name and race of the teacher, if there was one. Occasionally, there is reference to the success of their agriculture and how their land and houses appear. Visits to the homes of residents were common, and from all indications, relationships between Quakers and freedmen families were very congenial.

The third Gist settlement, located in Highland County, suffered from the same policy that haunted the two Brown County settlements – no deeds for the land on which they lived, but residents still responsible for land taxes. Wright notes in Gist's Promised Land that, "Since 1948, Highland County Gist Settlement descendants have been trying to get deeds for their property" (2013, 105). Actually, the Highland Weekly News records the following effort to set things straight, but not coming from the settlement residents, but from poorly informed people or hucksters: "Notice to the Gist Heirs."...you are hereby notified to meet in Convention at Hillsboro, Ohio, on Thursday, Oct. 20, 1881, to commence a vigorous prosecution of our clams in Ohio and Virginia." Signed by Rev. E. Cumberland, General Agent (Anonymous September 1883).

Another example appeared in the June 20, 1883 issue of the same newspaper. "THE GIST ESTATE: New Developments Which May Lead to a Settlement." This notice Indicates that, there is approximately twenty million dollars from the Gist trust which, "...has been kept back by designing persons; that there is now a probability that it will shortly be recovered and settled upon the legatees; that he understands that persons are trying to buy up the claimants, and notifying all the parties that he is there [sic.] sole legal representative" (Anonymous June 1883).

Other such claims could be added to these failed and fraudulent claims, but the plight of these Highland County Gist residents continued. The same slow but steady voluntary

movement of these people off the settlement continued, and in 1964, it was reported that approximately thirty persons currently lived there (Anonymous, 1964).

Trotti summarizes the situation in 1995 as follows:

...Ohio courts on several occasions attempted to remedy the situation and they successfully did so in the case of the Brown County settlement. But the long and jumbled history of informal land sales, bequests, and rentals among the freedmen left the Highland County land in a tangled state that few lawyers or judges wanted to wrestle with. Local wisdom also hints that years of hanky-panky - questionable backroom arrangements that lawyers and judges would just as soon not uncover – were to blame (1996, 475).

The most recent and persistent efforts to claim and preserve this land have been made by Paul Turner, a direct descendent of the original settlers who arrived in 1831. Paul's story is clearly and sympathetically spelled out in Paula Wright's carefully researched book Gist's Promised Land. As a youth, Turner moved several times, living with relatives and working at whatever was available. At age 19, he enlisted in the Navy and rose to the highest NCO position possible. His time in Vietnam left a deep impression on him, and from all

indications, he was loved by everyone with whom he came into contact. After 26 years in the Navy, he returned to the Settlement and proceeded to live on the small piece of land that was available and to work for neighbors when necessary. He vowed to pay back taxes on whatever land he could, including abandoned land. As Wright states, "...he paid the $28,800 back taxes and continues to this day to pay taxes due on the original lots assigned to his ancestors" (2013, 89-90).

Trotti states in his seriously-researched 1996 article "But this is more than a tale of an Ohio farmer redeeming the land of his forebears; in fact, the farm does not belong to Paul Turner or to his family, not entirely, and it probably never will." (1996, 455) This assertion, that this quandary would possibly never be settled, had come to be the accepted conclusion – commonly shared by those who had attempted to settle it – lawyers, relatives, locals, etc. This may not, however, be the end of this very sad and lengthy story.

Through the work of two area women, there may be light at the end of this tunnel. The first is Paula Wright, who researched and wrote the book quoted above, Gist's Promised Land: The Little-Known Story of the Largest Relocation of Freed Slaves in U.S. History, published in 2013. For two and a half years, she identified and integrated original sources and appropriate interviews to produce this book.

In addition to the above work, Melissa Beal Beyerlein, with little more than a degree in paralegal studies and a large dose of compassion and commitment, looked into the legal dimensions of the Gist Settlement quagmire. She shepherded the decision through the courts that ultimately resulted in the deed for most of the Gist land being given to Paul Turner. What was universally considered impossible, she was able to achieve after many years of research.

These two women have done much more than I have mentioned and deserve many more accolades than words can convey. What a different world this would be if there were more people like Paula and Melissa.

Bibliography

Anonymous. June 1883. The Highland Weekly News (Hillsboro, Ohio), June 13, 1883.

Anonymous. 1964. "Gist Settlement Still Center of Much Legal Controversy," The Press-Gazette (Hillsboro, Ohio), January 7, 1964.

Anonymous. September 1883. "Notice to the Gist Heirs," The Highland Weekly News (Hillsboro, Ohio), September 22, 1883.

Fairfield Branch of the Committee on the Concerns of the People of Color. 1855-1868. Book B. Fairfield Branch of the Committee on the Concerns of the People of Color (Highland County, Ohio, 1855-1868).

McGroarty, William Buckner. 1941. "Exploration in Mass Emancipation," William and Mary Quarterly 21, no. 3 (July, 1941): 208-26.

Sheeler, J. Reuben. 1946. "The Struggle of the Negro in Ohio For Freedom," Journal of Negro History 31, no. 2 (April, 1946): 208-26.

Trotti, Michael. 1996. "Freedmen and Enslaved Soil, A Case Study of Manumission, Migration, and Land,

The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography 104, no. 4 (Autumn 1996): 455-80.

Wright, Paula Kitty. 2013. Gist's Promised Land: The Little-Known Story of the Largest Relocation of Freed Slaves in U.S. History. Seaman, Ohio, Sugar Tree Ridge Publishing, 2013.

Lucretia Mott: A Rebel for Social Change

Cathy Pitzer and Jean Mulhern
Retired, Wilmington College

Lucretia Coffin Mott was a nineteenth century Quaker preacher, social reformer, abolitionist, feminist, suffragist, and pacifist, all aspects of her lifelong advocacy for universal equality and social justice**.** She was widely judged by her contemporaries "... as the greatest American woman of the nineteenth century" (Jacoby, 2005, p.95). Her political activism and strategic public challenges of social norms came a full century ahead of the American civil rights and feminist eras. Along the way, she shattered gender barriers.

Early Life

Born in Nantucket, Massachusetts in 1793, Lucretia Mott was the daughter of Quakers Thomas Coffin and Anne Folger (Bacon, 1980). Nantucket, an island off the shore of Massachusetts, was the center of the whaling industry in America, a profitable but dangerous enterprise (Philbrick, 2015). Lucretia's father invested in the *Trial*, a whaling ship, and led his crew out to sea for months at a time. As a result, Lucretia's mother Anna, like many women on the island, conducted the daily business, headed the social structure, and exerted more independence than was typical of mainland women of that era (Bacon, 1980). In fact, the main shopping street on Nantucket had so many shops run by local women that it was nicknamed "Petticoat Row." Lucretia credited much of her success in life to the role models provided by these "liberated" Nantucket Quaker women, who were merchants, manufacturers, preachers, community leaders, and equal partners with their husbands (Kovach, 2015; Palmer, 2002). And as a birthright Quaker she also saw how women had an equal right to speak during meeting, could be elders with religious authority, and could travel alone and publish under their own names (Bacon, 1980).

In 1804 Thomas Coffin moved his family to Boston, leaving whaling for the safer and more stable occupation of a merchant. At age thirteen, after briefly attending public school, Lucretia was sent to Nine Partners Boarding School in Dutchess County, New York. Nine Partners had been established by the New York Yearly Meeting, founding members of which included Elias Hicks and James Mott Sr., the grandfather of Lucretia's future husband James. Both boys and girls studied substantially the same rigorous curriculum of reading, writing, mathematics, accounts, grammar, and poetry (Bacon, 1980). After graduating at age 16 she became an assistant teacher, finding to her dismay that "...the charge for the education of girls was the same as that for boys, but…when they became teachers, women received but half as much as men for their services…"(Bacon, 2013, p. 33).

In 1811, at age 19, Lucretia made what was probably the most propitious decision of her life, marrying James Mott, who was not just the love of her life but her strongest supporter in all of the causes she actively embraced. James was a teacher at Nine Partners but after marriage became a partner in Lucretia's father's cut nail and wholesale merchandise businesses in Philadelphia. James later became a successful textile merchant. Together

they had six children, five of whom survived to adulthood.

After 1811, the Motts lived most of their lives in or near Philadelphia. Pre-Civil War Philadelphia

and its surrounding area had the largest number of members of the Society of Friends in the country. Philadelphia Quakers established a prosperous international trading economy and controlled the counting houses as well. Their religious beliefs inspired a strong anti-slavery community that banned trading or owning slaves in the eighteenth century and supported freedmen with education and jobs.

Lucretia as a Quaker Minister

Lucretia was accepted as a recorded minister of the Twelfth Street Monthly Meeting in 1821 with a letter to travel and preach. Contemporary reports of her speeches marveled that such a tiny woman, only four foot ten inches and 95 pounds, could draw repeatedly such large audiences (Faulkner, 2011).

James financed her ministry because the Society viewed accepting payment for preaching a sin. He often traveled with her, helped with logistics, and chaired meetings when asked. Her topics included abolition of slavery; support of stores that sold only “free produce”, goods made without slave labor; the rights of women in marriage and in society; temperance; the importance of education; and improving the status of Native Americans. Concerning matters of faith, she spoke positively about the Inner Light, peace, non-resistance, and women's responsibilities in both home and community. She spoke in opposition to a growing Quaker church hierarchy, quietism (tacit acceptance of slavery and inequality as social norms), and any elevated role for the *Bible.* She demonstrated her "...commitment to the inner light, or individual conscience, above all other forms of religious or temporal authority" (Faulkner, 2011, p.17).

When the Quaker Orthodox and Hicksite factions separated in 1827, Lucretia and James joined with the Hicksites, moving from the Twelfth Street to the Cherry Street meeting. Orthodox meetings emphasized Biblical authority and a stronger power for church hierarchy while Hicksite meetings chose to focus on the Inner Light. Unquestionably, the disownment of her sister and other relatives for marrying non-Quakers was a factor in her decision, as was her distaste for the heavy handedness of the Orthodox Quaker elders in enforcing their rules. Lucretia's willingness to speak persuasively on unjust social practices led to her emergence as a moral leader in her meeting and earned her the esteem of others as a person of integrity and great faith. She was elected year after year in the 1830s as clerk of the Philadelphia Women’s Yearly Meeting.

Eventually, Lucretia's advocacy of women’s legal rights and the abolition of slavery and her “promiscuous” practice of traveling without a male escort and speaking to audiences that included men resulted in accusations of heresy, even by the liberal Hicksites (Faulkner, 2011). Despite these accusations, she was never disowned by her own meeting.

Lucretia as an Abolitionist

While Quakers opposed slavery, there were wide divisions of opinion as to how to end it. Some believed in a gradual approach while others favored immediate emancipation. Lucretia and James took up the Garrisonian tactics of non-violent moral suasion to end slavery immediately. The Mott home became a gathering spot for abolitionists and fugitive slaves, as many as 50 of whom often stayed at

their home at one time (Bacon, 1980). Abolition of slavery was promoted through petitions, publications, conventions, organizations, lectures and speeches. Formed in 1784, the Philadelphia Anti-Slavery Society, like other similar groups that followed, was open to white men only. As a result, Garrison, James Mott, and others, black and white, founded the American Anti-Slavery Society (AASS). Lucretia and other women formed a parallel organization, the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society (PFASS), which would become the longest lasting anti-slavery organization in the country (1833 - 1870). The group was unusual in that it was integrated economically and racially. As PFASS members, the women conducted petition drives and ran fairs that raised over $900,000 (in today's dollars) for schools and abolitionist publications.

Concerns about violence, an increasingly common tactic used by pro-slavery groups, led to criticism of Lucretia in the Quaker community, which feared she was attracting trouble by becoming a lightning rod for controversy. In fact, the newly built abolitionist-sponsored Philadelphia Hall in Philadelphia was burned in 1838 by pro-slavery agitators immediately after her speaking engagement there with other abolitionists. In 1842 Philadelphia Quakers refused to give her permission to travel as a minister and British Quakers refused to recognize her as a member of the Society of Friends (Faulkner, 2011). The abolitionist movement, in frustration after a half-century of activism, was becoming fragmented over whether moral suasion was sufficient, whether violence should be met with violence, whether issues of women's rights were impeding efforts to end slavery, and even whether women should be involved in abolitionism at all.

In 1840 the Motts traveled to London to attend the World Anti-Slavery Convention, the objective of which was to better coordinate global abolitionist movements. Originally attending as delegates, Lucretia and other women found themselves excluded by men, who required them to sit behind a screen as silent observers. A few of the male delegates sat with the women in protest, most notably William Lloyd Garrison and Boston orator Wendell Phillips. One of the women forced to sit in the female section was Elizabeth Cady Stanton, a young activist from upstate New York who attended with her husband on their honeymoon. The two women briefly discussed organizing a convention in America to promote the rights of women; it would be eight years before they met again. Lucretia continued her anti-slavery activities in the decade of the 1840s, addressing state legislatures, delivering public speeches and sermons, and even meeting with President John Tyler, a slave owner himself. While she never addressed Congress, over 40 members of Congress came to hear one of her speeches. When possible, she confronted slave owners directly, challenging slavery based on religious and rational arguments.

Passage of the Fugitive Slave Act in 1850, violence in Kansas, the Dred Scott decision, and John Brown's Harpers Ferry insurrection all served to reinvigorate the abolitionist movement in the 1850s. Lucretia and James helped many slaves escape on the Underground Railroad, including "Box Brown" who shipped himself to Philadelphia (Faulkner, 2011).

Lucretia regarded the Civil War with mixed feelings as she was a pacifist. She had always hoped slavery would be eliminated because the Inner Light would lead people, especially slave owners, to realize for themselves that it was morally wrong and free slaves voluntari-

ly, as had Philadelphia Quakers in 1776. Although she fundamentally opposed violence and war in service to any cause, many abolitionists and Quakers did join the Union Army, including her own son-in-law (Fager, 2004; Faulkner, 2011). During the Civil War, Lucretia and the women in PFASS sewed for soldiers and kept active in Freedmen's Aid Societies. They also fought to end segregation on the Philadelphia railway system (Bacon, 1980).

Lucretia as a Feminist and Women Suffragist

Lucretia's earliest social concern was with the rights of women, especially equal pay, property rights lost when a woman married, freedom from marital abuse, and equitable and just divorce proceedings. She believed that the Quaker practice of disownment for premarital sex and for marrying non-Quakers excluded otherwise faithful Quakers. But it was not until 1848 that Lucretia became acquainted with the woman suffrage movement, as it was called at that time, and even then, not willingly. Lucretia met Elizabeth Cady Stanton at a chance meeting in July 1848, the first time that they had met since their brief time together eight years before at the anti-slavery convention in London. At this reunion tea near Seneca Falls, New York, the women discussed the issues of the day and at Stanton's urging, agreed to draft a *Declaration of Sentiments* and call a women's rights convention. Non-Quaker Stanton and others, not Lucretia, drafted the *Declaration of Sentiments*, with its decidedly political theme of electoral politics and voting rights for women (Tetrault, 2014).

Lucretia believed emphasis upon voting rights for women detracted from and divided the abolitionist movement but she continued to encourage all woman suffrage factions to work for general human equality and civil rights. Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony were very impressed with her years of public preaching and her ability to attract such large audiences; thus Lucretia found her hard-earned national reputation co-opted as the founding mother of the woman suffrage movement in their *History of Woman Suffrage*, published beginning in the 1880s (Tetrault, 2014). In reality that movement was of their making, not hers, although she did make presentations on human rights at suffrage conventions.

The woman suffrage movement soon split between those seeking immediate universal suffrage and those like Lucretia who sought to delay voting rights of women in favor of attaining black male suffrage first.

The Later Years

In the 1850s Lucretia and James, now in their seventies, retired to an old stone house north of Philadelphia called "Roadside." While the couple occasionally drove their carriage into Philadelphia, they immersed themselves in country and family life. Their trips throughout the country to speak and preach had largely ended. Lucretia continued to try to broker peace among the women's suffrage factions, ever vigilant to furthering her life's interest in women's rights, broadly interpreted. She also encouraged emerging peace movements.

In 1868 James Mott passed away from pneumonia. After his death Lucretia withdrew for a time from most public activity and missed him terribly: "Scarcely a day passes that I do not think, of course for an instant only, that I will consult him about this or that…We have loved each other", she wrote, "with perfect love" (Haines, 2013). On November 11, 1880 Lucretia Mott passed away and was buried next to her husband at Fair Hill Cemetery in Philadelphia (Faulkner, 2011).

The Legacy of Lucretia Mott

Although popularly labeled as an abolitionist or a woman suffragist, Lucretia from her early years into old age acted on one overarching principle, to right social injustices through moral suasion bolstered by determined persistence. She hoped her calls for justice and equality for all would eventually win over the public. While she decried the position of woman as a "cipher" in history, invisible and overlooked, she herself, once lionized, became largely forgotten over the next century, reduced to a “footnote” in women’s history. Recently, starting with the comprehensive collection and publication of her letters in 2002 (Palmer), scholars such as
Mary Bacon, Carol Faulkner and Lisa Pace Vetter have begun reexamining her career and identifying her substantive contributions to American society.

Two hundred years ago Lucretia Mott stood up and spoke out for the first time. One hundred years ago the 19th Amendment to the United States Constitution was ratified, guaranteeing women the vote and completing the struggle for basic civic equality for all Americans. Now it is time for a new generation of selfless social reform leaders equipped with education, moral authority, and national visibility to continue the efforts to create the peaceful, inclusive, just society envisioned and so passionately promoted by Lucretia Coffin Mott.

References

Bacon, M.H. (1980). *Valiant Friend.* New York, NY: Walker and Company.

Bacon, M.H. (2013). *Lucretia Mott Speaking;* Pendle Hill: Pamphlet 234. Kindle Version. Retrieved from Amazon.com.

Fager, C. 2004, Spring/Summer. "Lucretia Mott, Liberal Quaker Theologian." *Quaker Theology #10.* Retrieved from http://quakertheology.org/issue-10-mott-CEF-01.htm

Faulkner. C. (2011). *Lucretia Mott’s Heresy: Abolition and Women’s Rights in Nineteenth-Century America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Finger, J. L. (2014, Sept. 10). These Ladies Weren’t Flouncy: Nantucket’s Petticoat Row." *Nantucket Chronicle*. Retrieved from https://www.nantucketchronicle.com/nation-nantucket/2014/these-ladies-werent-flouncy-nantuckets-petticoat-row

Haines, P. (2013 Sept.). Lucretia and James: Living in Perfect Love. *Friends Journal.* Retrieved from https://www.friendsjournal.org/lucretia-james-living-perfect-love/

Jacoby, S. (2005) *Freethinkers: A History of American Secularism.* New York: Metropolitan Owl.

Kovach, J. D. (2015). *Nantucket women: Public Authority and Education in the Eighteenth Century Nantucket Quaker Women’s Meeting and the Foundation for Female Activism* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2/374

Palmer, B.W. (Ed). (2002). *Selected Letters of Lucretia Coffin Mott.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Philbrick, N. (Dec 2015). How Nantucket Came to be the Whaling Capital of the World. *Smithsonian Magazine.*

Stanton, E. C., Anthony, S.B., and Gage, M. J. (1881-1922). History of Woman Suffrage. 6 volumes. New York: National American Woman Suffrage Association.

Tetrault, L. (2014). *The Myth of Seneca Falls: Memory and the Women's Suffrage Movement, 1848-1898*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Vetter, L.P. (2015). The Most Belligerent Non-resistant. *Political Theory 43(5), 600-620.*

MADNORMALITY

Nicolin Haines
Adjunct Professor, Wilmington College

Alluding to botanical forms and cumulative abnormalities, my work confronts the viewer by providing a surreal embellishment of possible future mutations. I establish an unsettling reality that examines how our exploitation of the natural world impacts life. Through explorations of texture and use of ceramic material my sculptures provide a visceral assessment of this impact. Consecutively, Earth's history has demonstrated its ability to adapt and survive through calamity and destruction. Like an infection or disease, human activity is the planet's biggest threat, causing repercussions detrimental to all life. I examine these ideas by creating objects afflicted with their own mutations that are both seductive and threatening, and by doing so I hope to create a moment of reflection on the impingement of our existence.

I am consistently drawn to botanical species as inspiration for my work and I use them as references to create organic forms. I am interested in the function of a seed pod as an inherent origin to life and the symbolic duality of the world as a seed pod for mankind. I reference seed pods and botanical forms because of their seductive qualities while at the same time, suggesting environmental distress through mutation. I obtain insight for rendering mutation through research and the recognition of the impact of pollution and toxic waste, examining the impacts of our existence and incorporating a balance between beauty and disgust.

Through a combination of form, surface texture and crater glazes, I arrange nuances of color upon bubbling-foaming craters, illustrating a reaction to mankind's continuous disregard to our environment. In suggesting dramatic mutations, I am carefully establishing a system of growth and existence while imagining possibilities of evolution.

This new body of work is an extension of ideas and forms in my previous sculptures. The title, "Madnormality", suggests a proliferation of mutations on an extreme or wild capacity. Through an exploration of construction techniques, I have found new (repetitive) forms upon which to experiment in the application of textures and reticulated crater glazes. I want my work to act as a catalyst for self-reflection on the human impact on Earth and to facilitate confrontation: the viewer cannot help but become drawn to the work, but must also question our part in environmental demise.