

ABSTRACT

Open Hearts, Closed Doors:
Native Protestants, Pluralism, and the “Foreigner” in America, 1924-1965

Nicholas T. Pruitt, Ph.D.

Mentor: Barry G. Hankins, Ph.D.

At the turn of the twentieth century, leading white Protestant denominations sponsored vigorous home mission work among immigrant communities in the United States. As the century progressed, these programs, often conducted by women and occasionally by immigrants themselves, blended progressive social gospel ideals, such as the brotherhood of man, with traditional evangelistic goals. This diffusion of the social gospel among Protestant believers helped temper nativist sentiments inherited from the nineteenth century. While home missions among immigrants and ethnic Americans focused on spiritual edification, these ministries also reinforced American citizenship and culture. Home missionaries often promoted an “American Way of Life,” while simultaneously tolerating diverse immigrant cultures. Some Protestants grew more comfortable with cultural pluralism by midcentury, while remaining reluctant to embrace a religious pluralism that would replace their vision of a Protestant Christian nation.

Many Protestant leaders, often holding positions in the Federal/National Council of Churches, also promoted immigration policy reform. During the four decades

following the restrictive Immigration Act of 1924, progressive Protestants worked to overturn Asian exclusion and, by the 1950s, to challenge discriminatory quotas against eastern and southern Europeans. Through frequent communication with political representatives and testimony before congressional committee hearings, Protestants advocated a more liberal immigration system and encouraged refugee resettlement. Such efforts often put progressive, ecumenical figures at odds with more conservative Christians and anti-communist crusaders. Immigration reform eventually came to fruition in 1965 when President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Hart-Celler Act that overturned the national origins quota system.

Though not cognizant of it at the time, Protestant leaders helped pave the way for increasing immigration reflecting more diverse nationalities and faiths. By the end of the twentieth century, mainline Protestantism's historic preeminence in American society began to wane, due in part to an increasing acknowledgement of religious pluralism in the United States. Through their developing support for cultural pluralism and their persistence in promoting a Christian nation, native Protestants arrived at a pluralistic bargain with immigration. Such an arrangement helped reconfigure U.S. society and culture by the twenty-first century.

Open Hearts, Closed Doors:
Native Protestants, Pluralism, and the "Foreigner" in America, 1924-1965

by

Nicholas T. Pruitt, B.A., M.A.

A Dissertation

Approved by the Department of History

Barry G. Hankins, Ph.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by the Dissertation Committee

Barry G. Hankins, Ph.D., Chairperson

Philip Jenkins, Ph.D.

James M. SoRelle, Ph.D.

Andrea L. Turpin, Ph.D.

Sarah Ford, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School
August 2017

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Copyright © 2017 by Nicholas T. Pruitt

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
DEDICATION	x
CHAPTER ONE	1
Introduction: “The Next Forty Years”	1
<i>Organization</i>	9
<i>Concerning Sources and Definitions</i>	14
<i>Intersecting Themes</i>	16
<i>Conclusion</i>	27
CHAPTER TWO	29
Historiographical Justification	29
<i>Development of Immigration History</i>	31
<i>Nativism and Native Responses</i>	41
<i>Religion and Immigration</i>	48
<i>Twentieth-Century Protestantism</i>	56
<i>Conclusion</i>	65
CHAPTER THREE	67
Settling into Restriction	67
<i>Protestant Ministry among Immigrants</i>	69
<i>The Social Gospel Inheritance and Its Challenges</i>	80
<i>Pluralism vs. Americanization</i>	87
<i>Congress and Immigration Restriction</i>	96
<i>The Aftermath</i>	105
<i>Conclusion</i>	107
CHAPTER FOUR	109
The Trying Thirties	109
<i>Home Missions and Social Concern</i>	111
<i>Interpreting National Identity</i>	131
<i>Political Statements and World Crisis</i>	143
<i>Conclusion</i>	149

CHAPTER FIVE	151
The Huddled Masses the War Produced	151
<i>Foreign Wars, Domestic Missions</i>	154
<i>Conditions the War Produced</i>	163
<i>Midcentury Social Sensibilities</i>	170
<i>Exclusion on Its Way Out</i>	176
<i>Conclusion</i>	190
CHAPTER SIX.....	192
Strangers in Mayberry.....	192
<i>Christian Nation through Home Missions</i>	194
<i>Refugees</i>	210
<i>Conclusion</i>	229
CHAPTER SEVEN	231
Paving the Way for Pluralism	231
<i>Legislating Pluralism</i>	232
<i>Confronting the McCarran-Walter Act</i>	237
<i>The Consequences of Protest</i>	249
<i>Arriving at the Hart-Celler Act of 1965</i>	256
<i>Conclusion</i>	270
CHAPTER EIGHT	273
Conclusion: The Pluralistic Bargain	273
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	284

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support of numerous individuals and institutions. Central to this project were the sources drawn from multiple archives. The United Methodist Church Archives, Southern Baptist Historical Library and Archives, Presbyterian Historical Society, American Baptist Historical Society Archives, Archives of the Episcopal Church, and the Woman's Missionary Union Library and Archives proved to be indispensable. I especially appreciate the support provided by the United Methodist Church Archives through the Florence Ellen Bell Scholar Award and by the Southern Baptist Historical Library and Archives with a Lynn E. May Study Grant. The reliable and prompt assistance of the Baylor University Libraries and Interlibrary Services made researching and writing this dissertation much more efficient, and Sandra Harman's assistance with dissertation formatting and completing graduate school requirements was most helpful.

My colleagues inspire my work in manifold ways. Graduate students in Baylor's Department of History are a special group that encouraged my work and challenged my thinking over the last six years. They are a community of adept scholars and dear friends. I am thankful for my initial cohort of MA and PhD students, including Eric Brandt, Robert DeBoard, Meghan Clark, Adina Kelley, Katie Miles, Jonathan Riddle, and Lauren Wheeler. I continue to be blessed by Brendan Payne and Tim Grundmeier who entered the doctoral program during my second year; their support and friendship is much appreciated. I benefited greatly from Paul Putz's suggestions of secondary sources and

the help Skylar Ray provided by sending me copies of *Christian Century* at a moment's notice while I was away from the library. My colleagues within the Baptist College and University Scholars Program, including João Chaves who took time to read certain portions of this dissertation and offer helpful critique, provided vocational encouragement, and I appreciate Laine Scales and Dean Larry Lyon for their commitment to Christian higher education. Finally, Nathan Cartagena, Adina Kelley, and Alina Beary gave much needed help in honing my writing.

I will always remain in debt to the faculty who comprise the History Department at Baylor University. Beth Allison Barr provided constant support as both professor and Graduate Program Director, and Michael Parrish brought to my attention several important sources. While teaching at Baylor, David Bebbington had a formative influence on my development as a historian. In particular, his attention to the “diffusion” of ideas in history inspired much of my interpretation in this dissertation. I also appreciate the invaluable insight that my dissertation committee members, Philip Jenkins, James SoRelle, Andrea Turpin, and Sarah Ford, provided and the time they sacrificed to comment on my work and participate in the defense. In good Strunk and White fashion, I must recognize at the end of this sequence of professors the faculty member who has contributed the most to my formation as a graduate student, my dissertation advisor Barry Hankins. I owe my development as a scholar, writer, and historian to him. Thank you for your vision for the Baylor History Department and the humanity and scholarship you cultivate in your students.

The Eastern Nazarene College community has been a blessing over the last year as I completed this dissertation. The support, friendship, and counsel of my colleague

and chair, Bill McCoy, has been tremendous, and the faculty at the college offered a great welcome to this Texas expat teaching in Massachusetts. Their devotion to the Christian liberal arts tradition is an inspiration. Students in the ENC History Department and those who took my Spring 2017 course on U.S. immigration history provided intellectual inspiration during the latter stages of this project and are a pleasure to work with.

No scholar's work is separate from the support of friends and family. I am particularly in debt to the encouragement received from Adina Kelley and Nathan, Angela, and Anna Cartagena. Joe and Debora Hoyle provided earnest friendship and hospitality, both before and after my move to Massachusetts. My brother, sister-in-law, and nephew, Andrew, Stacey, and Emmett, sister and brother-in-law, Bethanie and Micah Hankins (and child on the way), brother, Daniel, and sister, Lydia, all inspire my work; you make life exciting and full of meaning. My parents, Mark and Karla, remain a strong pillar of support in my life, providing steadfast encouragement, love, and wisdom. I am so blessed to have you as parents and friends and value the support you have given me throughout my education. I dedicate this dissertation to the legacy of my grandparents and their example of faith, hope, and love through their devotion to ministry, education, and family.

DEDICATION

To Granny and Grandad, Grandma and Grandpa

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction: “The Next Forty Years”

“But the world has suddenly become very small. Space has wondrously shrunk, and we are face to face in a closely intertwined and increasingly interdependent life. Isolation is no longer possible. A new era is upon us. The question for us all is whether this is to be a glorious era of brotherhood and good-will, an era of interchange of our best spiritual treasures and material achievements, or an era of enmity, aggression and strife.”

—Sidney L. Gulick, *Adventuring in Brotherhood among Orientals in America*¹

In 1926, Henry Goddard Leach, editor of the popular journal *Forum*, published an article reflecting on America’s recent past and near future. Leach tapped into the intellectual and cultural pulse of his day and determined that the United States was entering a period in history when much was in flux. The world was recovering from the trauma of the First World War. The war’s devastation and the long shadow it cast over the ensuing years dashed humanity’s hopes for progress. Despite the “creeds of peace in our churches,” Leach noted, the war proved that people during the early twentieth century were simply “helpless and savage children, destroying our flimsy civilization.” In the areas of science and art, Leach acknowledged an increasing relativism, whereby “[t]o-day has more facets than ever before.” As for religion, Leach believed the nation was heading in a more ecumenical direction, where Protestants, Jews, Catholics, and even irreligious scholars were learning to coexist. Leach announced triumphantly, “Christendom as well as iconoclasm is on the march, and it is marching in harmony.”

¹Sidney Lewis Gulick, *Adventuring in Brotherhood among Orientals in America* (New York: Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1925), 19.

Finally, Leach also assessed the international scene, noting America's new place in the world and the dramatic political changes taking place in Europe. Though the 1920s were supposed to be a time of isolationism, he quipped, "The world has contracted and we have expanded."²

Immigration was a visible manifestation of this contraction and expansion for the United States. It was certainly a vital topic for Leach. Besides editing a prominent journal, he also served as president of the American-Scandinavian Foundation. Concerning the waves of immigrants in the nation's history, Leach wrote, "After a century of unthinking hospitality America has recently closed her gates abruptly to the tide of immigration. We Americans are taking count of stock. We are girding up our loins for a new day. We are heeding the sign 'Stop! Look! Listen!' in our national life." Leach then resolved, "A new American consciousness is dawning in this post-war period." As for immigration, Leach was convinced that restriction allowed the nation to assimilate its recent additions. Later in the article, Leach concluded, "The closing of the Immigration door is an insurance for a new and compact national consciousness. Who knows but we will melt and fuse into some distinguished expression of our national purpose as noble as our health and our energy."³

For Leach, as his title suggested, "The Next Forty Years" were going to be a formative period for America. But history rarely follows one's predictions, even someone as eloquent as Leach. During the next forty years, a "national consciousness" did coalesce at various points, but the overall trajectory of American culture was one of

²Henry Goddard Leach, "The Next Forty Years," *Forum* 75 (March 1926), 414-19; first quote from 416; second quote from 414; third quote from 419; fourth quote from 417.

³*Ibid.*, first quote from 414; second quote from 419.

further fragmentation, aided in part by past immigration and the continued, though drastically reduced, influx of more people from overseas. The “melting” and “fusing” that Leach hoped for, an allusion to Israel Zangwill’s 1908 play *The Melting Pot*, would never be complete, and despite efforts to restrict immigration, foreign-born people and their children continued to make America a more plural nation.

Passed just two years before Leach wrote his article, the Immigration Act of 1924 placed heavy restrictions, in the form of quotas, on southern and eastern European groups in an effort to curtail the massive flow of “new” immigrants who began coming to America during the forty years prior. Though their overall numbers declined, people from overseas still entered the United States under the new law, and others made it into America illegally. The 1924 legislation left Latin American immigration largely untouched, and during the 1940s, 50s, and 60s, America opened its borders to Bracero workers from Mexico, people displaced by the upheaval of World War II, an increasing number of Asian immigrants, and refugees fleeing political turmoil during the Cold War. In addition, millions of immigrants who had already come to the United States since the late nineteenth century continued to settle into their American surroundings. America’s growing role in global politics only compounded the issue raised by people of various nationalities residing in the United States. Despite restrictive quotas, between 1924 and 1965 immigrants from prior years continued to speak foreign languages and practice foreign cultures while settling in American neighborhoods and additional people arrived from other lands. How did Americans respond?

One way to decipher this response is to examine the reactions of American Protestants. Protestant denominations have represented a large segment of the population

throughout the nation's history, and their responses to immigration are telling. Protestants maintained a prominent place in American society ever since colonial times, but they began to witness their hold on culture and politics weaken due to increasing pluralism and secularism by the end of the twentieth century. Nevertheless, during the early to mid-twentieth century, Protestants still retained their cultural clout and, as historians Charles Lippy and George Marsden argue, worked to preserve an American Protestant consensus despite rising pluralism.⁴ This position of power within American society, however, did not preclude Protestant work among immigrant communities; if anything, Protestants felt obligated to reach out to the "foreigners" in the nation.⁵ The North American Home Missions Congress in 1930 reported, "The Restriction Law has largely changed the immigrant situation in the United States. It should be remembered, however, that over ten million people of foreign birth have made this country their permanent home and are becoming more and more an integral and formative part of its political, social and industrial life." The Congress concluded: "Home missionary efforts

⁴Charles Lippy, "From Consensus to Struggle: Pluralism and the Body Politic in Contemporary America," in *Gods in America: Religious Pluralism in the United States*, ed. Charles L. Cohen and Ronald L. Numbers (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 298, 300-303; George Marsden, *The Twilight of the American Enlightenment: The 1950s and the Crisis of Liberal Belief* (New York: Basic Books, 2014). See also Charles L. Cohen and Ronald L. Numbers, "Introduction," in *Gods in America: Religious Pluralism in the United States*, 6-7. This religious hegemony, however, was already eroding even before midcentury. Kevin Schultz persuasively demonstrates that a "tri-faith" conglomeration of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews was already in the making prior to 1950. Kevin M. Schultz, *Tri-Faith America: How Catholics and Jews Held Postwar America to Its Protestant Promise* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

⁵This study uses the term "foreigner," a term often employed by native Protestants and other contemporaries during the twentieth century, in order to incorporate the perspectives and language of the study's subjects.

among these people should be continued.”⁶ This statement serves as an example of continued attention to immigrants even after the Immigration Act of 1924.

The twentieth century marked a period of time when pluralism was on the rise in the United States. The primary cause of this phenomenon was the physical migration of people who brought their culture with them. The fate of pluralism, however, also depended upon the host nation. Would the native people and institutions encourage or discourage pluralism? This study delineates the ways that native Protestants in the United States between 1924 to 1965 facilitated and helped define pluralism within the nation through their interaction with foreigners and their approach to the government’s immigration policy. Through their home mission programs and political activism, Protestants helped pave the way, or so they thought, for immigrants to flourish in America, often in a manner that was in continuity with earlier Protestant assimilation programs. Earlier social gospel sentiments and current events largely shaped Protestant approaches to immigration during this time, and underlying their national concerns was a developing progressive critique of the racial components of restrictive legislation. In the process, native Protestants also worked to define what pluralism should look like. But in their support for immigration reform lay unintended consequences. The increasing pluralism that immigration fostered took a toll on Protestants’ own position in American culture. Charles L. Cohen and Ronald L. Numbers note, “The twentieth century’s dramatic rise in the proportion of Americans adhering to non-Christian faiths (or none at all) played out amid this ongoing tension between the value placed on freedom of worship, which encouraged religious diversity, and ideologically driven concerns about

⁶North American Home Missions Congress, *Reports of Commissions, Addresses and Findings*, Washington, D.C., December 1-5, 1930 (1930), 78.

maintaining the nation's historic Protestant identity.”⁷ This study argues that Protestant denominations ultimately had to juggle both increasing support for pluralism implied in their moderate positions on immigration and their efforts to preserve the nation's Protestant identity, thus resulting in a pluralistic bargain. Protestants largely approached this dilemma by stressing cultural pluralism, rather than religious pluralism. But in so doing, they helped foster both forms of pluralism in America.

In William R. Hutchison's seminal work, *Religious Pluralism in America*, he argues that American history reflects three different stages of pluralism. After the nation's founding and into the early republic, many Americans advocated “pluralism as toleration.” But by the end of the nineteenth century, Americans began to consider “pluralism as inclusion.” Finally, during the latter half of the twentieth century, Hutchison claims, most Americans valued “pluralism as participation,” though, according to Hutchison, this ideal has yet to be fully realized. It is Hutchison's stage of “pluralism as inclusion” that this study helps illuminate. Protestant positions on immigration and their home mission programs to immigrants and ethnic Americans reflected attempts to “include” immigrants in American life, but, as Hutchison points out, inclusive pluralism had many shortcomings, especially in its demands for assimilation and subsequent “forms of subordination.”⁸

Pluralism can be an amorphous term, a catchall for diversity in America. The term is often used to describe the variety of religions practiced within the United States.

⁷Cohen and Numbers, 1. See also Matthew S. Hedstrom, *The Rise of Liberal Religion: Book Culture and American Spirituality in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); Lippy, “From Consensus to Struggle”; Marsden, *The Twilight of the American Enlightenment*, 97-126; and Schultz, *Tri-Faith America*.

⁸William R. Hutchison, *Religious Pluralism in America: The Contentious History of a Founding Ideal* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 6, 8-9.

But pluralism can also be applied in a more general sense as a label for cultural diversity. The American philosopher Horace M. Kallen, a Jew who emigrated from Germany during the late nineteenth century, wrote on pluralism in the latter sense. Beginning with his 1915 piece titled “Democracy Versus the Melting-Pot” published in *The Nation*, Kallen advocated the congruency of immigrant diversity and American democracy. Published the same year that Congress established the restrictive quota system, Kallen then argued in *Culture and Democracy in the United States*, “Cultural Pluralism is possible only in a democratic society whose institutions encourage individuality in groups, in persons, in temperaments, whose program liberates these individualities and guides them into a fellowship of freedom and cooperation. The alternative before Americans is Kultur Klux Klan or Cultural Pluralism.”⁹ The following chapters reference pluralism in both its cultural and religious connotations.

This multifaceted approach to pluralism helps in part to explain why Protestants supported a more diverse America. They certainly understood the cultural pluralism they were fostering in America, and justified this agenda on the basis of human equality and Christian love. Protestant leaders, however, did not have the foresight to realize that in supporting a form of cultural pluralism, they were also inviting a religious pluralism that would undermine their own social standing.

⁹Horace M. Kallen, “Democracy Versus the Melting-Pot,” *The Nation*, February 18, 1915, 190-94, February 25, 1915, 217-20; Horace M. Kallen, *Culture and Democracy in the United States* (1924; repr., New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1998), 35. Kallen continued to work on this topic later in the century. See Horace M. Kallen, *Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea: An Essay in Social Philosophy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1956). For treatment of the continued influence of Kallen and the idea of cultural pluralism, see Robert L. Fleegler, *Ellis Island Nation: Immigration Policy and American Identity in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013); Philip Gleason, “American Identity and Americanization,” in *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, ed. Stephan Thernstrom (Cambridge: Belknap Press, Harvard University Press, 1980), 43-50; Carl J. Bon Tempo, *Americans at the Gate: The United States and Refugees During the Cold War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 23.

When historians assess Protestant home mission efforts to minister to immigrants, they usually focus on efforts to assimilate immigrants during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and Protestant support for restriction leading up to 1924.¹⁰ According to the standard timeline, concerned Christians hoped to integrate the foreigner into American society through evangelization and assimilation, only to find that by the 1920s this was not working. As this line of interpretation goes, Protestants then turned to immigration restriction, thus reflecting the nativist inclinations of American society at large that were eventually codified in the legislation Congress passed in 1921 and 1924. This declension narrative abruptly ends the story in 1924, failing to account for subsequent attempts by Protestants to assimilate immigrants.

During the early twentieth century, leading white Protestant denominations included the Methodist Episcopal Church, Southern Baptist Convention, Northern Baptist Convention, Presbyterian Church, USA, and Protestant Episcopal Church.¹¹ Despite a broad spectrum of doctrinal differences, all of these denominations shared similar forms of immigrant ministry. Under the umbrella of “Home Missions,” most Protestant denominations continued to work among immigrants after 1924. Denominations often ministered to immigrants through settlement houses or community centers that served urban populations. Denominations organized departments that they labeled as ministries to “foreigners,” “immigrants,” specific foreign-language groups, or different nationalities.

¹⁰See for example, Lawrence Davis, *Immigration, Baptists, and the Protestant Mind in America* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973); Derek Chang, *Citizens of a Christian Nation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010); William J. Phalen, *American Evangelical Protestantism and European Immigrants, 1800-1924* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2011).

¹¹According to the 1936 Census of Religious Bodies, the final compilation of religious statistics the federal government published, these denominations accounted for the highest number of members among white Protestant groups. United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1936, Vol. I, Summary and Detailed Tables* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941), 19.

In addition to denominational programs, there were several interdenominational groups that organized work among immigrant groups in America. Most notably, the Federal Council of Churches (FCC), renamed the National Council of Churches (NCC) in 1950, organized mainline Protestant work in America, establishing the Home Missions Society and Council of Women for Home Missions. Finally, World Church Service, also sponsored by the NCC, helped coordinate refugee resettlement following World War II and during the Cold War. Together the home mission work and political activism of these Protestant groups helped clarify their position on immigration and pluralism in America.

Organization

This survey of Protestant responses to immigration is divided into seven chapters that investigate the overall progression of home missions and mainline political positions on immigration policy during this period. Though the chapters follow each other chronologically, the first two chapters of this dissertation stress the ideological and theological basis of ministries to immigrants inherited from the earlier social gospel, while the later chapters place more emphasis on the political responses of native Protestants and the contemporary developments that shaped their views on immigration. Each chapter also considers the inherent tension between consensus and pluralism within Protestant positions. Adhering to chronological order helps the study relate home mission programs to domestic and international developments between the years 1924 and 1965 (e.g. Immigration Act of 1924, Great Depression, World War II, Cold War, etc.) and identify certain elements of continuity, such as the assimilationist goals and desire for a Christian nation that Protestants maintained. Each chapter, however, also

lends itself to specific themes tied to the context of the time period addressed. For instance, while covering home missions during the 1930s, chapter three naturally addresses the financial challenges Protestants faced during the Great Depression, while chapter four on the 1940s highlights the roles of nationalism and internationalism. In sum, identifying Protestant views helps elucidate how a large segment of the U.S. population considered immigration and ethnic Americans during the twentieth century, while also accounting for Protestant efforts to reconcile pluralism with the ideal of a Christian nation.

The first chapter, “Historiographical Justification,” addresses the historiography on this topic. This chapter provides an assessment of U.S. immigration history during the last century, with a particular emphasis on religion and culture. This literature review also describes the dearth of historical work on nativism since John Higham’s *Strangers in the Land* published in 1955.¹² Finally, this chapter assesses the historiography of twentieth-century American Protestantism, especially in relation to pluralism and mainline denominations.

Titled “Settling into Restriction,” the second chapter examines Protestant reactions to the Immigration Act of 1924 and home missions during the final years of the 1920s. This chapter provides background information on the 1924 law and interprets Protestant perceptions of it, while also tracing the effect this law had on Protestant ministry to immigrants in the years following 1924. Chapter two also identifies the social gospel’s influence on native Protestant ministries among immigrant and ethnic communities, in addition to providing a survey of Americanization programs during the

¹²John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism 1860-1925*, Corrected Edition (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981).

1920s. Through an investigation of home missions, it is evident that earlier social gospel sentiments were being diffused among regular churchgoers, resulting in a synthesis of evangelism and social concern among Protestants.

The third chapter, “The Trying Thirties,” addresses the relationship between white Protestants and immigration during the 1930s in the midst of the Great Depression. The economic crisis and rising fascism in Europe provide a global backdrop for assessing domestic concerns over the foreigner. Both of these developments influenced the way Americans considered immigrants and their supposed political and economic liabilities. Native Protestants responded by striving to make the United States a Christian nation, a theme that permeated their home mission work. Another critical topic in this chapter is the growing reluctance of Protestants to advocate Americanization and their greater acceptance of cultural pluralism, though efforts to assimilate foreigners continued in various forms. Finally, this chapter highlights the continued work of mainline Protestant leaders to challenge Asian exclusion in the legislative arena.

The fourth chapter covers the 1940s and World War II. This chapter, labeled “The Huddled Masses the War Produced,” concentrates on the domestic and international implications of the war for Protestant missions to foreigners. During the war, Protestants encouraged immigrants to embrace the “American Way of Life,” while mainline Christians also became more open to accepting immigrant cultures. The war created numerous challenges and opportunities for home missions, including Japanese internment and the overseas refugee crisis. The Second World War also encouraged various social sensibilities among white Protestants when it came to race, diversity, gender roles, and

family values. Finally, it was during and immediately after the war that mainline leaders in the FCC began an aggressive push to overturn Asian exclusion, with mixed results.

“Strangers in Mayberry,” the title of the fifth chapter, provides a closer look at how white, Protestant Americans interpreted increasing pluralism during and after World War II. Global upheaval led many Protestant denominations to sponsor refugees fleeing political instability in other parts of the world. Assisting refugees provided an opportunity for American Christians to deliver humanitarian relief, promote their denominations, and counter communist revolution overseas. Following the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, many denominations sponsored resettlement programs that provided living space and employment for thousands of refugees. These refugee sponsorship programs resulted in displaced people relocating among American populations not familiar with foreign ways.

The sixth chapter, “Coming to Terms with Pluralism,” focuses on the Cold War era and concludes with the Immigration Act of 1965. As America set itself apart from foreign powers whose ideology was considered “godless” (i.e., Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union), home missions and evangelization of immigrants remained imperative. Anti-Catholicism still fueled the concerns of some Protestants about the influence of foreigners, but Cold War ideology channeled fears more toward the threat of global communism and stressed the importance of keeping the country Christian. During this time, mainline groups affiliated with the NCC increased their protest against the federal government’s racially-biased immigration policy, as seen in their continued criticism of the discriminatory quotas established in 1924 and their response to the 1952 McCarran-Walter Act. The Red Scare during the early 1950s also affected progressive leaders

engaged in the immigration debate, and this chapter examines the accusations some conservative groups made against mainline Protestant groups that their protest against immigration policy aided communism in America. In addition, it was during this time that sociologist Will Herberg argued that the nation was becoming a “triple melting-pot” for Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, and this chapter adds nuance to this interpretation and the equilibrium it implies; this was a period when some Protestants continued their drive for a Protestant Christian nation, despite growing pluralism. Protestant positions on racial equality in society, in the wake of the developing civil rights movement, are also taken into account when considering their concurrent treatment of immigrants. Finally, this chapter concludes by exploring how Protestants aligned themselves in 1965 when Congress overturned the immigration quota system based on national origins.

The seventh chapter, “The Pluralistic Bargain,” concludes the study by reexamining how Protestants perceived foreigners while also considering what this history says about Protestantism’s place in America by the mid-twentieth century. This history helps delineate the progress and evolution of home missions and how Protestants interpreted immigration and pluralism during this period. As the twentieth century progressed, white, native Protestants slowly came to witness their hold on American culture slip in the face of ethnic and religious diversity. Unlike other periods of American history, however, Protestants did not resort to staunch nativism, but worked instead to assist foreigners and incorporate immigrants into a nation that they believed was Christian. Along the way, Protestants chose to foster cultural pluralism, while largely ignoring the prospects of religious pluralism. This project helps unpack this quandary and explain how Protestants arrived at a pluralistic bargain where their

acceptance of cultural pluralism and immigration reform contributed to rising immigration and religious pluralism, which would ultimately challenge white Protestantism's position in American society.

Concerning Sources and Definitions

The selection of sources for this study is tailored to stress breadth. Primary sources include material produced by denominational leaders and documents that provide a local, on-the-ground perspective. Such sources encompass official denominational statements and minutes, periodicals, pamphlets, surveys, educational material used in churches, and missionary correspondence. In addition, using local newspaper coverage of immigrant work helps tap into the broader culture.

This project employs the term “immigrant” when referring to people who traveled from their original homeland to the United States, or as an adjective relating to a group’s heritage or composition (e.g. immigrant community). Currently there is no established vocabulary for identifying the descendants of immigrants. Historians often refer to them as second- or third-generation immigrants or simply defer to their ethnic designation. This study employs the term “ethnic Americans” when referring to the progeny of first-generation immigrants that retained, or at least were interpreted as maintaining, some form of ethnic identity.¹³ Contemporary native Protestants often simply resorted to using the term “foreigner” to identify anyone of foreign descent, whether they be a first-, second-, or third-generation immigrant; this dissertation, when using the term

¹³See also Alan M. Kraut, “A Century of Scholarship in American Immigration and Ethnic History,” in *A Century of American Historiography*, ed. James M. Banner, Jr. (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2010), 132-33. Historian Thomas Archdeacon uses the terms “foreign stock” and “ethnic groups” in *Becoming American: An Ethnic History* (New York: Free Press, 1983). For example, see 185.

“foreigner,” points to native Protestant sentiment at the time.¹⁴ In most cases, this study simply relies on specific ethnic, national, or language characteristics to identify immigrants. Finally, only immigrants and their posterity who were a part of the “new” immigration from southern and eastern Europe (post-1880) or those who came from Asia or Latin America are included in this project since they represented, for contemporary white Americans, the greatest perceived threat to the nation during the twentieth century.

Using words such as “liberal” and “progressive” also begs definition, especially since historically they have never been terms set in stone. For this project, I abide by Amy Kittlestrom’s definitions of American liberalism in her recent book, *The Religion of Democracy*. Kittlestrom traces the liberal current among American political leaders, intellectuals, and social reformers across the span of U.S. history and argues that the American liberal tradition was in cooperation with, rather than in opposition to, religion. In her book, she provides accessible definitions of classical and modern liberalism. Kittlestrom writes that classical liberalism is the “political commitment of a society to replace coercion with consent” and that modern liberalism is the “moral commitment of a society to the collective needs of all its members, regardless of their differences.” In reference to the liberals included in her book, she notes their penchant for “[believing] in the possibility and desirability of progress—moral progress, human progress, and social progress dependent on each individual’s growth in conversation with other individuals, rather than in opposition to them, in a society that rises together if it is to rise at all.”¹⁵

¹⁴Historian Matthew Jacobson occasionally uses “foreigner” when referring to foreign people groups and immigrants. For example, see *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001), 96. And John Higham in *Strangers in the Land* episodically used the terms “foreign-born” and “foreigners.”

¹⁵Amy Kittlestrom, *The Religion of Democracy: Seven Liberals and the American Moral Tradition* (New York: Penguin Press, 2015).

Many of the subjects of this study articulate a similar form of liberalism that is a combination of Kittelstrom's two definitions and that abides by the notion of progress. Finally, my use of "progressive" references the specific movement and its enduring ideals promoted by determined social crusaders during the early twentieth century who addressed, through scientific, rational means, what they perceived as the social, economic, and moral injustices of their day. Though the progressive movement collapsed with the onset of World War I, many of the aspirations and ideas of progressivism survived into the twentieth century in the work of various social and political reformers.

Intersecting Themes

The native Protestant reception of immigrants underlines additional facets of American history. While this dissertation's primary focus is Protestant interpretations of pluralism, within the scope of this thesis, multiple themes intersect, including denominational institutions and missions, gender, race, politics, and nativism. All of these topics are valid historical subjects in their own right, but considered together, they help further illuminate Protestant attempts to grapple with immigration and pluralism during the twentieth century.

While the historian may trace Protestant threads throughout American culture and society, focusing on denominational publications and manuscripts offers a distinctly Protestant source base. This project helps further historicize institutional Protestant religion in the United States.¹⁶ Missions programs vacillated between adjusting to the times and aiming to maintain the "historic faith." This sentiment is evident in a 1952

¹⁶Jon Butler recently noted in his presidential address at the 2016 meeting of the Organization of American Historians the importance of institutional religious history and its vitality during the expansion of modernism in early twentieth-century America. "God, Gotham, and Modernity," *Journal of American History* 103, no. 1 (June 2016): 19-33.

Presbyterian article describing the denomination's home mission work: "The automobile has replaced the horse for these traveling ministers; the motion picture and the wire-recorder give new wings to the old words. The message remains the same."¹⁷ Often, however, the history of American Christianity is that of culture and religion shaping each other. Denominations continued to stress the importance of evangelization; nevertheless, spiritual priorities are hardly ever divorced from temporal concerns. Americanization programs and citizenship classes speak to Protestant attempts to do more than simply meet the spiritual needs of immigrants. This study also situates Protestant responses to immigration within the historical context of midcentury global affairs. Protestants believed home missions were intertwined with foreign missions, and work among immigrants represented a synthesis of these two forms of Christian ministry. As a result, what happened overseas informed Protestant responses to foreigners within the United States.

Examining twentieth-century Protestant denominations, however, presents several challenges for the historian. First, when addressing the Protestant establishment during the twentieth century, one must define "mainline Protestantism." Historians often interpret mainline Protestantism as denominations who cooperated ecumenically through the Federal Council of Churches, later renamed the National Council of Churches. But mainline status included more than just institutional membership in an ecumenical body; historically, it also reflected cultural influence and expansive membership.¹⁸

¹⁷"Because We Are... 'A City Set on a Hill,'" *Presbyterian Life*, October 18, 1952, 13.

¹⁸For historical work on mainline Protestantism, see Jason S. Lantzer, *Mainline Christianity: The Past and Future of America's Majority Faith* (New York: New York University Press, 2012); Elisha J. Coffman, *The Christian Century and the Rise of the Protestant Mainline* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013); and David A. Hollinger, *After Cloven Tongues of Fire: Protestant Liberalism in Modern American History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013).

This study adds nuance to the concept of mainline Protestantism by highlighting the continuity of practice and sentiment among leading denominations at midcentury, including those not necessarily a part of the mainline consensus. Here I include the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) to provide a more complete sweep of twentieth-century Protestantism. While Southern Baptist churches did not participate in ecumenical endeavors and were not “mainline,” their sheer numbers make the SBC one of the leading white, Protestant groups in America during the twentieth century, and the largest Protestant denomination shortly after the time this study concludes.¹⁹ Add to this the fact that one president during this period, Harry Truman, identified as Southern Baptist, and it becomes imperative that a “Protestant” history addressing twentieth-century developments must include the SBC along with leading mainline denominations.

Historians of twentieth-century American Protestantism also find it a challenge to distinguish between the views of the clergy and laity. Often times, historical assessments of the liberal nature of mainline denominations are indicative of leadership, while the masses of church members were usually more conservative and evangelical.²⁰ Simply to assume that mainline denominations went the way of modernity and liberalism does not acknowledge Protestant polity and the decentralized, congregational nature of churches. But, one must also avoid going to the other extreme. Historians cannot afford to overlook the role of ideas in religious groups and the diffusion of principles that occur over time among religious leaders, theologians, and church members. In order to help provide a fuller picture of Protestant work among immigrants, I incorporate home

¹⁹Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), 186.

²⁰Coffman stresses the liberal characterization of denominational leadership, as opposed to laity, in *The Christian Century and the Rise of the Protestant Mainline*.

mission sources that shed light on a broader swath of church life and provide insight into the work of people who were not simply “denominational elites.” This study finds that mainline Protestantism during the twentieth century experienced a diffusion of both social gospel and evangelical convictions.

Though the evangelical impulse continued in most Protestant denominations into the twentieth century, there nevertheless was a diffusion of social gospel sentiment that was a part of a generally liberal, progressive impetus within mainline Protestant denominations. The presence of social gospel sentiment by the midcentury speaks to the staying power of certain theological principles. In short, the social gospel was a distinct emphasis placed on Christian social ministry that began absorbing certain tenets of modernist theology during the late nineteenth century in an effort to Christianize a nation succumbing to rampant industrialization and urbanization.²¹ The social gospel movement reached its apogee of institutional advancement in the formation of the Federal Council of Churches in 1908 and that organization’s Social Creed of the Churches declared the same year.²² The social gospel was closely tied to the progressive movement in America and represented distinct liberal trends of the age. Among proponents of this form of social Christianity, a shared terminology developed, most often linked to the concepts of the brotherhood of man, fatherhood of God, and postmillennial stress on the kingdom of God. Many of these concepts were infused into Protestant considerations of immigration,

²¹These ideas were not only the product of distinguished seminary professors and ministers, such as Walter Rauschenbusch and Washington Gladden, but, as Heath Carter has recently argued, were also promoted by the working class. See Heath W. Carter, *Union Made: Working People and the Rise of Social Christianity in Chicago* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015). In his study of book culture among Protestants during the early twentieth century, Matthew Hedstrom in *The Rise of Liberal Religion* delineates “liberal religious sensibilities” based upon psychology, mysticism, universal application, and individual experience.

²²Susan Curtis, *A Consuming Faith: The Social Gospel and Modern American Culture* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), xiv, 1-2.

and the increasingly progressive stance toward immigration reflects in part earlier social gospel tenets that were making inroads among a broader stretch of Protestants by the mid-twentieth century.

Historian Susan Curtis suggests the social gospel was both a reaction to and product of American culture, and that it permeated many avenues of Protestant life, including interpretations of work and family. Curtis notes, “By the 1920s, social gospel ideology reflected a redefined work ethic, the ideals of companionate families, a commitment to progressive politics, and an emphasis on manly efficiency. Moreover, it was presented increasingly in commercial idiom and images.”²³ The traits Curtis identifies are present throughout this project, but most notably, her latter comment on the commercial nature of the social gospel evident by the 1920s speaks to the dissemination of progressive ideas throughout Protestant churches, so much so that even the occupant of the White House in 1952, Harry Truman, used social gospel rhetoric in a presidential address.²⁴

A final contribution this study makes to denominational history is the immigrant profiles that are woven into the story. These vignettes help stress the complexity of this history. In many cases, immigrants actually rose in the denominational ranks and helped with home mission efforts, leaving behind accounts that shed a positive light on their experience. J. F. Plainfield, originally from Italy, and Joseph Gartenhaus, an Austrian immigrant, became important leaders in Southern Baptist home missions. Tabea Korjus,

²³Curtis, xiii.

²⁴Harry S. Truman, “Address in Columbus at a Conference of the Federal Council of Churches,” March 6, 1946, *American Presidency Project*, ed. Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=12599> (accessed April 17, 2017); Harry S. Truman, “Text of Truman’s Message to House on Veto of Immigration Bill,” *New York Times*, June 26, 1952.

originally from Estonia, worked as a Christian Friendliness missionary for the Woman's American Baptist Home Mission Society in New York. Other immigrants outside of the denominations, however, found Protestant attempts to convert and Americanize them offensive. I also work to weave their perspectives into this study, and while their accounts are more difficult to trace, often the reports home missionaries provided of local resistance offer some perspective in this area.

In addition to institutional Protestantism and its theological expressions, this dissertation also addresses gender dynamics. When assessing Protestant home missions and immigration, gender becomes doubly important. Both immigrant women and native, white Protestant women are key components of this study. As Donna Gabaccia, Martha Gardner, and other historians have shown, U.S. government policy regulating immigration and naturalization had gendered implications, and immigrants themselves maintained definitions of gender as they settled into their new surroundings.²⁵ Home mission programs also communicated white, Protestant notions of marriage and family to incoming immigrants, and one platform of Protestant protest against restriction was the difficulties it created for immigrant families to reunite. Moreover, during the early twentieth century, women led much of the Protestant work among immigrants. This study, however, raises questions concerning women's autonomy in denominational structures.²⁶

²⁵Donna Gabaccia, *From the Other Side: Women, Gender, and Immigrant Life in the U.S., 1820-1990* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994); Martha Gardner, *The Qualities of a Citizen: Women, Immigration, and Citizenship, 1870-1965* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005). See also Jeanne D. Petit, *The Men and Women We Want: Gender, Race, and the Progressive Era Literacy Test Debate* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2010).

²⁶The work of historian Melody Maxwell on Southern Baptist settlement house work among Italians in Birmingham, Alabama, is a good example of a gradual shift toward male control of home mission work. Melody Maxwell, "'We Are Happy to Co-Operate': The Institutionalization and Control of

This dissertation also contributes to a better understanding of racial thought during the era of immigration restriction. A definition of race premised on scientific attempts to categorize a supposed natural, biological hierarchy of humanity was already in vogue by the 1920s. Madison Grant's *The Passing of the Great Race* in 1916 drew the public's attention to what he believed were the deleterious effects immigration had on the racial makeup of America. Grant warned that the "altruistic ideals" and "maudlin sentimentalism that has made America 'an asylum for the oppressed,' are sweeping the nation toward a racial abyss. If the Melting Pot is allowed to boil without control, . . . the type of native American of Colonial descent will become extinct."²⁷ As Matthew Frye Jacobson has persuasively argued, racial categories changed during the twentieth century in light of continuing immigration and the burgeoning civil rights movement. American society expanded the racial category "Caucasian" so that it included European immigrant groups as racial discord between white and black protestors increased by midcentury.²⁸ Racial marginalization within society often meant that groups such as African Americans, Native Americans, migrants, and Eskimos were included alongside immigrants in home mission programs. Overall, race was an amorphous concept during the twentieth century, never following consistent categories and oftentimes used loosely and synonymously

Birmingham's Baptist Good Will Center, 1909-1928," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 38, no. 3 (Fall 2011): 249-65. Other studies of Protestant women's home mission work include Barbara Reeves-Ellington, Kathryn Kish Sklar, and Connie A. Shemo, eds. *Competing Kingdoms: Women, Mission, Nation, and the American Protestant Empire, 1812-1960* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010); Susan M. Yohn, *A Contest of Faiths: Missionary Women and Pluralism in the American Southwest* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995).

²⁷Madison Grant, *The Passing of the Great Race, or the Racial Basis of European History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916), 228.

²⁸Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998).

with nationalities and ethnicities, but the following chapters help clarify the progression of racial categorizations within Protestant work.

Changing perceptions of race were also tied to current events. The rebirth of the Ku Klux Klan in 1915, the racial policies of Nazi Germany and the Holocaust, the formation of the United Nations and its defense of human rights, and the entrenched segregation in the U.S. South fueled Protestant work among immigrants and helped shape their stand for racial equality. As the civil rights movement began to proliferate in the 1950s, it provided a great impetus for Protestants to combat the racial aspects of immigration policy. Much of mainline Protestant effort to liberalize immigration policy paralleled the drive for desegregation and voting rights for African Americans.

The following chapters also shed light on the various ways the American public interpreted the politics surrounding immigration law during the twentieth century. According to historian Roger Daniels, the Constitution “provided no particulars, so that naturalization has been a kind of political litmus test of the national climate of opinion about immigrants and immigration.”²⁹ Native Protestant opinion is a central component of this “litmus test.” For many twentieth-century Protestant groups, the racial implications of restrictive legislation invited a response in the political sphere. As the social gospel encouraged political confrontation in the legislative arena, Protestant denominations actively responded to evolving immigration policy. Such activism can be traced back to the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, but became more concerted by the time Congress passed the 1924 quotas. Japanese exclusion also implemented in 1924 kept the quota system a point of contention for many Protestant leaders for the next several

²⁹Roger Daniels, *Coming to America: A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper Perennial, 2002), 113.

decades. By 1952, when the McCarran-Walter Act passed, Protestants had become even more vocal against immigration policy they perceived as racist. Protestant leadership frequently appealed to congressmen for immigration reform, and in 1961 the National Council of Churches hosted a convention where Protestant ministers and several politicians spoke on the shortcoming of U.S. immigration policy. But the political history of Protestants and immigration is not simply a story of increasingly progressive rhetoric. Protestants were products of their time, responding to current events and maintaining concerns for the future of the nation. Protestant appeals for immigration reform considered the impact immigration would have on America and how capable the nation was to absorb more immigrants.

Many of the Protestant leaders in this study subscribed to the political liberalism of their day. In his history of liberalism as a political ideology, Edmund Fawcett identifies specific periods of history in which liberalism developed and was practiced differently. He states that between 1880 and 1945, it morphed into a form of liberal democracy, and then between 1945 and 1989, its practitioners defended it successfully in the face of fascism and communism. He writes, ““Liberalism as I take it here was a search for an ethically acceptable order of human progress among civic equals without recourse to undue power.”³⁰ In many respects, mainline Protestant denominations during this time touted a similar form of liberal democracy in response to reactionary anti-immigrant voices and the threats that fascist and communist ideology posed.

Finally, the theme of nativism intersects with this project. The relationship between nativism and religion is a topic often taken for granted. As historian Ray Allen

³⁰Edmund Fawcett, *Liberalism: The Life of an Idea* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), xix-xxi.

Billington asserted in his 1938 book *The Protestant Crusade*, nativism and anti-Catholicism were intimately linked during the nineteenth century.³¹ Often textbooks include early twentieth-century nativism in the same chapter as Protestant fundamentalism, both considered reactionary responses to the Roaring Twenties.³² But religion and nativism during the twentieth century shared a very indefinite relationship. As scholars have noted, nativism was never a static force in American history. It ebbed and flowed according to contemporary developments.³³ While many Americans who espoused nativist ideals were Protestants, their religious commitments did not necessarily fuel their passion for restriction. If anything, it provided a modicum of moderation. Throughout American history, treatment of immigrants has often been at least paternalistic, if not nativist, but this was often tied to economic and cultural concerns, rather than a product of one's religious faith.

Nevertheless, the linkage between religion and nativism has had staying power. Ingrained in the public consciousness of most Americans is the term "WASP." While the specific term was a midcentury product, couplings of Anglo-Saxon and Protestant were an earlier innovation. Not surprisingly, during the contentious election of 1928 when the Catholic Al Smith ran for the presidency with the support of urban, ethnic groups, the Ohio Anti-Saloon League declared, "If you believe in Anglo-Saxon Protestant

³¹Ray Allen Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism* (New York: Macmillan, 1938). See also Katie Oxx, *The Nativist Movement in America: Religious Conflict in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Routledge, 2013).

³²See for example: "The reactionary mood of the 1920s fed on a growing tendency to connect American nationalism with nativism, Anglo-Saxon racism, and militant Protestantism." George Brown Tindall and David Emory Shi, *America: A Narrative History*, Vol. 2, 8th ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 2010), 1023.

³³See Oxx, 2; Daniels, 265-84; Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 3-5; and Archdeacon, xvii.

domination . . . you will vote for Hoover rather than Smith.”³⁴ “WASP” gained traction in 1957 when political scientist Andrew Hacker dubbed the American “ruling class” as “WASPs.” For Hacker, “they are white, they are Anglo-Saxon in origin, and they are Protestant (and disproportionately Episcopalian).” Hacker continued, “To their Waspishness should be added the tendency to be located on the Eastern seaboard or around San Francisco, to be prep school and Ivy League educated, and to be possessed of inherited wealth.” Sociologist Irving Lewis Allen concludes that the term came into vogue following Hacker’s article when the civil rights movement and later the white ethnic revival highlighted race and ethnicity in American society and as elite scholars frowned upon suburban culture. Allen notes the derogatory nature of the term, and concludes, “Insofar as *WASP* refers to all white Protestants, and this is clearly one of its uses, it designates little or no social reality. The ideological urge is to identify white Protestants as a kind of unethnic ethnic group, a relative monolith of religion, ideology, custom, behavior, association, and common interest.”³⁵ Allen argues that using the term in this way is not helpful, and this study agrees.

Despite the popular notion that white, Anglo-Saxon Americans fearful of immigration were naturally Protestant, many Protestant denominations did not promote a staunchly nativist program; instead, they often demonstrated concern for the welfare of

³⁴“Dry Paper Opposes Smith as Catholic,” *New York Times*, September 24, 1928. The ASP designation actually made a comeback during the 1960s, but was eventually discarded in favor of WASP. Irving Lewis Allen, *Unkind Words: Ethnic Labeling from Redskin to WASP* (New York: Bergin & Garvey, 1990), 110.

³⁵Andrew Hacker, “Liberal Democracy and Social Control,” *American Political Science Review* 51, no. 4 (December 1957): 1011; Allen, *Unkind Words*, 103-17. See also Fred R. Shapiro, “Earlier Evidence for the Acronym WASP,” *American Speech* 64, no. 2 (Summer 1989): 189; John Higham, *Send These to Me: Immigrants in Urban America*, Revised Edition (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), 13; and E. Digby Baltzell, *The Protestant Establishment: Aristocracy and Caste in America* (New York: Random House, 1964).

both the nation and immigrants. Rather than a bonafide nativist position, distinctly Protestant groups became increasingly moderate on immigration and more critical of racist positions in society. As an influential part of American society, Protestants even contributed to a decline in nativism through their eventual cooperation with Jews and Catholics, groups that had earlier triggered strident anti-immigrant protest. Nevertheless, subtle forms of paternalism and assimilationist agendas continued, and the following chapters help tease out the fate of nativism among Protestant groups in America.

Conclusion

There is a glaring omission of historical research on native responses to immigrant groups between 1924 and 1965. This study strives to help fill this gap. It also hopes to complicate the history of white Protestant treatment of immigrants and ethnic Americans by arguing that midcentury Protestant groups did more to encourage pluralism than limit it. While a form of tempered nativism remained from the froth of earlier anti-immigration sentiment, concerned Protestants often worked among, rather than against, both established immigrant communities and those immigrants recently arrived. Yet while they were not vehemently nativist, some Protestant groups still qualified their liberal positions with concerns over the economic and cultural import of ethnic Americans and immigration. This topic is thus more complicated than simply characterizing Protestants during this time as WASPs. As the century progressed, Protestants were forced to respond to the increasing pluralism that challenged the Protestant coloring of America. In 1924 the U.S. Congress attempted to plug the breach that previously allowed a significant number of immigrants to enter the nation, but this

restriction did not diminish Protestant attention to immigration, pluralism, and national identity over the next forty years.

CHAPTER TWO

Historiographical Justification

“Another area neglected in [John] Higham’s work is the role of organized religion. Just how important were the churches in nativism? Lawrence Davis’s book suggests that at least the northern Baptists were tolerant, but we have no systematic body of historical literature on the mainstream American Protestant denominations and their relations with immigrants.”

—Leonard Dinnerstein and David Reimers,
“Strangers in the Land: Then and Now”¹

Since the field’s inception during the early twentieth century, historians of American immigration have labored to tease out the relationship between American culture and the immigrant experience. Historians perennially dispute several theories in this subject area, often over whether America is a “melting pot” in which immigrants shed their former culture and assimilate into American society or whether it is a nation composed of various, distinct ethnic identities. This particular dispute has perplexed historians and animated the field of immigration history for most of the twentieth century. Earlier immigration history honed in on assimilation, before historians during the 1960s began stressing the persistence of ethnicity. Since that debate over assimilation and ethnicity, the historiography has expanded in breadth and depth by the start of the twenty-first century. More recently immigration historians have stressed transnational and political themes and begun to write the histories of non-European immigrants. Both Mae M. Ngai and Alan M. Kraut provide helpful overviews of immigration historiography that trace these trends, and Russell A. Kazal’s article on the historiography of assimilation

¹Leonard Dinnerstein and David Reimers, “Strangers in the Land: Then and Now,” *American Jewish History* 76, no. 2 (December 1986): 115.

offers another succinct overview of the field.² Jay P. Dolan's work on the place of immigration in religious history is another indispensable source for approaching the historiography of American immigration.³

While analyzing assimilation and ethnic continuity is an important part of immigration history, this debate has often overshadowed historical inquiry in other areas. The subjects of nativism and religion are two striking examples. "Old-stock" American reactions to immigration were frequently suspicious, if not hostile, and nativism serves as a central component of any history of America's reception of immigrants. Historians, however, have for the most part passed over the native standpoint. The role of religion in immigration history also highlights the close interaction between culture and migrations of people; the faith of both immigrants and native Americans is an important part of the story. In an effort to contextualize the relationship between American culture and immigration, this chapter will trace the overall development of American immigration history and then identify how historians have dealt with American culture, nativism, and religion, particularly in twentieth-century history. With this historiographical justification in place, this dissertation will then be in a better position to contribute a

²Mae M. Ngai, "Immigration and Ethnic History," in *American History Now*, ed. Eric Foner and Lisa McGirr (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011), 358-75; Alan M. Kraut, "A Century of Scholarship in American Immigration and Ethnic History," in *A Century of American Historiography*, ed. James M. Banner, Jr. (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2010), 124-40; Russell A. Kazal, "Revisiting Assimilation: The Rise, Fall, and Reappraisal of a Concept in American Ethnic History," *American Historical Review* 100, no. 2 (April 1995): 437-71. See also Philip Gleason, "Crèvecoeur's Question: Historical Writing on Immigration, Ethnicity, and National Identity," in *Imagined Histories: American Historians Interpret the Past*, ed. Anthony Molho and Gordon W. Wood (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 120-43. For a more topical approach to the historiography of American immigration, see James P. Shenton and Kevin Kenny, "Ethnicity and Immigration," in *The New American History*, Revised and Expanded Edition, ed. Eric Foner (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997), 353-73.

³Jay P. Dolan, "Immigration and American Christianity: A History of Their Histories," in *A Century of Church History: The Legacy of Philip Schaff*, ed. Henry W. Bowden (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1988), 119-47. Dolan's essay helped form much of my understanding of immigration historiography and, consequently, figures largely in this chapter.

history of the relationship between native Protestants and immigration between 1924 and 1965.

Development of Immigration History

During the early twentieth century, immigration studies largely fell within the scope of social scientists, most notably scholars working at the University of Chicago. Books accounting for the history of immigration appeared on occasion during the early twentieth century, but historians did not give concerted attention to immigration until the 1940s and 1950s. Several of these early historians who began studying immigration completed their education at Harvard University under Frederick Jackson Turner's tutelage. Inspired by Turner's "Frontier Thesis," these historians assumed the inexorable force of American culture led immigrants to assimilate. Several decades passed before scholars seriously challenged this interpretation.⁴

Marcus Lee Hansen was one of the earliest historians to study immigration as a distinct historical field, and it is no surprise that he was one of Turner's students at Harvard. Hansen in many respects set the stage for later immigration history, including his attention to generational differences among immigrants and the topics of assimilation and ethnicity.⁵ While most of his work was published posthumously, in a lecture he delivered in 1937, Hansen articulated what would later become his signature contribution to the field of American immigration history and sociology. In short, Hansen claimed that third-generation immigrants develop an interest in their ethnic roots, despite the

⁴Dolan, "Immigration and American Christianity," 126-28, 129; Kraut, 125. For an example of early twentieth-century historical treatment of immigration, see George M. Stephenson, *A History of American Immigration, 1820-1924* (New York: Ginn, 1926). Horace Kallen's work in the 1920s was an exception in its challenge to assimilation. See Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 141-49.

⁵Dolan, "Immigration and American Christianity," 126-27; Shenton and Kenny, 363.

second generation's efforts to shed the ethnicity of their parents. Fifty years later essays compiled in *American Immigrants and Their Generations* addressed the viability of the "Hansen Thesis." While most historians recognize that the immigrant experience was more nuanced than Hansen's conclusions originally suggested (with some historians flatly disagreeing with Hansen), other scholars concede that Hansen's work still holds some merit as a lens to interpret the process by which immigrants grapple with the American host culture.⁶

By midcentury, Oscar Handlin became the leading historian of immigration. Considering his influence in the field of immigration history, a later historian noted that Handlin "shifted the question historians were asking from 'What have immigrants done to America?' to 'What has America done to the immigrants?'"⁷ Handlin began publishing immigration history in 1941 with *Boston's Immigrants*, and in 1952, his book *The Uprooted* garnered a Pulitzer Prize.⁸ *The Uprooted* provided a sweeping account of immigrants who came to America during the nineteenth century and the isolation they experienced in society. *The Uprooted* adeptly considered the social, economic, and psychological conditions of immigrants. The shift from village communalism to rigorous individualism immigrants experienced was, for Handlin, the most important result of their settlement in America. Handlin boldly concluded that the displacement of

⁶Peter Kivisto and Dag Blanck, eds., *American Immigrants and Their Generations: Studies and Commentaries on the Hansen Thesis after Fifty Years* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990).

⁷Donald B. Cole, "Book Review: *Ethnic Americans: A History of Immigration and Assimilation* and *To Seek America: A History of Ethnic Life in the United States*," *American Historical Review* 83, no. 3 (June 1978): 818.

⁸Oscar Handlin, *Boston's Immigrants* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1941); *The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migrations that Made the American People* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1952).

immigrants who came to America during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries reflected “in some degree the experience of all modern men.”⁹

With Hansen and Handlin jumpstarting historical attention to American immigration during the 1940s and 50s, the assimilation theory largely defined these and subsequent studies of immigration history. Historians vigorously accepted the idea that the United States was a melting pot in which immigrants conformed to American cultural norms. Drawing heavily from the work of Hansen and Handlin, the sociologist Will Herberg contributed his own interpretation of assimilation through an examination of American religion. In his groundbreaking book *Protestant, Catholic, Jew* published in 1955, Herberg claimed that by midcentury to be American was to identify as either a Protestant, Catholic, or Jew. Herberg argued that these three faiths represented a “triple melting pot” (a term he credited to Ruby Jo Kennedy) whereby third-generation immigrants hoped to retain a semblance of their ethnic religious heritage while also accepting the “American Way of Life” and democratic principles these three faiths espoused. For Herberg, even as ethnic groups tried to maintain their religious roots, they were only assimilating further within the confines of American culture.¹⁰

Though Hansen, Handlin, Herberg, and many other midcentury scholars were generally in agreement that assimilation was a leitmotif for immigration studies, by the 1960s and 1970s, immigration historians began to emphasize ethnicity and pluralism instead of their predecessors’ consensus accounts of American immigration history. In many ways, this historiographical shift reflected contemporary social developments as

⁹Handlin, *The Uprooted*, 305.

¹⁰Will Herberg, *Protestant, Catholic, Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology* (1955; repr., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

the civil rights and counterculture movements defied a complacent culture, and political uncertainty and corruption challenged earlier postwar patriotism. Historians and sociologists began to attack the assumptions of the assimilation theory and argue instead that ethnic identity defied entreaties to assimilate.¹¹ Maldwyn Allen Jones's history of American immigration published in 1960 reflected this growing ambivalence over assimilation. Jones acknowledged that by the time he wrote the book, religion defined immigrant identity more so than ethnicity, clearly a nod to Herberg's work from a few years earlier. But Jones also asserted that when ethnic Americans clung to former traditions, "they are merely asserting their cultural distinctiveness, merely seeking to make clear their own identity in the larger American community. And even while doing so," Jones continued, "they rededicate themselves to the common national ideals that bind them together." Jones clearly embraced a form of cultural pluralism, though he was unwilling to dismiss assimilation entirely.¹²

Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan in *Beyond the Melting Pot* (1963) directed their focus towards ethnicity. In their preface, they argued that the "notion that the intense and unprecedented mixture of ethnic and religious groups in American life was soon to blend into a homogeneous end product has outlived its usefulness, and also its credibility." Focusing on ethnic groups in New York City, Glazer and Moynihan came to the simple conclusion that the "melting pot . . . did not happen." They suggested instead that later generations of ethnic communities maintained ethnic identities separate

¹¹Dolan, "Immigration and American Christianity," 133, 135-37; John Higham, *Send These to Me: Immigrants in Urban America*, Revised Edition (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), xi-xii; Thomas J. Archdeacon, *Becoming American: An Ethnic History* (New York: Free Press, 1983), 218; Ngai, 362.

¹²Maldwyn Allen Jones, *American Immigration*, Chicago History of American Civilization, ed. Daniel J. Boorstin (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), quote from 319. Concerning Jones's global scope and British background, see Daniel J. Boorstin's Editor's Preface, v-vii.

from their American surroundings. They conceded that assimilation did occur, but still claimed that ethnic groups were not a “new social form,” but rather identities premised on race and religion.¹³

Milton Gordon’s *Assimilation in American Life* appeared a year later and offered another interpretation of ethnicity and assimilation. Gordon’s analysis came during the middle of the civil rights movement and Johnson’s Great Society initiatives. In the spirit of reform, Gordon hoped that his study of American society and ethnicity would encourage proper courses of action to confront racism and discrimination. Overall, Gordon identified the persistence of ethnic communities, premised on race, religion, and nationality, in spite of society’s efforts to Americanize them. Gordon identified three historical interpretations of ethnic identity in America: Anglo-conformity, the Melting Pot, and cultural pluralism. He clearly favored the notion of cultural pluralism, though he acknowledged that to a certain extent assimilation occurred. Gordon, nevertheless, contended that “structural pluralism” persisted; immigrant groups still retained separate social structures that allowed them to maintain ethnic distinctives despite acculturation. Gordon concluded that cultural pluralism was a hallmark of ethnic identity in America, but that the demands of American society and economy gradually chipped away at the cultural characteristics of ethnic groups in later generations. In sum, Gordon believed that a proper dialectic must be maintained between ethnic identity and cultural assimilation.¹⁴

¹³Nathan Glazer and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City* (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, Harvard University Press, 1963); first quote from v; second quote from 16.

¹⁴Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964).

By the 1970s, many scholars stressed the place of ethnicity in American social and cultural history in a vein similar to Glazer, Moynihan, and Gordon. Leonard Dinnerstein and David M. Reimers in their 1975 *Ethnic Americans*, a text that has gone through five editions, offered an ethnic history of America, and two years later, in *Natives and Strangers*, Dinnerstein and Reimers teamed up again, along with Roger L. Nichols, to write a general history of ethnic groups in America that highlighted their economic contributions.¹⁵ The prominence of ethnicity as a topic among scholars reached its apogee in 1980 with the publication of the *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*. Of the numerous scholars who participated in this project, Philip Gleason, Harold J. Abramson, George M. Fredrickson, and Dale T. Knobel contributed entries outlining the subjects of Americanization, pluralism, nativism, and immigrant religion.

Ewa Morawska places in greater historiographical context the challenge ethnicity posed to assimilation in her 1990 essay “The Sociology and Historiography of Immigration.” Morawska argues immigration scholarship since the mid-1970s has challenged two previous emphases, the individual initiative of immigrants and assimilation. She then posits four themes that have defined sociological and historical scholarship on immigration since then: the role of structures, immigrant “collectivist strategies,” ethnicity, and the “interrelation of class and ethnicity.” Morawska

¹⁵Leonard Dinnerstein and David M. Reimers, *Ethnic Americans: A History of Immigration*, 5th ed. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009); Leonard Dinnerstein, Roger L. Nichols, and David M. Reimers, *Natives and Strangers: Ethnic Groups and the Building of America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979). See also Maxine Seller, *To Seek America: A History of Ethnic Life in the United States* (Englewood, NJ: J. S. Ozer, 1977).

acknowledges most historians no longer dogmatically assert the theory of assimilation, but she recognizes that instead some scholars juggle both ethnicity and assimilation.¹⁶

By the 1980s, the assimilationist theory began to reemerge, though scholars continued to devote considerable attention to ethnicity.¹⁷ Even Dinnerstein and Reimers admit in hindsight that “much of the assertion of ethnicity of the 1970s has proved to be superficial.”¹⁸ John Higham reflected this shift as early as 1975. His book *Send These to Me* is an example of immigration history that bridges the divide between the theories surrounding assimilation and ethnicity. His book addresses numerous cultural themes relating to American immigration, but Higham gave special attention to the tension between diversity and uniformity in America’s self-understanding. He concluded his book with an appeal to “pluralistic integration,” a solution he proposed for America’s identity crisis.¹⁹ Published just a year earlier, Thomas Archdeacon’s *Becoming American* also synthesized ethnicity and assimilation, while extending the timeline of immigration

¹⁶Ewa Morawska, “The Sociology and Historiography of Immigration,” in *Immigration Reconsidered: History, Sociology, and Politics*, ed. Virginia Yans-McLaughlin (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 187-238.

¹⁷Higham, *Send These to Me*, xii; Dolan, “Immigration and American Christianity,” 140. For examples of continued attention to ethnicity during the 1980s, albeit through a more literary, deconstructionist lens, see Werner Sollors, *Beyond Ethnicity: Consent and Descent in American Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); and Werner Sollors, ed., *The Invention of Ethnicity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

¹⁸Dinnerstein and Reimers, *Ethnic Americans*, xi.

¹⁹John Higham, *Send These to Me: Immigrants in Urban America*, Revised Edition (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984).

history later into the twentieth century.²⁰ Scholars today typically shy away from the term “assimilation,” and opt instead to use “incorporation.”²¹

By the end of the twentieth century, historians were in a better position to produce sweeping syntheses of U.S. immigration history. Published in 1990, Roger Daniels’s *Coming to America* provided a comprehensive account of immigration and ethnic communities in American history. Daniels carried the timeline through the 1980s and offers adept political, social, and cultural history. His account also dispels the common bifurcation between “old” and “new” immigration. Throughout his study, Daniels provided commentary on nativist sentiment in America, and towards the end of his book, Daniels briefly compared the nativism of the 1920s with that of the 1980s.²² In his 1985 book *The Transplanted*, John Bodnar approached immigration from a more class-oriented focus, rather than simply ethnicity. In his research, Bodnar found that immigration reflected a dialectic between communal and individual endeavors within a capitalist society. Bodnar concluded, “Immigrant adjustment to capitalism in America was ultimately a product of a dynamic between the expanding economic and cultural imperatives of capitalism and the life strategies of ordinary people.”²³

By the start of the twenty-first century, historians began to step outside of the debate over ethnicity and assimilation and apply other lenses to the study of American

²⁰Thomas J. Archdeacon, *Becoming American: An Ethnic History* (New York: Free Press, 1983). This assessment is based on a reading of Archdeacon and Dolan’s interpretation in “Immigration and American Christianity,” 140.

²¹Kraut, 131-32, 136-38.

²²Roger Daniels, *Coming to America: A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper Perennial, 2002). For a historical overview of ethnic groups in America, see Ronald Takaki, *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America*, Revised Edition (New York: Back Bay Books, 2008).

²³John Bodnar, *The Transplanted: A History of Immigrants in Urban America* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987), 207.

immigration history, most notably stressing transnational contexts and the role of borderlands.²⁴ Studies of non-European immigrants also experienced a boon by the end of the twentieth century, boosted in part by the ethnic turn and the demographics of twentieth-century immigration from Latin America and Asia.²⁵ Two recent examples of this trend include Madeline Y. Hsu's study of Chinese immigrants during the twentieth century and Deborah Cohen's work on Bracero workers from Mexico.²⁶

Other studies shed light on race and gender either in the context of immigration or American pluralism.²⁷ Matthew Frye Jacobson in *Whiteness of a Different Color* investigates the evolution of American racial classifications of southern and eastern European immigrants, concluding that these immigrants were considered racially separate during the early twentieth century only to become white once the civil rights movement began.²⁸ David R. Roediger in *The Wages of Whiteness* unravels the convoluted, nineteenth-century relationships between race and class through an examination of the evolving characteristics of the white working class, and Reginald Horsman's *Race and Manifest Destiny* examines notions of race during the nineteenth century via nationalism

²⁴Kraut, 129, 130-31; Shenton and Kenny, 356; Ngai, 363-66.

²⁵Shenton and Kenny, 366; Kraut, 133-34; Ngai, 363-66, 368-70. See also Reed Ueda, *Postwar Immigrant America: A Social History* (Boston: Bedford Books, 1994).

²⁶Madeline Y. Hsu, *The Good Immigrants: How the Yellow Peril became the Model Minority* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015); Deborah Cohen, *Braceros: Migrant Citizens and Transnational Subjects in the Postwar United States and Mexico* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011).

²⁷Kraut, 134-37.

²⁸Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998).

and interracial interactions.²⁹ Another seminal study of race in America is Gary Gerstle's *American Crucible*, which traces the development and interplay of civic and racial nationalism during the twentieth century, placing strong emphasis on the century's wars.³⁰ Finally, Martha Gardner, Donna Gabaccia, and Linda Gordon offer insight into the dynamic of gender in relation to American immigrants and government policy, and the correlation among gender, race, and ethnicity.³¹

More recently, an increasing number of historical studies highlight the importance of immigration policy.³² Aristide R. Zolberg in *A Nation by Design* explicates the multitude of ways that economic and cultural forces helped shape immigration policy in American history, and he pushes back on any linear interpretation of immigration policy or monolithic view of immigration. Susan F. Martin's book *A Nation of Immigrants* entails a broader focus that includes both the history of immigration and the formation of policy. She outlines three different historical perspectives, what she refers to as the Virginia, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania models. These interpretations of immigration draw upon the orientation of the colonies during early American history, whereby Virginia stressed immigrant labor, Massachusetts emphasized the need for ideological

²⁹David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*, Revised Edition (1991; repr., New York: Verso, 2003); Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981).

³⁰Gary Gerstle, *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

³¹Donna Gabaccia, *From the Other Side: Women, Gender, and Immigrant Life in the U.S., 1820-1990* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994); Martha Gardner, *The Qualities of a Citizen: Women, Immigration, and Citizenship, 1870-1965* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); Linda Gordon, *The Great Arizona Orphan Abduction* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).

³²Kraut, 140.

unity, and Pennsylvania fostered a tolerant spirit towards various immigrant groups.³³ Another facet of government policy and immigration history is the U.S. response to political and economic refugees during the twentieth century. Carl J. Bon Tempo canvases postwar refugee policy in *Americans at the Gate*, demonstrating how foreign and domestic currents led the United States to respond to refugees displaced during the Cold War. Bon Tempo pays considerable attention to the notion of “American identity” and the shift from racial to ideological concerns after World War II.³⁴

Nativism and Native Responses

While historians of American immigration made great strides over the last century, the ways American citizens have responded to immigrants and the topic of nativism itself, especially its fate during the twentieth century, remain understudied. Two early histories of nativism serve as benchmarks for the field, and largely remain unmatched. Published in 1938, Ray Allen Billington’s *Protestant Crusade* provided an early scholarly assessment of nineteenth-century nativism. For Billington, anti-Catholicism was a central component of nativism, evident in American fears over increasing immigration, the attack on the Ursuline Convent in Massachusetts, polemical publications, political organizations, the 1844 riots in Philadelphia, and the Know-

³³Aristide R. Zolberg, *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008); Susan F. Martin, *A Nation of Immigrants* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011). See also Daniel J. Tichenor, *Dividing Lines: The Politics of Immigration Control in America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).

³⁴Carl J. Bon Tempo, *Americans at the Gate: The United States and Refugees During the Cold War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008). See also Lewis A. Coser, *Refugee Scholars in America: Their Impact and Their Experiences* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984). For the topic of Jewish refugees and immigrants during the twentieth century, see Richard Breitman and Allan J. Lichtman, *FDR and the Jews* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, Harvard University Press, 2013); Libby Garland, *After They Closed the Gates: Jewish Illegal Immigration to the United States, 1921-1965* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014); Stephan F. Brumberg, *Going to America, Going to School: The Jewish Immigrant Public School Encounter in Turn-of-the-Century New York City* (New York: Praeger, 1986).

Nothing Party. Billington argued that a confluence of immigration, class interests, the western frontier, debates over using the Bible in public education, developments in Europe, and Protestant religion all fueled anti-Catholicism, and when united with economic concerns over immigration and American nationalism, nativism flourished during much of the nineteenth century.³⁵

Published the same year as Herberg's *Protestant, Catholic, Jew*, John Higham's *Strangers in the Land* offered a more comprehensive study of nineteenth-century nativism and stretched the timeline into the early twentieth century. Higham emphasized the ideology behind nativist concerns over European immigration and acknowledged that nationalism and ethnic tension were important parts of the story. Like Billington, Higham tied religion to nativism by pointing to anti-Catholicism, but he also demonstrated how the threat of political radicalism fueled nativist sentiment. Finally, Higham delved into the racial dynamics of nativism and claimed that Anglo-Saxon superiority was part of the anti-immigration perspective. His study concluded that the restriction enforced by 1924 supplanted earlier Americanization ideals.³⁶

Higham's 1955 study of nativism has remained a classic study in the field. Testifying to its significance, the December 1986 issue of *American Jewish History* published multiple scholars' reflections on Higham's contributions to the study of nativism. This journal issue, focusing particularly on Higham's *Strangers in the Land*, serves as a valuable source for tracing the historiography of nativism since Higham's work. In his essay, James M. Bergquist identifies the significance of Higham's work in

³⁵Ray Allen Billington, *The Protestant Crusade: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism, 1800-1860* (1938; repr., Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964).

³⁶John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925*, Corrected Edition (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981).

the way it stressed cultural conflict, rather than a progressive emphasis on economic and class identities. Bergquist traces this shift of focus in multiple studies of nineteenth-century nativism written after Higham and examines the ways historians have interpreted nativism's relationship to social reform and the Republican party. Bergquist concludes that historical nativism is a complicated affair that consists of varied expressions based upon multiple historical and regional factors.³⁷

Evident in the work of Billington and Higham and in Bergquist's historiographical observations, historians often neglect to study the fate of nativism during the twentieth century. Some historians since the 1980s periodically study forms of nativism during the twentieth century, but their works are usually local studies and often stress the early part of the century.³⁸ Kristofer Allerfeldt focuses on nativism in Oregon and Washington during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, considering demographic features that suggest nativist concerns were inflated by fear rather than actual interaction with increasing numbers of "new" immigrants. He stresses Protestant concerns over Catholic and Jewish immigrants and also examines Protestant nativism demonstrated in Klan activity. Nevertheless, regarding religion, Allerfeldt concludes that the emphasis placed on assimilation during the early twentieth century "would imply that race and nationality played a dominate role in objections to the 'new' immigration, re-enforcing, if not largely replacing, the function played by religion in the 'old.'" The Pacific Northwest, as Allerfeldt suggests, complicates the relationship between religion

³⁷James M. Burgquist, "The Concept of Nativism in Historical Study Since *Strangers in the Land*," *American Jewish History* 76, no. 2 (December 1986): 125-41.

³⁸An exception is Roger Daniels, "Changes in Immigration Law and Nativism since 1924," *American Jewish History* 76, no. 2 (December 1986): 159-80.

and nativism by the first two decades of the twentieth century.³⁹ Like Allerfeldt, William Ross in his 1994 book *Forging New Freedoms* provides an account of nativism during the early twentieth century, focusing specifically on the years from 1917 to 1927. Ross considers the historical context surrounding the Supreme Court's decision to reverse three separate cases involving parochial education, two of which involved the teaching of foreign languages. In addition to outlining nativist sentiment during this period, this book also reveals that some Americans challenged nativism and the threats it posed to civil liberties.⁴⁰

Two other texts essential to any study of early twentieth century immigration restriction are books by Jeanne D. Petit and Robert F. Zeidel. Petit's *Men and Women We Want* examines the debate surrounding the restrictive literacy test that Congress eventually implemented in 1917. Petit incorporates into her study of this policy debate themes of race, gender, and sexuality. She argues that the literacy test, which targeted southern and eastern European immigrants, served as a precursor for the 1924 quota laws. Petit concludes that this debate helped shape America's consideration of immigration in the years that followed. Along with her analysis of policy, she includes the social themes of race and gender, and her book serves as a promising example for future historical accounts of immigration policy.⁴¹ Zeidel offers a thorough account of the Dillingham Commission. He argues that the commission was a product of the Progressive Era and, while nativist in some respects, was not necessarily xenophobic. Instead, it was a

³⁹Kristofer Allerfeldt, *Race, Radicalism, Religion, and Restriction: Immigration in the Pacific Northwest, 1890-1924* (Westport: Praeger, 2003), 76-77.

⁴⁰William G. Ross, *Forging New Freedoms: Nativism, Education, and the Constitution, 1917-1927* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994).

⁴¹Jeanne D. Petit, *The Men and Women We Want: Gender, Race, and the Progressive Era Literacy Test Debate* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2010).

calculated attempt to improve American society during the early twentieth century premised upon the economic ramifications of unchecked immigration. Zeidel concludes that the commission “hijacked” Progressivism’s claims to scientific objectivity.⁴²

Outside of studies focusing on policy during the early twentieth century, significant work has been done on discrimination against Latino and Asian groups. Arnaldo De León in *They Called Them Greasers* focused on racist Anglo interpretations of Mexicans in nineteenth-century Texas. Analyzing the interplay of class, race, economics, and politics, David Montejano examined Mexicans and Anglos along Texas’s southern border during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Linda Gordon recounts an episode in Arizona at the turn of the twentieth century where Irish orphans sent to Arizona to Mexican foster parents were abducted by white locals on account of racial and anti-Catholic fears.⁴³ As for discrimination against Asian immigrants, the essays in Sucheng Chan’s edited volume, *Entry Denied*, address the history of Chinese immigrants between 1882 and 1943. Though a period of exclusion for Chinese immigration that was the culmination of stringent xenophobic sentiment along the West Coast, these years also reflected a time when Chinese immigrants who came earlier worked to settle into their

⁴²Robert F. Zeidel, *Immigrants, Progressives, and Exclusion Politics: The Dillingham Commission, 1900-1927* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2004).

⁴³Arnaldo De León, *They Called Them Greasers: Anglo Attitudes Toward Mexicans in Texas, 1821-1900* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987); David Montejano, *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836-1986* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987); Gordon, *The Great Arizona Orphan Abduction*. See also Camille Guerin-Gonzales, *Mexican Workers and American Dreams: Immigration, Repatriation, and California Farm Labor, 1900-1939* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994); Abraham Hoffman, *Unwanted Mexican Americans in the Great Depression: Repatriation Pressures, 1929-1939* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1974); Robin Dale Jacobson, *The New Nativism: Proposition 187 and the Debate over Immigration* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008).

new surroundings.⁴⁴ Izumi Hirobe writes on the fate of Japanese immigration to America by focusing on the formation of policy following their outright exclusion in 1924. Hirobe especially draws upon the activism of religious leaders and West Coast businessmen to recount the end of Japanese exclusion.⁴⁵

Ever since Billington's 1938 book, historians across the board have acknowledged that anti-Catholicism was closely tied to nativism during the nineteenth century. Donald L. Kinzer examined in 1964 this aspect of nativism in his book *An Episode of Anti-Catholicism*. Kinzer chronicled the American Protective Association during the late nineteenth century, and actually pushed against the nativist label of the APA. Instead, he pointed out that other contemporary groups, including nativists, coopted the APA for their purposes. For Kinzer, the APA "flourished on, rather than engendered, sentiment for immigration restriction." Kinzer even recognized that Catholic opposition conflated nativism with anti-Catholicism.⁴⁶ In *The Lion and the Lamb*, William Shea traces the relationship between Protestant evangelicalism and Roman Catholicism during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Shea devotes a chapter to nativism and some of its evangelical proponents, but also recognizes differences between nativism's xenophobia and evangelicalism's religious concerns over Catholicism. Shea

⁴⁴Sucheng Chan, ed., *Entry Denied: Exclusion and the Chinese Community in America, 1882-1943*, Asian American History and Culture, ed. Sucheng Chan (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

⁴⁵Izumi Hirobe, *Japanese Pride, American Prejudice: Modifying the Exclusion Clause of the 1924 Immigration Act* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001).

⁴⁶Donald L. Kinzer, *An Episode in Anti-Catholicism: The American Protective Association* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964), quote from 247.

notes, however, that by the end of the twentieth century the relationship between evangelicals and Catholics was improving.⁴⁷

Since Higham's sweeping analysis in 1955, only one other scholar has come close to providing a comprehensive account of nativism in U.S. history. In *The Party of Fear*, David H. Bennett chronicled right-wing movements tied to nativist fears over the course of American history, focusing particularly on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Overall, Bennett argued that nativism during the nineteenth century was fearful of foreigners and largely anti-Catholic and that the 1920s Ku Klux Klan was the final expression of this form. Bennett acknowledged that the demise of nativism as a movement would not be complete until the postwar period, and he provided adept analysis of the decline of nativism during the 1930s and 1940s. He argued, however, that after the 1920s right-wing concern turned from foreigners and focused instead on foreign ideology (i.e., communism). He concluded his study with a glimpse of the New Right that emerged in the 1970s and suggested, while similar in spirit, was separate from the right-wing extremism of the 1920s. As for its contributions to the historiography of nativism, a particular hallmark of Bennett's study is his treatment of anti-immigrant and domestic concerns after 1925.⁴⁸

Two texts produced during the early twenty-first century reflect promising avenues of research for future studies of native reactions to immigration during the twentieth century. Matthew Jacobson's *Barbarian Virtues* delivers a compelling investigation of the interplay between foreign policy and domestic concern over

⁴⁷William M. Shea, *The Lion and the Lamb: Evangelicals and Catholics in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).

⁴⁸David H. Bennett, *The Party of Fear: From Nativist Movements to the New Right in American History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988).

foreigners by the end of the nineteenth century. Jacobson delineates the dissonance found in Americans' hopes and fears concerning increased immigration during this period, and he situates his study within the context of the Spanish-American War. Jacobson also investigates the ways that Americans defined the "other" in their midst.⁴⁹ In his book *Ellis Island Nation*, Robert L. Fleegler argues that American culture eventually developed an interpretation of European immigration known as "contributionism." Amidst increasing tolerance by the midcentury, many Americans came to interpret earlier European immigrants as an important component of the American heritage, and Fleegler provides a carefully researched account of this line of thought.⁵⁰

Religion and Immigration

Much like the study of twentieth-century nativism, the subfield of religion in immigration history is a work still in its early stages. Earlier historians and sociologists occasionally addressed this topic; Hansen and Handlin periodically noted the importance of immigrant faith, and Herberg's study helped elevate the importance of studying these two subjects.⁵¹ But as late as 1988, Jay Dolan still lamented that church historians were disinclined to address immigration, and it was not until the turn of the twenty-first

⁴⁹Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001).

⁵⁰Robert L. Fleegler, *Ellis Island Nation: Immigration Policy and American Identity in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

⁵¹Dolan, "Immigration and American Christianity," 127, 132, 134-35; Philip Gleason, "Hansen, Herberg, and American Religion," in Kivisto and Blanck, 85-103.

century before historians began a concerted effort to study the relationship between religion and immigration.⁵²

As with most marginalized topics, a few historiographical exceptions exist. The religious historian Timothy Smith began working on immigrant religion during the 1960s and 1970s in two articles. Reflecting the temper of his times, he stressed the relationship between ethnicity and immigrant religious communities.⁵³ Philip Gleason in *The Conservative Reformers* focused on a Catholic organization, the Central-Verein, and used it as a lens through which to study the assimilation of German Americans during the early twentieth century.⁵⁴ In 1977, Randall M. Miller and Thomas D. Marzik edited a collection of essays focusing on the religion of urban European immigrants during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and Robert Orsi's study of Harlem Italians and Karen McCarthy Brown's work on Haitian religion in Brooklyn are two other early examples of analysis of immigrant religion, reflecting the merits of micro social and cultural history. Finally, Jay P. Dolan published in 1985 an account of Catholicism in the United States that integrates the subject of immigration. His section titled "The Immigrant Church, 1820-1920" introduces central characteristics of Catholic immigrant

⁵²Jay P. Dolan, "The Immigrants and Their Gods: A New Perspective in American Religious History," *Church History* 57, no. 1 (March 1988): 61-72.

⁵³Timothy L. Smith, "Religious Denominations as Ethnic Communities: A Regional Case Study," *Church History* 35, no. 2 (June 1966): 207-26; Timothy L. Smith, "Religion and Ethnicity in America," *American Historical Review* 83, no. 5 (December 1978): 1155-85; Dolan, "Immigration and American Christianity," 139-40.

⁵⁴Philip Gleason, *The Conservative Reformers: German-American Catholics and the Social Order* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968).

communities in America, including settlement, parish structure, family, education, and responses to modernity and industrialization.⁵⁵

Despite this earlier body of work, Dolan by 1988 was still concerned about the study of immigration and religion. In his essay “Immigration and American Christianity: A History of Their Histories,” he offered an adept introduction to the historiography of immigration itself and that of immigration and its relationship to Christianity. Dolan began with an examination of nineteenth-century church historians and noted the scarcity of attention to immigrant religion. The few accounts that did address immigrant religion were usually assimilationist or pessimistic in tone, though he did consider the work of Philip Schaff as an exception. Dolan then proceeded to the twentieth century and argued that secular historians who first began writing immigration history handled the topic of religion more proficiently than did church historians. He remained pessimistic concerning prospects for the future study of religion and immigration history. Before concluding his essay, Dolan offered advice to prospective historians of immigrant religion; he stated it is imperative that studies of immigrant faith consider the Old World context before attempting to analyze the religion of immigrants living in America.⁵⁶

Three years following Dolan’s essay, the American Immigration and Ethnicity Series produced a volume titled *The Immigrant Religious Experience* edited by George E.

⁵⁵Randall M. Miller and Thomas D. Marzik, eds., *Immigrants and Religion in Urban America* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1977); Richard Alba, Albert J. Raboteau, and Josh DeWind, “Introduction: Comparisons of Migrants and Their Religions, Past and Present,” in *Immigration and Religion in America: Comparative and Historical Perspectives*, ed. Richard Alba, Albert J. Raboteau, and Josh DeWind (New York: New York University Press, 2009), 2; Robert A. Orsi *The Madonna of 115th Street: Faith and Community in Italian Harlem, 1880-1950*, 3rd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010); Karen McCarthy Brown, *Mama Lola: A Vodou Priestess in Brooklyn* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991); Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985).

⁵⁶Dolan, “Immigration and American Christianity,” 119-47.

Pozzetta. This collection compiles twenty-three journal articles, most published during the 1970s and 80s. In his introduction to the series, Pozzetta argues that earlier historians limited their focus to denominational history and conflicts involving Catholicism. Yet, Pozzetta suggests historians by the time he was writing were beginning to study the role of religion in the overall immigrant experience. While the essays in this volume continue to emphasize Catholicism, they also confirm the importance historians were assigning to ethnicity. Overall, the articles are an early attempt to bring religion to the fore in immigration history.⁵⁷

In his essay “Ethnicity and American Protestants: Collective Identity in the Mainstream” included in *New Directions in American Religious History*, John Higham was less sanguine than Pozzetta. Higham noted the absence of an ethnic interpretation of American Protestantism, a symptom of a greater failure on the part of historians to incorporate religion into their immigration studies. Writing in 1997, Higham offered a helpful consideration of historiographical trends. Higham recognized early efforts to unite ethnic and immigration studies with religion, including developments within political history and the work of Timothy Smith beginning in the first half of the 1960s. Higham, however, concluded these prospects did not lead to significant progress in the study of religion in immigration history. For Higham, studies addressing ethnicity and religion, as opposed to immigration and religion, were more abundant. Nevertheless, by the 1970s and 80s, according to Higham, historians no longer even studied ethnicity and religion very often. He suggested the topic of ethnicity and Protestant identity in America has also been a victim of these developments, largely due to scholars limiting

⁵⁷George E. Pozzetta, ed., *The Immigrant Religious Experience*, vol. 19, American Immigration & Ethnicity Series, ed. George E. Pozzetta (New York: Garland Publishing, 1991). For Pozzetta’s assessment of religion’s status in works of immigration history, see viii-ix.

their studies to ethnic minorities, rather than considering the Protestant majority. Higham proceeded to offer his own analysis of this topic, concluding that nativism during the mid-nineteenth century infused within Protestantism ethnic and national themes founded on fears of Roman Catholic immigrant faith.⁵⁸

More direct studies of religion and immigration began to appear by the early twenty-first century. Jenna Weissman Joselit's *Parade of Faiths*, included within Oxford University Press's Religion in American Life series, provides an overview of American immigrant religion, with separate chapters devoted to Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and Asian/Middle Eastern immigrant religions in America.⁵⁹ In *Immigration and Religion in America*, edited by Richard Alba, Albert J. Raboteau, and Josh DeWind, contributing scholars compare the faiths of "old" and "new" immigrants and bring together the disciplines of history, religious studies, and the social sciences, while also considering the institutional and ideological aspects of immigrant religion in the United States. An innovative approach, this volume parallels Italians and Mexicans, Japanese and Koreans, European Jews and Arab Muslims, and African Americans and Haitians.⁶⁰

Other studies address more recent immigrant religion. David Yoo's *Contentious Spirits* assesses the religious history of Korean Americans during the first half of the twentieth century using racial, transnational, and colonial lenses.⁶¹ Kambiz

⁵⁸John Higham, "Ethnicity and American Protestants: Collective Identity in the Mainstream," in *New Directions in American Religious History*, ed. Harry S. Stout and D. G. Hart (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 239-59.

⁵⁹Jenna Weissman Joselit, *Parade of Faiths: Immigration and American Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

⁶⁰Alba, Raboteau, and DeWind, eds., *Immigration and Religion in America*.

⁶¹David K. Yoo, *Contentious Spirits: Religion in Korean American History, 1903-1945* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010).

GhaneaBassiri traces the multiple expressions of Islam in American history and their interaction with the larger culture.⁶² David A. Badillo and Arlene M. Sánchez Walsh offer helpful studies in the area of Latino religion in the United States during the twentieth century.⁶³

As historians continue to grapple with the religious history of immigration in America, they must, in addition to focusing on the religion of immigrants, heed Higham's observations and reckon with the faith of the white, Protestant mainstream, reflected in both home mission programs and political activism. The standard interpretation of this subject posits that concerned Christians hoped to integrate late nineteenth-century immigrants into American society through evangelization and assimilation, only to find that by the 1920s this was not working. Native Protestants then turned to immigration restriction. This declension narrative ends abruptly in 1924 and fails to recognize subsequent Protestant attempts to assimilate immigrants.

In his study of American Baptists during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, for example, Lawrence Davis traced the initial hope northern Baptists placed in the power of evangelism and assimilation and their eventual disillusionment and support for legislative restriction. More recently, Derek Chang in *Citizens of a Christian Nation* reexamines American Baptists during the latter half of the nineteenth century and compares their work among African Americans in Raleigh, North Carolina, with their ministry to Chinese immigrants in Portland, Oregon. Chang finds that home mission

⁶²Kambiz GhaneaBassiri, *A History of Islam in America: From the New World to the New World Order* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

⁶³David A. Badillo, *Latinos and the New Immigrant Church* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006); Arlene M. Sánchez Walsh, *Latino Pentecostal Identity: Evangelical Faith, Self, and Society* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003). See also Moises Sandoval, *On the Move: A History of the Hispanic Church in the United States* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1990).

work among these groups reflected American Baptists' interpretation of race and a strong commitment to "evangelical nationalism." William J. Phalen's account of Protestant evangelicals and their relationship to immigration traces anti-Catholicism and the myriad ways Protestant social reform shaped their response to immigration. Phalen addresses the fears of Protestant evangelical groups, primarily the Evangelical Alliance, as they witnessed increasing numbers of immigrants, most notably Catholics, entering America during the nineteenth century. Overall, he emphasizes both the religious and political nature of evangelical concerns about immigration. Phalen's study, however, also focuses heavily on the nineteenth century, giving only cursory attention to the early twentieth century.⁶⁴

Pluralism in many respects serves as the nexus point for studying American immigration and religion during the twentieth century. Diana L. Eck's *A New Religious America* provides an extensive introduction to American pluralism. Her treatment of Hindus, Buddhists, and Muslims helps counterbalance the frequent attention historians give Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism. While Eck's book does not provide comprehensive histories of the migration of these religions to America, the study does give enough historical background and introduction to American pluralism to make it a necessary work for any student of American immigration history.⁶⁵ While Eck demonstrates the progress of pluralism by the beginning of the twenty-first century, William R. Hutchison in *Religious Pluralism in America* provides a more expansive

⁶⁴Lawrence Davis, *Immigration, Baptists, and the Protestant Mind in America* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973); Derek Chang, *Citizens of a Christian Nation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010); William J. Phalen, *American Evangelical Protestantism and European Immigrants, 1800-1924* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2011).

⁶⁵Diana L. Eck, *A New Religious America: How a "Christian Country" Has Become the World's Most Religiously Diverse Nation* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2001).

view. Hutchison argues that white American culture understood pluralism in three distinct ways during the nation's history. During the early Republic, Americans interpreted pluralism as toleration, while later in the nineteenth century they believed pluralism reinforced inclusion. Hutchison then claims that during the twentieth century segments of American society believed pluralism must be participatory.⁶⁶ In 2013 Charles L. Cohen and Ronald L. Numbers edited a volume on pluralism, the essays a product of a conference held at the Lubar Institute at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. This collection covers numerous facets of American pluralism, but it is Charles H. Lippy's essay that is especially useful for the study at hand. Lippy explores the relationship between pluralism and the Protestant consensus, arguing that since World War II American culture has vacillated between cultivating diversity and striving for a common religious identity.⁶⁷

In addition to Lippy, several other historians have studied the white Protestant response to pluralism. David Mislin in *Saving Faith* explicates Protestant interpretations of early twentieth-century pluralism in America. Mislin argues persuasively that liberal Protestant leaders between 1870 and 1930 began to espouse religious pluralism in light of their growing acceptance of theological doubt and attempts to stave off secularism. Mislin recognizes his subjects are a minority voice, but he also purports that these same voices helped later guide Protestants and American culture towards a level of comfort

⁶⁶William R. Hutchison, *Religious Pluralism in America: The Contentious History of a Founding Ideal* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).

⁶⁷Charles H. Lippy, "From Consensus to Struggle: Pluralism and the Body Politic in Contemporary America," in *Gods in America: Religious Pluralism in the United States*, ed. Charles L. Cohen and Ronald L. Numbers (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 297-319. See also Charles H. Lippy, *Pluralism Comes of Age: American Religious Culture in the Twentieth Century* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2000).

with diversity.⁶⁸ Rivka Lissak in *Pluralism and Progressives* complicates the historical interpretation that settlement workers during the early twentieth century either favored Americanization or cultural pluralism. She focuses on Hull House and the cooperation between social workers and University of Chicago faculty in establishing a Liberal Progressive position on assimilation. Lissak works to tease out the myths surrounding Jane Addams's pluralist reputation and finds that Hull House promoted a limited cultural pluralism that focused on eventual assimilation.⁶⁹ Finally, Kevin M. Schultz demonstrates the development of a "tri-faith" pluralism during the postwar period, in many ways historicizing and explicating Herberg's earlier observations. By looking at the formation of the National Conference of Christians and Jews and pluralist developments in suburbanization, education, and the U.S. census, Schultz demonstrates the formation of an American pluralism premised on the acceptance of Jews and Catholics within a diminishing Protestant hegemony.⁷⁰

Twentieth-Century Protestantism

The fate of Protestantism in the United States during the twentieth century was tied to various intellectual and social currents, especially secularism and pluralism. As already noted, several scholars have investigated the interplay between pluralism and Protestant Christianity, but a broader examination of the historiography of twentieth-

⁶⁸David Mislin, *Saving Faith: Making Religious Pluralism an American Value at the Dawn of the Secular Age* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015).

⁶⁹Rivka Shpak Lissak, *Pluralism and Progressives: Hull House and the New Immigrants, 1890-1919* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).

⁷⁰Kevin M. Schultz, *Tri-Faith America: How Catholics and Jews Held Postwar America to Its Protestant Promise* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011). See also Kevin M. Schultz, "The Blessings of American Pluralism, and Those Who Rail Against It," in *Faith in the New Millennium: The Future of Religion and American Politics*, ed. Matthew Avery Sutton and Darren Dochuk (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 269-85.

century Protestantism is necessary in order to fully understand the fate of white Protestants in an increasingly diverse America.

Central to interpreting Protestantism's cultural prominence during the twentieth century is defining "mainline" Christianity. In 1989 William R. Hutchison edited a volume of essays that served as a rallying cry for historians beckoning them to focus more on mainline Protestantism in the twentieth century. The volume considered the multiple ways that mainline Protestantism began to lose its cultural status and concede social space to religious pluralism by the 1960s.⁷¹ The work of Elesha J. Coffman and Jason Lantzer represents more recent attempts to explicate mainline Christianity in the United States. Coffman contends that a coterie of liberal Protestant figures worked to form a Protestant consensus through the periodical *Christian Century*, though often confronted by a more conservative laity and other Protestant streams.⁷² Meanwhile, Lantzer considers the history of mainline Protestantism more broadly and explores the shifting locus of mainline Christianity's authority and its evolving parameters.⁷³

Historical attention to theological strife between fundamentalists and modernists during the early twentieth century has largely detracted from serious inquiry into mainline Protestant groups before midcentury. Matthew Bowman's seminal work *The Urban Pulpit*, however, helps clarify the history of mainline Protestants during the early twentieth century. Bowman asserts that rather than a simple divide between modernists

⁷¹William R. Hutchison, ed., *Between the Times: The Travail of the Protestant Establishment in America, 1900-1960*, Cambridge Studies in Religion and American Public Life, ed. Robin W. Lovin (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

⁷²Elesha J. Coffman, *The Christian Century and the Rise of the Protestant Mainline* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

⁷³Jason S. Lantzer, *Mainline Christianity: The Past and Future of America's Majority Faith* (New York: New York University Press, 2012).

and fundamentalists, a third group, “liberal evangelicals,” largely constituted American Protestantism. By examining Protestants in New York City during the early twentieth century, Bowman describes a class of Protestants that favored innovative methods corresponding to a changing culture, while still maintaining the primacy of Christian conversion and spiritual formation. Bowman states, “Liberal evangelicals were those who came to believe that evangelicals could have it all: aid to the poor and their conversion, communion with Christ through rather than instead of social reform.” The subjects of this dissertation largely fall within this categorization.⁷⁴

Social Christianity, as practiced by mainline Protestants, is a topic several historians have tackled over the last several decades. Henry F. May addressed the topic as early as 1949 in *Protestant Churches and Industrial America*. May argued that social conditions during the late nineteenth century, rather than simply religious liberalism, encouraged the formation of the social gospel. May differentiated among conservative, progressive, and radical forms of social Christianity, a distinction that stressed the “moderate” nature of the social gospel movement.⁷⁵ Later, Susan Curtis in her 1991 study *A Consuming Faith* delves into the cultural components of the social gospel and argues that the movement colored Protestant views of family and commercialism.⁷⁶ The work of Paul Carter and Robert Moats Miller helped explicate social Christianity’s

⁷⁴Matthew Bowman, *The Urban Pulpit: New York City and the Fate of Liberal Evangelicalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014). Quote from 110.

⁷⁵Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (1949; repr., New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1967). See also the work of Charles Howard Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940); Ronald C. White, Jr., and C. Howard Hopkins, *The Social Gospel: Religion and Reform in Changing America* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976); William R. Hutchison, “The Americanness of the Social Gospel: An Inquiry in Comparative History,” *Church History* 44, no. 3 (September 1975): 367-81.

⁷⁶Susan Curtis, *A Consuming Faith: The Social Gospel and Modern American Culture* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991).

history during the interwar years, and both historians acknowledged the continuing presence of the social gospel while also identifying the inroads of neo-orthodox theology by World War II.⁷⁷ Miller also provided biographies of two mainline luminaries staunchly devoted to sociopolitical reform during their lifetimes, Harry Emerson Fosdick and G. Bromley Oxnam.⁷⁸ Finally, Heath W. Carter's *Union Made* represents the latest reassessment of the social gospel in its argument that labor tensions and working-class concerns of late nineteenth-century Chicago were the prime impetus for the ensuing social gospel.⁷⁹

Several historians extend the narrative of mainline Protestantism further into the twentieth century. Matthew Hedstrom in *The Rise of Liberal Religion* argues that a liberal book culture shaped mainline Christianity, especially helping Protestants come to terms with pluralism as they found spiritual commonality with Catholics and Jews.⁸⁰ In *After Cloven Tongues of Fire*, David A. Hollinger investigates the ways that Protestant liberal positions shaped American culture. A central theme in Hollinger's work is the thesis that liberal Protestantism helped inculcate values that ushered in a more secular society, values that continued to shape American ideology even after Protestantism lost

⁷⁷Paul A. Carter, *The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel: Social and Political Liberalism in American Protestant Churches, 1920-1940* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1956); Robert Moats Miller, *American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958).

⁷⁸Robert Moats Miller, *Harry Emerson Fosdick: Preacher, Pastor, Prophet* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); Robert Moats Miller, *Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam: Paladin of Liberal Protestantism* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990).

⁷⁹Heath W. Carter, *Union Made: Working People and the Rise of Social Christianity in Chicago* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015).

⁸⁰Matthew Hedstrom, *The Rise of Liberal Religion: Book Culture and American Spirituality in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).

its social standing.⁸¹ Another helpful study of mainline Protestantism is Margaret Bendroth's *The Last Puritans*. In recounting the ways that Congregationalists interpreted their history as descendants of Puritans and Pilgrims, Bendroth argues that mainline Congregationalists worked, often unsuccessfully, to maintain a denominational history that acknowledged both a liberal, progressive spirit and congregational polity. Bendroth's work highlights the tension between an ecumenical spirit that favored theological and spiritual ambiguity and a deference to denominational distinctives.⁸²

Another important interpretation of twentieth-century religious and cultural trends is George Marsden's *Twilight of the American Enlightenment*. Marsden canvases the post-World War II cultural climate and considers the inherent contradiction in a society striving for enlightened progress through consensus principles of equality and freedom while also adhering to a relativistic worldview that deferred to science and individualism. In his chapter "The Latter Days of the Protestant Establishment," Marsden traces the vestiges of the Protestant consensus before pluralism overwhelmed it following 1965. He stresses Protestants' close relationship to mainstream society and affinity for "inclusive pluralism." Midcentury Protestants practiced a form of public religion that was open to diversity and promoted progressive sentiments of equality, freedom, and individualism, while also claiming special status in American life. Marsden provides helpful context for the eventual dissolution of mainline Protestants' cultural hegemony and suggests many Protestant groups were unprepared to reconcile an increasing pluralism with a secular

⁸¹David A. Hollinger, *After Cloven Tongues of Fire: Protestant Liberalism in Modern American History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013).

⁸²Margaret Bendroth, *The Last Puritans: Mainline Protestants and the Power of the Past* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015).

society, and were left with the option to publically “retreat” in the name of progressive secular values.⁸³

Despite liberal, ecumenical currents in mainline Protestantism that downplayed American exceptionalism and a gradual rapprochement among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, many Protestant believers continued to maintain that America was a Christian nation. This concept was largely the product of nineteenth-century anti-Catholicism, as Philip Hamburger stresses. Steven K. Green also works to untangle this concept in *Inventing a Christian America*, in which he argues that this “myth” was born during the early nineteenth century amidst rising nationalism. Kevin Kruse offers an interpretation of this myth premised on more recent developments. Kruse argues that a concerted effort on the part of anti-New Deal business interests and publicists promoted the notion of America as a Christian Nation that eventually flourished in the postwar 1950s.⁸⁴

Protestant home missions is another topic that helps shed light on the treatment of immigrants and ethnic Americans in history. Two helpful volumes are *The Quiet Hand of God*, edited by Robert Wuthnow and John H. Evans, and *Competing Kingdoms*, edited by Barbara Reeves-Ellington, Kathryn Kish Sklar, and Connie A. Shemo. *The Quiet Hand of God* considers the social activism of mainline Protestants at the end of the twentieth century. The volume provides analysis of various facets of the mainline Protestant denominational apparatus, both nationally and locally. Peter Thuesen’s essay on the history of the “logic of mainline churchliness” is an indispensable text for students

⁸³George Marsden, *The Twilight of the American Enlightenment: The 1950s and the Crisis of Liberal Belief* (New York: Basic Books, 2014).

⁸⁴Philip Hamburger, *Separation of Church and State* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002); Steven K. Green, *Inventing a Christian America: The Myth of the Religious Founding* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015); Kevin M. Kruse, *One Nation Under God: How Corporate America Invented Christian America* (New York: Basic Books, 2015). See also Mark A. Noll, Nathan O. Hatch, and George M. Marsden, *The Search for Christian America* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1983).

of mainline Christianity. Thuesen traces the evolution of Protestantism's public voice in relation to American cultural and political developments. Going back all the way to the Reformation, Thuesen argues that the Protestant social witness reflected varying forms of tolerance, ecumenism, and a broad public vision. When Thuesen arrives at the early twentieth century, he provides penetrating analysis of the social gospel movement and its gendered, bureaucratic, ecumenical, and political features. Thuesen concludes his essay by acknowledging that increasing religious pluralism and internal conflict reduced the public voice of mainline Protestantism, though a semblance of the earlier social gospel remained.⁸⁵

The essays included in *Competing Kingdoms* address the intersection of gender, missions, and international perspectives during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Though mostly essays on overseas missions and transnational themes that emphasize race and gender within American women's missions, the volume occasionally touches on domestic elements of this mission work. Jane H. Hunter recounts in her essay the historical notion of female domesticity within missions. Particularly important for the study at hand, her attention to early twentieth-century internationalism and the role women missionaries had in countering racism and imperialism reflects the ways that missions work sometimes softened previous forms of discrimination. Also included in this volume is an essay by Derek Chang that focuses on Baptist female home missions to African Americans and Chinese immigrants during the late nineteenth century. Chang articulates many of the same arguments he would later make in his book already

⁸⁵Peter J. Thuesen, "The Logic of Mainline Churchliness: Historical Background since the Reformation," in *The Quiet Hand of God: Faith-Based Activism and the Public Role of Mainline Protestantism*, ed. Robert Wuthnow and John H. Evans (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 27-53.

referenced in this chapter, but his focus on racial and nationalistic themes in women's missions work makes this essay a useful tool for approaching the topic of home missions and gender.⁸⁶

Coupling both home missions and pluralism, Susan M. Yohn's *A Contest of Faiths* focuses on women and Presbyterian missions in the Catholic Southwest during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Yohn's account addresses the assimilationist goals of women missionaries in New Mexico and their eventual accommodation to Hispanic culture. She traces a missional trajectory whereby initial attempts to evangelize Hispanics waned while educational and social services continued. Yohn delineates the unintended consequences of home missions: "What resulted was the elaboration of a process to be repeated again and again in different parts of the country as a dominant Anglo-Protestant class tried to assimilate a growing population of immigrants and others deemed foreign, thereby generating increasing awareness of cultural pluralism."⁸⁷

Recent diplomatic history has also incorporated twentieth-century religion. John S. Nurser addresses the role of ecumenical Protestants in the World Council of Churches during the 1930s and 1940s, culminating in the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and Andrew Preston's tome *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith* considers American religion and foreign relations throughout U.S. history, but particularly during

⁸⁶Jane H. Hunter, "Women's Mission in Historical Perspective: American Identity and Christian Internationalism," in *Competing Kingdoms: Women, Mission, Nation, and the American Protestant Empire, 1812-1960*, ed. Barbara Reeves-Ellington, Kathryn Kish Sklar, and Connie A. Shemo (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), 19-42; Derek Chang, "Imperial Encounters at Home: Women, Empire, and the Home Mission Project in Late Nineteenth-Century America," in *ibid.*, 293-317.

⁸⁷Susan M. Yohn, *A Contest of Faiths: Missionary Women and Pluralism in the American Southwest* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995), quote from 3. See also Mark T. Banker, *Presbyterian Missions and Cultural Interaction in the Far Southwest, 1850-1950* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993).

the twentieth century. A third study that brings together American Protestantism and global themes is Michael G. Thompson's *For God and Globe*, in which he recounts the work of Christian internationalists during the interwar years. He focuses on their attempts to promote a Christian universalism that united liberal Protestants in an effort to educate fellow Christians and engage the escalating international crises during the first half of the twentieth century.⁸⁸

Finally, several historians address American Protestant attention to race and civil rights during the twentieth century, providing useful context for understanding immigration reform during the twentieth century. In *The Color of Christ*, Edward J. Blum and Paul Harvey trace the diverse ways that Christ has been portrayed racially in American history.⁸⁹ A good resource for considering the varied racial positions of Christians in more recent history is the edited collection *Christians and the Color Line*.⁹⁰ The work of James F. Findlay, David L. Chappell, and Carolyn Renée Dupont offer analysis of white Protestant responses to the midcentury civil rights movement, and Joel L. Alvis, Gardiner H. Shattuck, and Mark Newman provide careful studies of specific denominations during the civil rights movement.⁹¹ Some historians have even begun to

⁸⁸John S. Nurser, *For All Peoples and All Nations: The Ecumenical Church and Human Rights* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2005); Andrew Preston, *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith: Religion in American War and Diplomacy* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012); Michael G. Thompson, *For God and Globe: Christian Internationalism in the United States between the Great War and the Cold War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015). See also Paul Boyer, "Piety, International Politics, and Religious Pluralism in the American Experience," in Cohen and Numbers, 320-46.

⁸⁹Edward J. Blum and Paul Harvey, *The Color of Christ: The Son of God and the Saga of Race in America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012).

⁹⁰J. Russell Hawkins and Philip Luke Sinitiere, eds., *Christians and the Color Line: Race and Religion after Divided by Faith* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

⁹¹James F. Findlay, *Church People in the Struggle: The National Council of Churches and the Black Freedom Movement, 1950-1970* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); David L. Chappell, *A Stone of Hope: Prophetic Religion and the Death of Jim Crow* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina

investigate the role of Asian and Latino religious groups and their efforts to defend civil rights; Stephanie Hinnershitz studies Asian Christian student organizations, and Felipe Hinojosa examines the social positions of Latino Mennonites during the twentieth century.⁹²

Conclusion

Immigration history has evolved over the course of the twentieth century. Just as the immigrants themselves have been a diverse lot, the historiography of immigration has proliferated in numerous directions. The prominent debate over assimilation and ethnicity eventually reached a dialectical conclusion as historians recognized both forces were at work in American immigration history. As many scholars have noted, the immigrant experience is too complex for any one theory to explain. The above studies have shown that the story of the relationship between immigrants and American culture involves mutual borrowing, sharing, and adaptation.

The current state of immigration historiography as it relates to American culture, while strong, still falls short on several accounts. As historians continue to write the story of American immigration, they must study further the American public's varied responses to immigration. Higham's *Strangers in the Land* provided serious inquiry into this subject in 1955, but historians since then have often neglected to write on nativism.

Press, 2004); Carolyn Renée Dupont, *Mississippi Praying: Southern White Evangelicals and the Civil Rights Movement, 1945-1975* (New York: New York University Press, 2013); Joel L. Alvis, *Religion and Race: Southern Presbyterians, 1946-1983* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1994); Gardiner H. Shattuck, *Episcopalians and Race: Civil War to Civil Rights* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2000); Mark Newman, *Getting Right with God: Southern Baptists and Desegregation, 1945-1995* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2001).

⁹²Stephanie Hinnershitz, *Race, Religion, and Civil Rights: Asian Students on the West Coast, 1900-1968* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2015); Felipe Hinojosa, *Latino Mennonites: Civil Rights, Faith, and Evangelical Culture* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014).

Moreover, the relationship between white Protestantism, pluralism, and immigration requires further attention. Dinnerstein and Reimers acknowledged that at the time they were writing “we have no systematic body of historical literature on the mainstream American Protestant denominations and their relations with immigrants.”⁹³ If Handlin led historians in considering America’s influence on immigrants, perhaps immigration history would benefit from another paradigm shift that encourages historians to study once again immigration’s impact on America and the resulting native responses. Beginning in the late nineteenth century, white Protestants increasingly turned their attention to immigration, and by the 1920s, they were vociferous participants in the social and political process of determining the fate of foreigners.

⁹³Dinnerstein and Reimers, “Strangers in the Land,” 115.

CHAPTER THREE

Settling into Restriction

“The church in its Americanization work has a sacred duty to perform. It must build in the immigrant the ideals which will make him a true citizen of America, and in a higher sense a citizen of the Kingdom of God.”

—Georgia Harkness, *The Church and the Immigrant*¹

By the early twentieth century, significant numbers of immigrants had come to the United States from southern and eastern Europe, Asia, and Mexico. Many Americans worried that these immigrants threatened time-honored political, cultural, and religious institutions. Immigrants during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were considered foreigners in every sense of the word. They came speaking little or no English and worshiping foreign faiths, and Americans feared these “new” immigrants would not assimilate according to American ideals to the extent that earlier immigrants had who came from northern and western Europe.

It was the perceived threat these immigrants posed to traditional American culture that troubled many within the native population. The vicissitudes of World War I only compounded the issues, and a desire for “normalcy” in the aftermath of conflict led many Americans to support their government’s decision to restrict immigration. Reflecting public concerns, Congress passed stringent immigration legislation in 1917, 1921 and 1924. The 1917 law established a literacy test for incoming immigrants, and the 1921 Emergency Immigration Act set up a temporary quota system based upon the total population in 1910 of each European nationality in America, allowing for 3 percent of

¹Georgia E. Harkness, *The Church and the Immigrant* (New York: George H. Doran, 1921), 90.

each nationality to enter. Then the 1924 law pushed the baseline back to 1890 and lowered the percentage to 2 percent, an intentional effort to limit immigration from southern and eastern Europe. The 1924 quota law also excluded the Japanese entirely.²

Native white Protestants, the majority affiliated with either the Federal Council of Churches (FCC) or the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC), responded to increasing immigration and its sudden demise in 1924 as citizens of both the Kingdom of God and the United States. With 20,052,781 constituent members in the FCC as of 1921 and 3,524,378 church members aligned with the SBC by 1926, native Protestants represented a significant portion of the population, with an even greater hold on American culture.³ When confronted with rising immigration, they maintained vibrant home mission ministries that sought to bring immigrants into the Christian fold while also introducing them to American ideals. Moreover, Protestant leaders responded to legislative proposals during the 1920s in a manner that reflected theological and missional positions. Along the way, Protestant political concerns and home mission programs designed to ensure the spiritual, cultural, and material wellbeing of immigrants helped temper nativism among church members.

²Aristide R. Zolberg provides a comprehensive overview of American immigration policy in *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008).

³E. O. Watson, ed., *Year Book of the Churches, 1921-22* (Washington D.C.: Hayworth Publishing House, 1922), 250; United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1926, Vol. I, Summary and Detailed Tables* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1930), 15-16.

Protestant Ministry among Immigrants

During the first two decades of the twentieth century, America witnessed the influx of over fourteen million immigrants.⁴ Protestants rose to what they perceived as the challenge of this increasing immigrant population. They decided the foreign born must hear the Gospel message and experience the warm charity of American Christians blessed with the means to aid men, women, and children listless from long travels.⁵ Most Protestant denominations had some form of organization charged with the task of home missions, and these departments usually included work among “foreigners,” as immigrants were often called. By the early twentieth century, Protestants realized the world was coming to America. A speaker announced at a Methodist Episcopal women’s convention in 1923, “I can give a foreign missionary . . . as large a field for his entire life work in any one of fifty American cities, as he could adequately reach in any European, Asiatic, or African field.”⁶ A booklet produced by the Protestant Episcopal Church likewise noted that its work was “Foreign Missions at Home.”⁷ Another publication printed in 1924 a poem titled “God is Sending Them” that demonstrates this spirit of missions that many Protestant denominations acted upon:

God is sending now the peoples
By the million to our shores;
They are coming from all nations,

⁴Roger Daniels, *Coming to America: A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper Perennial, 2002), 124.

⁵I especially appreciate the sources related to the social gospel and home missions to immigrants identified by Olivier Zunz in *Why the American Century?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 231n48.

⁶Dr. W. M. Gilbert, “Dr. Gilbert’s Address,” *Woman’s Home Missions* 39 (December 1922), 18.

⁷Thomas Burgess, *Foreign-Born Americans and Their Children: Our Duty and Opportunity for God and Country from the Standpoint of the Episcopal Church* (New York: Department of Missions and Church Extension of the Episcopal Church, 1922), 25.

They are knocking at our doors.
Shall we send the gospel message
To the souls across the seas,
And neglect the heathen with us
Who have needs as great as these?

It is God who in past ages
Hath controlled the tides of men;
And our God in his high heaven
Doth control today as then.
It is God who calls his children
With command both loud and clear:
Haste, O haste, my faithful workers;
I have sent the nations here!⁸

Many denominations, while retaining their own home mission departments, also combined their work and planning through ecumenical organizations. This period of time witnessed a rising tide of ecumenism among mainline Protestantism, leading most noticeably to the creation of the FCC and the Home Missions Council (HMC) in 1908. The HMC served as a clearinghouse for Protestant work among immigrants, with over forty denominational organizations aligned with the HMC by 1920. The HMC fostered missions to immigrants that included work among ports of entry, Americanization, and Vacation Bible School programs for immigrant children.⁹

Ellis Island became the site of numerous efforts to minister to the incoming immigrants. Despite setbacks during World War I, when immigration through Ellis Island came to a halt, ministry at the island was in full swing during the early 1920s. Just as immigrants poured into the port looking for a new start, a multitude of Protestant organizations claimed Ellis Island as their base of operation where they could provide benevolence to the newcomers. The proliferation of ministries that claimed Ellis Island

⁸Selected, "God is Sending Them," *Missionary Review of the World* 47 (June 1924), 466.

⁹Home Missions Council, *Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Home Missions Council* (New York: Home Missions Council, 1920), 12-26, 96, 99, 100-102.

was at times staggering. In an effort to consolidate these ministries, the General Committee on Immigrant Aid was organized to coordinate all agencies working on Ellis Island. By 1922, this included nineteen organizations, twelve of which were Protestant. While assistance at this port came in many forms, a prominent piece of Protestant missions on the island was mediation. A Congregationalist worker on Ellis Island recognized, “The missionary or social worker is a buffer between the immigrant and the Government agencies which he many times misunderstands and which do not always understand him.”¹⁰ The Foreign-Born Americans Division of the Protestant Episcopal Church claimed, “Successful work is being done in meeting, commending, and following up immigrants entering this country through Ellis Island. About 2,000 Anglican immigrants have been commended to the care of our clergy in various parts of the country.”¹¹ Providing benevolent assistance and reaching prospective church members defined encounters between the native and foreign born at Ellis Island.

Angel Island in the San Francisco Bay served as the West Coast’s counterpart to Ellis Island, and Protestants made sure workers were present and ready to provide Christian support, despite strong regional political and social resistance to Asian immigration. Often their work offered cultural and religious resources. A 1922 article in *Woman’s Home Missions* described Christmas festivities on the island. The event was clearly an attempt to introduce immigrants coming to the West Coast to both the Gospel

¹⁰Home Missions Council and Council of Women for Home Missions, *Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Home Missions Council and Council of Women for Home Missions* (New York: Home Missions Council, Council of Women for Home Missions, 1922), 189-92 ; “Christian Workers at Ellis Island,” *Woman’s Home Missions* 40 (June 1923), 10; “Since eighty per cent,” *Woman’s Home Missions* 39 (November 1922), 16; Henry M. Bowden, “Ellis Island Today,” *American Missionary* 76 (May 1921), 76-77.

¹¹Protestant Episcopal Church, *Living Church Annual, Churchman’s Year Book, and American Church Almanac*, 1924 (Milwaukee, WI: Morehouse Publishing, 1923), 97.

and American patriotism. The list of gifts given during the Christmas celebration is telling. “There were gifts for all: Christmas cards with John 3.16, and an American flag for each one, various other things including handkerchiefs, toys, games, and dolls, an American doll for each Chinese woman—a gift which transports her to the topmost peak of happiness.”¹²

Faith-based community centers were another important institution Protestants used to minister to the needs of immigrants. These centers were a direct descendent of the settlement houses in vogue during the earlier progressive movement at the turn of the century.¹³ Denominations often sponsored multiple community centers that ministered in a variety of ways. The Northern Baptist community center in Hammond, Indiana, named Brooks House, is a good example. Under the ambitious administration of John M. Hestenes, the center strove to transform the local immigrant community. Brooks House offered a plethora of programs, including a “kindergarten filled with little tots of every degree of tint from African duskiness to Saxon peaches-and-cream,” recreation for adolescents, laundry facilities, a library outfitted with literature to help Americanize the newcomers, medical services, and a room for meetings. According to one observer, Brooks House helped transform “a dozen different European races . . . united and working harmoniously together in the interests of better social and moral conditions.” Hestenes’s vision for urban reform through the ministry of Brooks House demonstrates the staying power of social gospel aspirations during the 1920s. “Two years ago,” according to an article covering Brooks House, “this section of the city had housed a

¹²Millicent M. McCorkle, “How They Celebrated Christmas,” *Woman’s Home Missions* 39 (March 1922), 10-11.

¹³John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925*, Corrected Edition (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981), 121.

sullen mass of suspicious, clannish, ignorant foreign-born with neither the will nor the knowledge to improve their conditions; living in dirt and squalor; torn by petty hatreds, the prey of Bolsheviks, unscrupulous politicians and the money lust of a soulless industrialism.” But no more. All the while, Brooks House maintained evangelical commitments; a description of the center affirmed that “souls are reached with the chief message . . . contained in John 3:16.” Brooks House was just one of thirty-four community centers Northern Baptists operated as of 1924.¹⁴

Other Protestant work directed towards immigrants came through the pioneering Bureau of Reference for Migrating Peoples. Formed in 1922 by the Home Missions Council and Council of Women for Home Missions, this organization helped connect American churches to new immigrant arrivals. The Bureau, under the leadership of Episcopal worker Raymond Cole, relied upon the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship Through the Churches for names of immigrants likely to come to America. The Bureau then provided the immigrants’ names to religious institutions in towns where they awaited the arrival of the immigrants. The Bureau peaked at fifteen thousand assignments in 1926, but had to close operations three years later on account of financial constraints. Such an operation demonstrates the frequent transnational nature of home mission work. The Bureau of Reference also reflects a commitment to sectarian

¹⁴H. Campbell-Duncan, “Creating Wealth out of Waste,” *The Baptist*, May 31, 1924, 423-25; first quote from 423; second quote from 423; third quote from 423-24; fourth quote from 424. See also Charles L. White, “Tracing the Spiritual Growth of a Great Society,” *The Baptist*, May 31, 1924, 433. Northern Baptists had a long tradition of ministry to immigrants. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Baptists in the North and Midwest sponsored work in urban centers as immigrants poured in from Eastern Europe. They labored to meet both the spiritual and physical needs of the immigrants, while also demonstrating a strong impulse to Americanize the newcomers. See Lawrence B. Davis, *Immigrants, Baptists, and the Protestant Mind in America* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973); William J. Phalen, *American Evangelical Protestantism and European Immigrants, 1800-1924* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2011).

identity, as the Bureau only sought immigrants who were Protestant and coordinated with specific denominations based upon the religious background of the foreign born.¹⁵

The work of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. [PC(USA)], Protestant Episcopal Church, and SBC each provide useful glimpses into denominational efforts to minister to immigrants at this time. The PC(USA) in 1918 identified its goals as such: publish material on immigration work, cooperate with other denominations, and promote community center work. Its area of influence stretched across the nation, extending from New York to California. A 1918 report noted that the denomination spent a total of \$86,000 for immigration ministry in twenty cities, four iron and coal regions, and rural areas in Texas and California.¹⁶ The Presbyterian Board of Church Erection also tabulated ten buildings that were maintained for work among foreigners between 1920 and 1921 at a cost of \$60,595, along with two new buildings for Mexicans totaling \$9,600 and eight new community centers at \$36,250.¹⁷ Presbyterians were also convinced that they would need to educate future home missionaries for immigrant ministry. The Presbyterian seminary at Dubuque University in Iowa educated prospective ministers who would “meet the demand of a ministry for the foreign-speaking population of our country.”¹⁸

¹⁵Benson Y. Landis, *Protestant Experience with United States Immigration, 1910-1960* (New York: Church World Service, 1961), 21-22.

¹⁶Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. [hereafter PC(USA)], *One Hundred Sixteenth Annual Report, Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America* (New York: Presbyterian Building, 1918), 19-20. See also “Articles, 1922-24,” United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 10, folder 1, RG 301.7.10.1, Presbyterian Historical Society (hereafter PHS), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

¹⁷“Review of the year in figures, Board of Church Erection,” *The Presbyterian*, May 19, 1921, 18.

¹⁸PC(USA), *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.*, vol. 1, part 1 (Philadelphia: Office of the General Assembly, 1922), 287.

The Protestant Episcopal Church also sought to reach immigrants through various means. This portion of its home mission work was organized through the Foreign-Born Americans Division established in 1919. A 1922 Episcopal manual on immigration identified various immigrant groups needing Episcopal assistance, including Italians, Poles, Hungarians, and Mexicans. According to the manual, the Catholic background of these particular groups made them prospects for the Episcopal fold. The manual went on to outline other ethnic and national groups that either were already a part of the Episcopal Church in America or were candidates for cooperative endeavors, including Japanese, Chinese, “Hindus,” Jews, Czechs, Slovaks, Scandinavians, Russians, Greeks, and Armenian and Assyrian Orthodox. The 1922 manual was generally sympathetic to the special challenges immigrants faced while being processed on Ellis Island and the subsequent urban living conditions they endured. Even as late as 1922, Episcopalians in immigrant work were still drawing from precedents set by the earlier progressive movement; the manual even cited the work of Jacob Riis. While the handbook recognized that some immigrants were not assimilating, and thus posed a threat to the nation, this was rather the fault of Americans not reaching out and demonstrating “Christian neighborliness.” Episcopalians acknowledged the importance of Americanization, but ultimately identified “religion—the knowledge and love of God through Jesus Christ our Lord” as “the most important factor of all, without which true democracy cannot stand; without which all so-called Americanization must fail; and that which it is the Church’s God-given responsibility to supply.” Alongside this evangelistic program, Episcopalians also sponsored childcare, neighborhood houses, and cultural

“refinement.” Occasionally, such efforts included ministers and workers who had been immigrants themselves, particularly among Italians.¹⁹

Another Episcopal pamphlet titled *How to Reach the Foreign-Born* continued to outline their work. Published in 1924, it called upon local parishes to be hospitable to immigrants, reminding its readers that their “approach to these, our neighbors, should always be not as foreigners but as friends.” It challenged local parishes not to treat immigrants as “curious exhibits to be looked at, nor creatures of a lower order to be avoided.” Instead, Episcopalians should realize that the foreign born are “just the same sort of men, women and children as the rest of us.” The pamphlet even acknowledged a level of diversity within the nation, admitting that the “glory of the American type is that it is a rich composite.” In addition to the services listed in the 1922 manual, the 1924 pamphlet also mentioned other ways Episcopalians reached out to local immigrants, including night schools, clubs, hospital visits, children’s camps, financial advice, cooperation with Orthodox churches, assistance with “the intricacies and official discourtesies of naturalization,” and helping men find “skilled work.” The program referred to Episcopal efforts to publish spiritual material in foreign languages, including printing prayer books that incorporated “their” prayers. The evangelistic mission of the Episcopal Church pulsed in the pamphlet’s concluding prayer:

O Saviour of mankind, who didst send Thy disciples unto every nation bidding them feed Thy sheep, and Who in these later times hast brought from many nations a multitude to dwell in our land; Grant that our Church in America may prove faithful to the trust that Thou hast laid upon her, and may have grace and power to feed by Thy appointed means these people of many races and tongues; through the same Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.²⁰

¹⁹Burgess, *Foreign-Born Americans*, quote from 23.

²⁰Foreign-Born Americans Division, National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, *How to Reach the Foreign-Born: A Practical Parish Program of American Fellowship*, Bulletin No. 45 (New

The Episcopal Church offered, like other mainline efforts, a comprehensive approach to ministering to the foreign born that united both spiritual counsel with social services.

Spiritual and social commitments also defined Southern Baptist immigrant work during the early twentieth century. Southern Baptists adhered to a strong evangelistic ministry, but never discouraged providing relief for the dispossessed in society.²¹

Though the South is not usually considered a haven for immigrants during the early twentieth century, Southern Baptists begged to differ. A 1923 publication calling for pledges for the SBC's Home Mission Board pointed out immigrant populations among Southern Baptists. With the headings "Foreigners at Our Door" and "Vast Groups in Cities and Rural Sections Present Duty to Provide Them With the Gospel," the piece called attention to large populations of Italians, Mexicans, "French speaking people," Bohemians, Greeks, and Russians situated in various cities of the South. To stress its point, this call for funds also noted that 37,700 foreigners lived "in Kansas City within eight or ten blocks of where the Southern Baptist Convention held its session last May."²²

According to a Southern Baptist report describing their ministry to foreigners during the

York: Department of Publicity, 1924), first quote from 10; second quote from 11; third quote from 4; fifth quote from 16; sixth quote from 17; seventh quote from 19; final block quote from 18, Archives of the Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas. See also Thomas Burgess, Charles Kendall Gilbert, and Charles Thorley Bridgeman, *Foreigners or Friends: The Churchman's Approach to the Foreign-Born and Their Children* (New York: Department of Missions and Church Extension, 1921).

²¹In his 1920 speech in Washington, D.C., George Truett declared, "The people, high and low, rich and poor, the foreigners, all the people are to be faithfully told of Jesus and his great salvation The only sufficient solvent for all the questions in America—individual, social, economic, industrial, financial, political, educational, moral, and religious—is to be found in the Saviourhood and Lordship of Jesus Christ." George W. Truett, "Baptists and Religious Liberty," in *Proclaiming the Baptist Vision: Religious Liberty*, ed. Walter B. Shurden (Macon, GA: Smyth and Helwys, 1997), 82. For Southern Baptist social ministry during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, see Keith Harper, *The Quality of Mercy: Southern Baptists and Social Christianity, 1890-1920* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1996).

²²"Broad Field Open to Home Missions," *Campaign Talking Points*, November 1, 1923, 1; see also W. H. Knight, "Christianizing the Homeland," *Baptist Standard*, March 9, 1922, 12-13. This article stated that the Southern Baptist Home Mission Board was ministering to Swedes, Germans, Italians, Cubans, French, and Mexicans in various states.

1923-1924 year, 11,894 sermons and addresses were given, 30,141 visits conducted, and 824 people baptized, along with progress made in the area of church construction and repairs.²³ With hopes to raise future ministers for immigrant work, one description of the Baptist Bible Institute in New Orleans suggested, “New Orleans, with its 400,000 population, consisting of divers nationalities, affords an unsurpassed opportunity for the study and solution of both Home and Foreign Mission problems.”²⁴ Good Will Centers, having much in common with other Protestant community centers, were established by Southern Baptists to meet the spiritual and social needs of incoming immigrants. Southern Baptist women often provided the early impetus for immigrant ministry, but as historian Melody Maxwell has demonstrated in the case of a Good Will Center in Birmingham, Alabama, their efforts were eventually appropriated by male leadership.²⁵

Southern Baptists were also aware of increasing Mexican immigration that the restrictive congressional legislation of the 1920s, which focused on European and Asian immigrants, largely overlooked.²⁶ The 1924 “Report of Committee on Mexican Work”

²³E. P. Alldredge, *Southern Baptist Handbook 1924* (Nashville, TN: Baptist Sunday School Board, 1924), 203-204.

²⁴Baptist General Convention of Texas, *Annual of the Baptist General Convention of Texas*, 1921, 22.

²⁵Melody Maxwell, “‘We Are Happy to Co-operate’: The Institutionalization and Control of Birmingham's Baptist Good Will Center, 1909-1928,” *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 38, no. 3 (September 1, 2011): 249-65. See also frequent attention to immigrants in *Royal Service* at this time.

²⁶Baptists were not alone in their work among Mexican immigrants. For Presbyterian efforts, see R. Douglas Brackenridge and Francisco O. García-Treto, *Iglesia Presbiteriana: A History of Presbyterians and Mexican Americans in the Southwest*, 2nd ed. (San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 1987); Susan M. Yohn, *A Contest of Faiths: Missionary Women and Pluralism in the American Southwest* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995); Mark T. Banker, *Presbyterian Missions and Cultural Interaction in the Far Southwest, 1850-1950* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993). See also Robert McLean, *Old Spain in New America* (New York: Association Press, 1916). Concerning the development of Hispanic Pentecostalism, see Arlene M. Sánchez Walsh, *Latino Pentecostal Identity: Evangelical Faith, Self, and Society* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003). For historical assessment of Protestantism and Hispanics, see Edwin E. Sylvest, Jr., “Hispanic American Protestantism in the United States,” in *On the Move: A History of the Hispanic Church in the United States*, by Moises Sandoval (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis

produced by the Baptist General Convention of Texas suggested half a million Mexicans lived in Texas. It recognized some Mexicans were in Texas to work temporarily while others planned to stay. As for the latter, the report noted that they “should be reached as citizens who are to help make this a great state, or else hinder its program by being a financial and social burden on our people.” Either way, evangelization was the ultimate answer. “Kind treatment, fair dealing and frank conversations about religion would result in winning many of them to Christ.” And if some immigrants returned to Mexico, taking their Protestant faith back with them, Texas Baptists were getting a two-for-one deal. The report also demonstrated concerns over education. It pointed out that Mexicans struggled to attain public education, and it called upon Baptists to intervene by either supporting public education for Mexicans or offering Baptist elementary education instead. The report ultimately recognized much work remained to be done and that Baptists were “touching the huge task with only our finger tips.”²⁷ Commenting on Mexican immigration, Texas minister J. M. Dawson concluded in 1927, “Our future is so bound up with theirs that we cannot refuse to think of them, cultivate them, work with them and together strive for the worth while things in civilization. Will the churches default with this responsibility?”²⁸ Southern Baptists and most other Protestant denominations worked to follow through with this perceived “responsibility” as the century progressed.

Books, 1990), 115-30; and Paul Barton, *Hispanic Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists in Texas* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006).

²⁷Baptist General Convention of Texas, *Annual of the Baptist General Convention of Texas*, 1924, 121-22.

²⁸J. M. Dawson, *The Spiritual Conquest of the Southwest* (Nashville, TN: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1927), 157.

The Social Gospel Inheritance and Its Challenges

Through the work sponsored by denominations and parachurch groups like the HMC, many Protestants in America believed immigration placed opportunities for missions on their doorsteps. While there were many fronts to this advance of home missions, most Protestant home missionaries shared a similar inspiration for their work, the social gospel. A thriving movement espoused by many mainline Protestant theologians and clergy at the turn of the century, it sought to apply the love of Christ to society and replace oppressive institutions and systems with social justice instead. Most historians agree that by the 1920s the social gospel was losing momentum as a cohesive movement. Many of its early spokesmen had died, and it continued to face resistance from evangelical and fundamentalist Protestant quarters. Nevertheless, the principles of the movement persisted and became diffused among the more rank-and-file of Protestant churches. Many young Protestants making their first forays into home missions during the 1920s had been fed a steady diet of social gospel precepts by their earlier mentors.²⁹

Social gospel rhetoric clearly survived the waning of the movement. Expressions such as the brotherhood of man, Fatherhood of God, and Kingdom of God were important concepts among progressive Protestants at the turn of the century, and these terms continued in the parlance of ministers and home missionaries into the later

²⁹For historical work on this movement, see Christopher H. Evans, *The Social Gospel in American Religion: A History* (New York: New York University Press, 2017); Heath W. Carter, *Union Made: Working People and the Rise of Social Christianity in Chicago* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015); Susan Curtis, *A Consuming Faith: The Social Gospel and Modern American Culture* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991); Paul A. Carter, *The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel: Social and Political Liberalism in American Protestant Churches, 1920-1940* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1956); Robert Moats Miller, *American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958); Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (1949; repr., New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1967); Charles Howard Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940); Ronald C. White, Jr., and C. Howard Hopkins, *The Social Gospel: Religion and Reform in Changing America* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976); and William R. Hutchison, "The Americanness of the Social Gospel: An Inquiry in Comparative History," *Church History* 44, no. 3 (September 1975): 367-81.

twentieth century. While references to the Kingdom of God evidenced the postmillennial optimism of social gospelers, the brotherhood of man and Fatherhood of God were semantic inheritances from late nineteenth-century social reformers and liberal theology. The notion of the brotherhood of man in particular succumbed to various interpretations both secular and sacred during the late nineteenth century and into the twentieth in America.³⁰ At the School of Applied Ethics in Plymouth, Massachusetts, in 1892, both Jane Addams and Henry C. Adams tied the idea of brotherhood to democracy and suggested it was a key element of social work. Addams perceived the budding idea among the younger generation: “I think it is hard for us to realize how seriously many of them are taking to the notion of human brotherhood, how eagerly they long to give tangible expression to the democratic ideal.”³¹ The concept appears to gain prominence a year later as a term celebrating religious pluralism and world peace at the Parliament of the World’s Religions held during the Chicago World’s Fair.³² After she attended the World’s Fair, Katharine Lee Bates incorporated the sentiments of brotherhood into a poem the religious periodical *The Congregationalist* published in 1895. Now enshrined as a patriotic standard of the United States, the poem became the lyrics of “America the

³⁰For a helpful introduction into the European origins of these concepts and their usage among American religious leaders at the turn of the century, see Jeffrey Wattles, *The Golden Rule* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 90-104.

³¹Henry C. Adams, “Introduction,” xi; Jane Addams, “The Subjective Necessity for Social Settlements,” 2, quote from 6, in *Philanthropy and Social Progress* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1893). Even the *New York Times* apparently embraced the idea of brotherhood. A 1920 editorial stated that a racial understanding of history “runs counter to our spiritual convictions as to the brotherhood of all human beings and the identical preciousness of all human souls.” “A New Basis for History,” *New York Times*, July 11, 1920, E2. See also Frederic Lawrence Knowles’s poem “The New Patriot” in *Love Triumphant: A Book of Poems*, 5th and Revised Edition (Boston: Dana Estes & Company, 1906), 104-5.

³²Amy Kittelstrom, “The International Social Turn: Unity and Brotherhood at the World’s Parliament of Religions, Chicago, 1893,” *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation* 19, no. 2 (Summer 2009): 245, 251-52; David Mislin, *Saving Faith: Making Religious Pluralism an American Value at the Dawn of the Secular Age* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015), 60, 70; Wattles, *The Golden Rule*, 91, 94.

Beautiful.” Though “brotherhood” was not included in the original 1895 version, by 1904 Bates had published the poem with the refrain laden with the familiar missional, and imperialistic, appeal: “America! America!; God shed his grace on thee,; And crown thy good with brotherhood; From sea to shining sea.”³³

At about the same time, the nascent social gospel movement began to coopt the notion of the brotherhood of man, and by the early twentieth century it was given an evangelical twist, as the concept “Christian Brotherhood” was commonly used. Though some Protestant leaders still supported the international peace and religious pluralism implied in the idea, the term indicated a growing toleration for ethnic difference and ecumenical cooperation, as opposed to sectarianism.³⁴ In his book on home missions published in 1917, while discrediting the predominant racism of his day, southern Presbyterian Samuel L. Morris wrote, “Upon the scientific fact of blood relationship, Philanthropy bases the brotherhood of man. Upon the revealed fact of redemption by the blood of Christ, Christianity grounds the brotherhood of believers.”³⁵ It was no coincidence that the spokesman of the social gospel movement Walter Rauschenbusch

³³Katharine Lee Bates, “America,” *The Congregationalist*, July 4, 1895, 17; “The Listener,” *Boston Evening Transcript*, November 19, 1904, 19; Ace Collins, *Songs Sung Red, White, and Blue: The Stories Behind America’s Best-Loved Patriotic Songs* (New York: HarperCollins, 2003), 13-21. See also Bates’s poem “To My Country,” in which she wrote: “Climb to the light. Imperiled Pioneer; Of Brotherhood among the nations, seal; Our faith with thy sublime.” Katharine Lee Bates, *America the Beautiful and Other Poems* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1911), 34.

³⁴By the mid-twentieth century, its more universal inference would be used once again in the spirit of global peace and cooperation following two world wars. Sociologist Will Herberg would conclude in 1955 that the brotherhood of man, along with the Fatherhood of God and the “dignity of the individual human being,” were “spiritual values” in American society. Will Herberg, *Protestant, Catholic, Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology* (1955; repr., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), 38-39. For Woodrow Wilson’s vision for world peace at this time, see Cara Lea Burnidge, *A Peaceful Conquest: Woodrow Wilson, Religion, and the New World Order* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016).

³⁵Samuel L. Morris, *The Task That Challenges: Home Mission Text Book* (Richmond, VA: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1917), 84. See also the chapter titled “America, The Melting Pot,” 159-86.

formed an organization named the Brotherhood of the Kingdom, and along with Washington Gladden and others, social gospel leaders advanced the ideas and rhetoric of the brotherhood of man.³⁶ In his 1919 text *The Social Gospel and the New Era*, John Marshall Barker offered no finer definition of the social gospel and its relationship to brotherhood:

Just as he [Jesus Christ] is the life of the vine, and the branches derive their life and fruitage from him, so the various social activities and institutions are giving expression in a larger and ever-increasing degree to Christian principles of conduct, and to the divine ideal of the brotherhood of man. . . . The essential essence of the Kingdom is an abiding divine power in the world which is gradually but surely giving form and direction to the existing social order.³⁷

Such rhetoric would infuse home mission work among immigrant and ethnic communities during the first two decades of the twentieth century. Howard B. Grose commented in his book *Aliens or Americans?* published in 1906 that the “hope of America’s evangelization is increased by the fact that the pure religion of Jesus Christ is so essentially democratic in its fundamental teachings of the brotherhood of man, of spiritual liberty and unity.” Grose then noted, “The immigrant comes into a new environment, created alike by civil and religious liberty, and cannot escape its influence.”³⁸ Later in 1921, an Episcopal manual made clear: “If we are to win our new neighbors to constructive participation in our national life we must show them that Americanism aims at nothing more or less than liberty, equality, justice and the brotherhood of man under the guidance and protection of God and in accordance with His

³⁶Wattles, *The Golden Rule*, 93.

³⁷John Marshall Barker, *The Social Gospel and the New Era* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1919), 15.

³⁸Howard B. Grose, *Aliens or Americans?* (Dayton, OH: Home Missionary Society of the United Brethren Church, 1906), 297.

laws.”³⁹ Though an often vague ideal, Protestant home missionaries frequently employed the idea of the brotherhood of man in their immigrant ministries as they pressed for toleration of other ethnicities and tried to incorporate immigrants into American churches.

The diffusion of social gospel principles with active home mission programs helped temper nativism among some quarters of the white Protestant community; nevertheless, it is probable that much of the Protestant laity, and many clergy, harbored similar prejudices and fears that were prevalent among society at large. A 1917 editorial published in *Christian Century* demonstrates a concern over rising immigrant numbers that were outpacing the “native population,” suggesting that the “birth rate is nearly twice as high among the foreigners” and favored the increase of Catholicism. (This obviously overlooks the fact that the children of non-Asian immigrants born in America are by law citizens, and thus, should be considered a part of the “native population.”) Nevertheless, the editorial hoped that more recent immigration birth rates would level out. “They will lose their group formation in our population,” the editorial posited, “and eventually be absorbed in the American life, as doubtless the ten tribes of the Israelites were absorbed in the east.”⁴⁰

On occasion more strident voices surfaced within Protestant publications criticizing the impact immigration had on America. Richard H. Edmonds, a prominent Baltimore journalist, wrote to Southern Baptists in 1924 encouraging their home mission

³⁹Burgess, Gilbert, and Bridgeman, *Foreigners or Friends*, 48.

⁴⁰“How Long Will America Be American?” *Christian Century*, August 23, 1917, 6. The article also reflected a callous nativist viewpoint of immigrant childbirth and parenting. “There is, of course, some offset to this [population statistic]. Among these people less intelligence is used in the rearing of children and the infantile death rate is also higher. It is not enough, however, to make up the difference.”

work that bolstered the formation of a New South. For Edmonds, the “foreign element” had weakened the North and the West and was threatening America. Edmonds surmised that the “future of this country is in the hands of the South, to be saved or lost according to what the Anglo-Saxons of the South may do,” in part because it is a region where the “foreign element is still comparatively small.”⁴¹ This more blatant appeal to Anglo-Saxon aspirations, a concept laden with racial, ethnic, and cultural biases, was common stock during the 1920s, an age when many whites appealed to “one hundred percent” definitions of what it meant to be American. While the Baptist publication that printed Edmonds’s letter did not provide an editorial response, the decision to publish it without comment tacitly acknowledged his concerns.

Elsewhere, other Protestant voices were also less than sanguine about immigrants in America. “They are liabilities or assets to the community,” according to an Episcopal booklet printed in 1924. “These people are our future political and economic rulers. As they will be, so will our country become. We cannot afford to close our eyes any longer to this obvious fact. Restriction of immigration does not remove the overwhelming numbers already here. It has not even stopped the crowds smuggling themselves over our borders.”⁴² In 1924 Arizona Presbyterians expressed concerns over immigration from Mexico. In their minds, immigration was linked to drinking, gambling, dancing, and “kindred vices of the underworld,” and so the Presbytery of Southern Arizona wrote a

⁴¹Richard H. Edmonds, “The South a Great Mission Field,” *Baptist Standard*, May 1, 1924, 7, 37.

⁴²Foreign-Born Americans Division, National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, *How to Reach the Foreign-Born*, 3.

resolution calling on the United States and Mexican governments to close the border after 8pm and that a dry zone be implemented south of the border.⁴³

The restrictive legislation Congress passed in 1924 still did not set some Protestant minds at ease. In 1926 the *Independent* lambasted Methodist bishop Adna W. Leonard and his criticism of New York Governor, and soon to be Democratic presidential candidate, Al Smith, who was not only Catholic, but also second-generation Irish. According to the article, Leonard proclaimed, “I am one hundred per cent Anglo-Saxon. America is a Protestant nation and always will remain so.” He continued, “We never will surrender our priceless American heritage to the hands of the foreigners who trample on our flag.”⁴⁴ Another Methodist, Erdmann D. Beynon, expressed concern over the possible threat immigrants posed to rural churches. “That the immigration from eastern and southern Europe has created a direct challenge to the Protestant churches of America is now generally conceded. Though our quota law has greatly curtailed the immigration from these regions,” Beynon noted, “still it did not become effective soon enough to eliminate the problem. The ‘foreigner’ is with us—in vast numbers—and as he moves here and there across the cities and villages of our country, he leaves in his wake a trail of abandoned Protestant churches.” For Beynon, this was a task for home missions and presented a challenge for more concerted efforts by local churches to reach their

⁴³“Urge Government Action,” *The Presbyterian*, April 24, 1924, 22.

⁴⁴“A Moron Militant,” *Independent*, August 21, 1926, 198. The *Independent* countered that Leonard’s remarks challenged the separation of church and state in the same manner that some critics claimed the Catholic Church was doing. The publication boldly concluded, “Bishop Leonard is false to the spirit of Christian teaching and practice; he should retire from his churchly offices and assume the more fitting and sympathetic functions which await him in some lofty Klonecilium of the Ku-Klux Klan.”

immigrant neighbors.⁴⁵ Such comments suggest Protestants brought together concerns over the wellbeing of American society and the nation's supposedly Protestant identity when considering immigration.

Pluralism vs. Americanization

Many Protestant home missionaries remained hopeful that immigrants could still benefit the nation and the church. This hope was often bound up with efforts to Americanize immigrants and tolerate limited forms of cultural pluralism. This is clearly seen in the “Melting Pot” narrative of American history popularized by writer Israel Zangwill in 1908. According to this interpretation, disparate people groups had throughout history come to America and contributed to its distinct culture. Earlier social gospel leaders and settlement house workers often grappled with cultural diversity and assimilationist expectations. Josiah Strong, the outspoken social gospeler and eventual nativist, recognized in 1911 the tension between pluralism and Americanization when he asked, “How shall such a heterogeneous multitude be transformed into Christian Americans—made one in loyalty to Christ and country?”⁴⁶ According to historian Rivka Shpak Lissak, Jane Addams and other settlement house workers respected cultural differences among the foreign born they worked with while still promoting Americanization.⁴⁷ Finding the proper balance between cultural pluralism and

⁴⁵Erdmann D. Beynon, “The Country Church and the Foreigner,” *Methodist Review* (January 1927), 84.

⁴⁶Josiah Strong, *The Challenge of the City* (New York: Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1911), 149.

⁴⁷Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 137-38; Rivka Shpak Lissak, *Pluralism and Progressives: Hull House and the New Immigrants, 1890-1919* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).

assimilation, however, would prove elusive for Protestant home missionaries over the next several decades.

One of the most prominent scholars to write on cultural pluralism during the early twentieth century was Horace Kallen, a scholar at the New School for Social Research in New York City who had earlier emigrated from Germany. In his work Kallen took up the subjects of pluralism and American democracy, coming to the conclusion that America could withstand, and actually benefit from, diverse cultures within its national borders. Rather than adhering to the assimilationist expectation that immigrants accept Anglo-Saxon ways, Kallen believed ethnic diversity could be maintained. Writing in 1915, Kallen asked, “What do we *will* to make of the United States—a unison, singing the old Anglo-Saxon theme ‘America,’ the America of the New England school, or a harmony, in which that theme shall be dominant, perhaps, among others, but one among many, not the only one?” Kallen hoped for “a multiplicity in a unity, an orchestration of mankind,” what he referred to as a “symphony of civilization.”⁴⁸ Such an interpretation of cultural diversity appeared periodically among home missionaries as they strove to aid immigrants of varied cultural backgrounds and integrate them into the Protestant church. And on occasion, a few Protestant leaders even acknowledged that cultural pluralism could bolster the nation.

In addition to advocates of cultural pluralism were Protestant leaders who recognized a limited form of religious pluralism in America. This growing toleration for

⁴⁸Horace M. Kallen, “Democracy Versus the Melting-Pot,” *The Nation*, February 18, 1915, 190-94; February 25, 1915, 217-20; first quote from 219; second quote from 220. Kallen would over the course of his career continue to advance a positive interpretation of cultural pluralism. See Horace M. Kallen, *Culture and Democracy in the United States* (1924; repr., New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1998); Horace M. Kallen, *Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea: An Essay in Social Philosophy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1956).

faiths outside of Protestantism had been developing since the late nineteenth century among liberal ministers and reformers, as historian David Mislin has pointed out, often drawing from the principle of the brotherhood of man. By the 1920s, some mainline Protestant leaders acknowledged that America was a nation in which Protestants, Catholics, and Jews all contributed to the religious landscape.⁴⁹ In their acknowledgement of religious liberty, even more traditional Protestant groups, such as Southern Baptists, recognized the place of Jews and Catholics in America. Speaking from the steps of Congress in 1920, George W. Truett reminded his Southern Baptist audience that despite their faith being “the very antithesis” of Catholicism, a “Baptist would rise at midnight to plead for absolute religious liberty for his Catholic neighbour, and for his Jewish neighbour, and for everybody else.”⁵⁰

A fierce dialectic, however, defined Protestant thought on national identity and immigration by the early twentieth century. With timid acceptance of cultural pluralism and religious pluralism for Jews and Catholics, white Protestants were also products of their time and demanded that immigrants assimilate according to American cultural norms. As churches worked to evangelize and minister to immigrants, many believed they had the additional responsibility to inculcate American ideals and voice their political views. Often at the nexus of this “duty” for “God and Country” was the work of Americanization. Several denominations devoted entire programs and commissions to the task.⁵¹ Most Protestant Christians felt America was a land of opportunity and liberty

⁴⁹Mislin, *Saving Faith*. See also Kevin M. Schultz, *Tri-Faith America: How Catholics and Jews Held Postwar America to Its Protestant Promise* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

⁵⁰Truett, “Baptists and Religious Liberty,” 66.

⁵¹Burgess, *Foreign-Born Americans and Their Children: Our Duty and Opportunity for God and Country from the Standpoint of the Episcopal Church*. American Baptist women formed in 1919 a

and that its values and culture must be preserved; thus, those whom Protestants identified as “foreigners” would need to accept this way of life as well. Consequently, Americanization became an important platform for Protestant work among immigrants. Historian Derek Chang, in his study of American Baptist home missions during the late nineteenth century, labels the product of such efforts as “evangelical nationalism.”⁵² Even though society in large part dismissed Americanization programs by 1920 and aimed instead for outright restriction, as historian John Higham contended, Protestants remained strong advocates of assimilation into the 1920s.⁵³

Americanization proved to be an amorphous term, allowing various groups to coopt it for manifold purposes. Kallen begrudgingly defined Americanization as a two-pronged agenda. At one level, it was cultural and “appears to denote the adoption of English speech, of American clothes and manners, of the American attitude in politics.” At another level, Kallen was concerned that the notion of Americanization was premised on race. “It connotes the fusion of the various bloods, and a transmutation by ‘the miracle of assimilation’ of Jews, Slavs, Poles, Frenchmen, Germans, Hindus,

Christian Americanization program that initiated work among foreigners. By 1928, the group claimed three thousand volunteers. “11/14/55,” Woman’s American Baptist Home Mission Society, Christian Friendliness, Historical Publicity, 32-6, American Baptist Historical Society Archives, Atlanta, Georgia; Mary Martin Kinney, *The World at My Door* (Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1938), 167-83. The New York Diocese’s Social Service Commission sponsored an Americanization Committee as of 1921. Burgess, Gilbert, and Bridgeman, *Foreigners or Friends*, “Preface”; Diocese of New York, *Journal of the One Hundred and Thirty-Eighth Convention of the Diocese of New York, New York: Synod Hall, May 11, 12, 13, 1921*, 227, Archives of the Episcopal Church.

⁵²Derek Chang, “‘Brought Together upon Our Own Continent’: Race, Religion, and Evangelical Nationalism in American Baptist Home Missions, 1865-1900,” in *Immigrant Faiths: Transforming Religious Life in America*, ed. Karen I. Leonard, et al. (Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 2005), 41; Derek Chang, *Citizens of a Christian Nation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010).

⁵³John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism 1860-1925*, Corrected Edition (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981), 260-63. Both Sidney Gulick and Charles Brooks suggested Americanization was not a complete success by the 1920s. Sidney L. Gulick, “A Comprehensive Immigration Policy and Program,” *Scientific Monthly* 6 (March 1918), 214; Charles Alvin Brooks, *Christian Americanization: A Task for the Churches* (Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1919), 5-6.

Scandinavians into beings similar in background, tradition, outlook, and spirit to the descendants of the British colonists, the Anglo-Saxon stock.”⁵⁴ With such a fluid term, Protestants readily formed their own application of the term.

Numerous publications espoused such principles. One author affiliated with the Council of Women for Home Missions went so far as to title her 1913 book *America, God’s Melting Pot*.⁵⁵ The leading “textbook” for Protestant Americanization programs during the 1920s was Charles Alvin Brooks’s *Christian Americanization: A Task for the Churches*. The publication of this text was a testament to the ecumenical spirit of the early twentieth century. Brooks, affiliated with the American Baptist Home Mission Society, published the book under the Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada. The HMC distributed this book with the hope that it would educate adult church members on Americanization. Brooks recognized the social import of Americanization, but for Brooks the spiritual was never far from the social. Indeed, the book was promoted alongside a compilation of Scripture passages titled *The Bible Message for the Stranger Within Our Gates* by Ida Harrison.⁵⁶

⁵⁴Horace M. Kallen, “Democracy Versus the Melting-Pot,” *The Nation*, February 18, 1915, 192.

⁵⁵Laura Gerould Craig, *America, God’s Melting-Pot: A Parable-Study* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1913), see 80 for a brief reference to “the brotherhood-of-man viewpoint.” See also Harkness, *The Church and the Immigrant*.

⁵⁶Charles Alvin Brooks, *Christian Americanization: A Task for the Churches*. Even Southern Baptists, by no means ecumenical, referenced the book in their own handbook on immigrant ministry published in the 1930s. J. F. Plainfield, *The Stranger within Our Gates* (Atlanta, GA: Home Mission Board, Southern Baptist Convention, n.d.), 87. The Home Missions Council also promoted material for young adults which included books with accompanying pictures of immigrants. The Council even suggested for its Protestant readers a drama production titled “A Pageant of Democracy.” Brooks, *Christian Americanization*, 161. See also Charles Alvin Brooks, ed., *The Church and the Foreigner: A Christian Service Program for the Local Church* (New York: American Baptist Home Mission Society, n.d.); Charles Alvin Brooks, *Through the Second Gate: Baptists in Action among New American* (New

In his book, Brooks argued that World War I served as a reality check for advocates of Americanization. He suggested that Americanization “was supposed to be an automatic process. Was not America a ‘melting pot’? . . . The war has cured us of absurd optimism.” In his consideration of Americanization and the church’s role, he defined what the principle was not. It was not tied to the war, race, the English language, American culture, or militant nationalism, nor was it nativism. Instead, Brooks argued that Americanization was something more sublime.⁵⁷

America is not a “melting pot.” It is something far more human and vital, more divine and spiritual than that. What we need to keep steadily in mind is that the process of Americanization is not the reduction of all to a common denominator but the elevation of all to the highest possible plane; to consider that each race reacts upon the other to the enrichment of all; and to endeavor to realize that the various racial stocks, thus contributing, lose their separate and distinct identity in the building of a new entity, a new race, which shall be a demonstration, in this day of grace, of the blood brotherhood of all men and the spiritual oneness of the sons of God.⁵⁸

For Brooks, Americanization was spiritual, but not in the evangelical sense. The spiritual mission of Americanization was more transcendent. Brooks’s position was not far removed from the social Darwinism defined by Herbert Spencer during the late nineteenth century, though Brooks emphasized cultural transformation rather than racial characteristics. According to Brooks, Americanization would, through an evolutionary process, produce a robust national culture out of a diverse population.⁵⁹

York: American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1922); and Florence E. Quinlan, “Some Samples from ‘The New Line,’” *Missionary Review of the World* 42 (August 1919), 612-14.

⁵⁷Brooks, *Christian Americanization*, 5-6, 9-12.

⁵⁸Ibid., 32-33.

⁵⁹The principle of social Darwinism is implicit in his consideration of the evolution of the American people. “The selection of the best among early settlers, the underlying purpose in settlement, the climate and geography of the country, the experiences and exigencies of pioneer life have all been credited with determining the type.” Ibid., 30-31. See also Phalen, 177-78.

Many denominations took Brooks's ideas to heart and sponsored Americanization programs within home missions. Yet, this was not simply a responsibility relegated to denominational staff. The Episcopal Church reminded its congregants that organized work went only so far. It announced, "Yet better and more efficient than paid advisers, is ordinary Christian neighborliness of ordinary men and women. . . . This is the real foundation of true Americanization, and the lack of it has been the root trouble. Have you been neighbors to your neighbors?"⁶⁰ For Brooks, Protestants were largely stalling Americanization because they did not open up their homes to immigrants, and in the process "lost invaluable opportunities for interpreting America." Despite the rising tide of nativism, Brooks remained hopeful, concluding, "To democratize and Christianize our contacts is to become a radiating center of the American spirit."⁶¹

Despite Brooks's admonition, Americanization in many ways reflected nativist concerns current within society at large. This is evident in a 1922 article published in the *Woman's Home Missions*, a publication of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The author began her essay by stating, "One cannot talk long on immigration without Americanization for they go hand in hand." She recognized the difficult conditions immigrants faced. With progressive flair, she also conceded that in America, "we are all immigrants." Her empathy turned to concern, however, by the end of the article. She noted, "The United States has been called the melting pot of all nations. The trouble is not all who fall into the pot melt."⁶² The *Presbyterian*, in a piece titled "A Hyphenated Allegiance," suggested that maintaining citizenship in more than one country was just as

⁶⁰Burgess, *Foreign-Born Americans*, 19.

⁶¹Brooks, *Christian Americanization*, first quote from 98; second quote from 147.

⁶²Mrs. W. H. Hickman, "Immigration," *Woman's Home Missions* 39 (November 1922), 14-15.

bad as Christians who leave the world behind and join the church, but do not “burn the bridge behind them. No more than in the days of our Lord’s mission can any man, in Church or State, serve two masters.”⁶³ In other words, the immigrant must wholeheartedly convert to American ways.

For Southern Baptists, the immigrant problem and Americanization were closely linked to two other groups that begged careful attention, African Americans and Roman Catholics. One report declared that prospects for blacks in southern urban centers were not promising since the “great congested masses of negroes in our big Southern cities are thrown . . . with the great congested masses of foreigners who know nothing about the negroes and many of whom know far less about American ideals and American Life than the negroes.” As for Catholicism, the report suggested the immigrant population in the urban South served as a wellspring for Catholicism. According to the Southern Baptist report the “twofold problem of foreigners and Catholics” reflected the “Americanization problem and the evangelization problem.” The report then suggested, “Whoever helps to solve the problem of the foreigner in our midst helps also to solve the problem of Roman Catholicism and vice versa. They are indissolubly linked together.”⁶⁴ The solution for Southern Baptists was evangelism, which only reinforced American principles. An article in the *Baptist Standard* on Italian immigrants reflected this dynamic, warning that not ministering to the foreign born was a dereliction of a “great duty.” It was, according to the article, “a double sin against God and against our beautiful land of America.”⁶⁵

⁶³“A Hyphenated Allegiance,” *The Presbyterian*, February 15, 1917, 12.

⁶⁴Aldredge, first quote from 43; second quote from 39. See also W. H. Knight, “Christianizing the Homeland,” *Baptist Standard*, March 9, 1922, 12.

⁶⁵L. M. Martucci, “Our Italian People,” *Baptist Standard*, January 31, 1918, 26.

While most Protestant home missionaries embraced the logic that Christianity and Americanization reinforced each other, some contemporaries both without and within Protestantism were more skeptical about the notion of Christian Americanization. In 1920, representatives from the FCC and Central Conference of American Rabbis met in New York City to work through Jewish concerns about Protestant Americanization. The final statement they agreed upon recognized the responsibility to “disclaim, and deplore, the use of the term ‘Americanization’ in any case where it is made to mean, or to imply, that there is no distinction between the words ‘Americanization’ and ‘Christianization,’ or carries the implication that Jews, or people of other religions and other races, are not good Americans.” This did not mean, however, that Americanization was undesirable. The Jewish and FCC representatives agreed “to co-operate with each other, as brethren, in all efforts for Americanization and for promoting righteousness in the American people.”⁶⁶ In this instance, mainline Protestant leaders were willing to stretch their definition of Americanization to include the concerns of the Jewish community.

Americanization sometimes found detractors from more conservative Protestants who were not as optimistic about Christianity’s ability to redeem the social order. Conservative and fundamentalist Christians believed in the power of individual conversion, and groups like Southern Baptists, while supporting Americanization, were not as vocal on legislative reform. Americanization, if it entailed using Christianity primarily for social ends, drew criticism from some Protestants. Writing in 1923 while teaching at Princeton Theological Seminary, J. Gresham Machen, a Presbyterian fundamentalist with a strong aversion to modernism, big government, and social gospel

⁶⁶“Jews and Christians Agree on Definition of ‘Americanization,’” *Federal Council Bulletin* 3 (April 1920), 66.

activity within his denomination, noted with a tinge of sarcasm the reception given to immigrants by a government and populace claiming Christianity. He stated, “We have attacked them by oppressive legislation or proposals of legislation, but such measures have not been altogether effective.” With tongue in cheek, Machen pondered, “It may be strange that a man should love the language that he learned at his mother’s knee, but these people do love it, and we are perplexed in our efforts to produce a unified American people.” Thus, Christian social workers were left with few options: “So religion is called in to help; we are inclined to proceed against the immigrants now with a Bible in one hand and a club in the other offering them the blessings of liberty. That is what is sometimes meant by ‘Christian Americanization.’”⁶⁷ Clearly, some conservative Protestants did not support Brooks’s form of Christian Americanization, and others instead stressed evangelism rather than using religion for what they believed was a form of social control. And for Jews, Catholics, and other non-Protestants in America, the Americanization work that home missionaries promoted could appear threatening.

Congress and Immigration Restriction

While most Protestant denominations in the United States continued to support Americanization, Congress passed legislation restricting immigration in 1917, 1921, and 1924 in part as a response to strong currents of nativism within American society. White Protestants were often caught between staunch nativists and immigrant communities. The Protestant response to the 1917 law and the literacy test it created was cool at best. According to Brooks in *Christian Americanization*, the literacy test could have unforeseen consequences. For Brooks, literacy and intellect did not guarantee that

⁶⁷J. Gresham Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism* (New York: Macmillan, 1923), 149.

desirable immigrants would enter America and assimilate. “Some very brilliant men and women of foreign birth have proved rather dangerous and with all their native capacity seem not to have assimilated the American spirit to any marked degree.”⁶⁸ The *Presbyterian* voiced similar concerns: “A man may be able to read and speak many languages, yet be a rogue; while another may not be able to read and yet be an industrious, thrifty, valuable citizen.” The article concluded that the literacy test “may increase the sharp devils and reduce the plain, honest men.”⁶⁹ At least two Baptist publications, however, *The Baptist and Reflector* and *The Home Field*, did publish material between 1915 and 1916 supporting a literacy requirement.⁷⁰

Through the Emergency Immigration Act of 1921, Congress established a temporary annual quota that admitted only 3 percent of the total population of each European nationality in America as of 1910. Similar to the 1917 legislation, this law did not garner much of a response from Protestants. The *Christian Century*, one of the leading mainline Protestant publications, did not address the law in its issues for May, when the law passed, or June.⁷¹ The *Christian Advocate* did mention the law’s passage, but without commentary.⁷² G. B. F. Hallock vaguely referenced immigration restriction in an article published in the *Presbyterian* a month prior to the bill’s passage. He suggested, “If the whole body of good people prayed as earnestly as Abraham did for Sodom, we would not have to exclude foreigners. We would evangelize them. We

⁶⁸Brooks, *Christian Americanization*, 78.

⁶⁹“The Literacy Test Bill Becomes a Law,” *The Presbyterian*, February 15, 1917, 4.

⁷⁰Phalen, 186, 188.

⁷¹*Christian Century*, May 5-June 30, 1921.

⁷²“Limited Immigration in Force Here,” *Christian Advocate*, June 9, 1921, 749.

would break the power of unrighteousness.”⁷³ Hallock’s comment was more of a critique of American Christianity than it was a response to the quota law. The 1921 law probably escaped criticism because Protestants in large part supported the idea of a quota system and believed that some form of restriction was necessary in light of recent immigration waves. The 1924 legislation, however, drew more attention from Protestant circles.

The legislation passed in 1924 outraged many Protestants, not because of the more stringent quotas it established targeting southern and eastern Europeans, but because it excluded Japanese immigrants entirely.⁷⁴ Japanese immigration had already been a topic of discussion within Protestant circles prior to the passage of the 1924 law. Sidney Gulick was a key Protestant figure on this subject. He previously served as a university professor in Kyoto for seven years and also helped form the National Committee for Constructive Immigration Legislation and the Commission on Relations with Japan.⁷⁵ With his international expertise, Gulick contributed to the immigration debate in America and even proposed a quota system as early as 1914. By 1917 he

⁷³G. B. F. Hallock, “Young People’s Prayer-Meeting,” *The Presbyterian*, April 21, 1921, 13.

⁷⁴Problems surrounding Japanese immigration had been brewing several years prior. Japanese immigration to the West Coast at the turn of the century brought workers that threatened American labor, and anti-Japanese movements began, including efforts to segregate schools. The Gentlemen’s Agreement between Theodore Roosevelt and Japan implied that Japanese in America would have access to public education and in turn Japan would decrease emigration to America. Anti-Japanese sentiments continued, however, and the Supreme Court even ruled that Japanese were ineligible for citizenship based upon race in 1922. The 1924 quota law affirmed that ruling by excluding Japanese immigrants entirely. Izumi Hirobe, *Japanese Pride, American Prejudice: Modifying the Exclusion Clause of the 1924 Immigration Act* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001), 3-13.

⁷⁵Hirobe, 5, 12-13; Sandra C. Taylor, *Advocate of Understanding: Sidney Gulick and the Search for Peace with Japan* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1984). See also Sidney L. Gulick, *Should Congress Enact Special Laws Affecting Japanese?* (New York: National Committee on American Japanese Relations, 1922).

advocated an immigration quota policy that would restrict immigration based upon each nationality's ability to assimilate, instead of race.⁷⁶

Gulick also served as secretary of the FCC's Commission on Relations with the Orient. Under Gulick's leadership, the Commission kept close watch on international relations with Asia and offered legislative proposals. The Commission even had the opportunity to present its recommendations to President Woodrow Wilson and the Foreign Relations Committee in 1917. By 1920 the Commission produced a report calling for various reforms to be made to U.S. immigration policy. It recognized that Japanese immigration was a national issue, rather than a matter that should be left to the state of California to settle. The report declared that the previous Gentlemen's Agreement that tacitly discouraged Japanese immigration should be discarded and also denounced any "race discrimination" in standards for selecting immigrants from different nations. The report, however, did acknowledge that immigration "should not exceed the number of that people that we can assimilate, Americanize and steadily employ." Moreover, the report called for reforming naturalization requirements and discarding laws discriminating against the Chinese.⁷⁷

The report then went on to describe the proper Christian response. It argued that Christians must be concerned about discriminatory laws, as they frustrated the Japanese who Christians were trying to reach. Christians must also incorporate the principles of justice and morality into the debate. The report, however, made the caveat that it was incumbent upon *individual* Christians and ministers to apply principles of justice, instead

⁷⁶Phalen, 183; Gulick, "A Comprehensive Immigration Policy," 214-23.

⁷⁷Samuel McCrea Cavert, ed., *The Churches Allied for Common Tasks: Report of the Third Quadrennium of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 1916-1920* (New York: Federal Council of the Church of Christ in America, 1921), 183, quote from 186.

of churches openly proposing legislation. Reflecting social gospel sentiments, the report concluded, “The Golden Rule must be applied. Christ’s teaching of brotherhood and its actual practice can alone solve the grave problems of races and nations that are ominously looming up before us.”⁷⁸

The Commission and its secretary, Sydney Gulick, eventually struck a nerve among nativist groups. A 1921 brief produced by the Japanese Exclusion League of California announced, “The plea of Sidney Gulick, and a number of his Christian friends, that we make citizens of the Japanese and then trust to making good citizens of them by Christianizing them, advocates an experiment dangerous in the extreme.” The author then argued that Christianity did not offer much hope, for even if the Japanese accepted Christianity, the Japanese immigrants would still retain their former Shinto beliefs. This report also discredited arguments that exclusion would hinder home and foreign missions to the Japanese. In this instance, Gulick and Protestants who advocated his moderate restriction clearly parted ways with nativists calling for the outright exclusion of Japanese immigrants.⁷⁹

Many Protestant groups criticized the Immigration Act of 1924 once they read about its treatment of Japanese immigration.⁸⁰ Based upon the principles articulated by the FCC’s Commission on Relations with the Orient in 1920, it is no surprise that this act drew outrage from various corners of American Protestantism. There were several facets to this frustration. First, Protestants remained concerned that the law would have a

⁷⁸Cavert, ed., *The Churches Allied*, 187-89, quote from 189.

⁷⁹V. S. McClatchy, *Japanese Immigration and Colonization* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921), 51-52, quote from 51.

⁸⁰For the Catholic response to immigration restriction during this time, see Richard Gribble, “The Immigration Restriction Debate, 1917-1929: Church and State in Conflict,” *Journal of Church and State*, February 16, 2016, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcs/csw001> (accessed February 7, 2017).

deleterious effect on home and foreign missions. William Axling, a former Northern Baptist missionary to Japan, argued, “This legislation has in tragic fashion put Christianity on trial in Japan. . . . It has raised great question marks against such central Christian truths as a divine Fatherhood, world brotherhood, justice, fair play and good will. It has struck the Christian movement in the Japanese empire a staggering blow.”⁸¹ Second, the principle of the brotherhood of man inspired many liberal-minded Protestants to espouse international harmony and oppose racial discrimination. Proponents of this principle believed the legislation violated this ideal by singling out the Japanese for exclusion and disregarding the sovereignty of the Japanese nation.

Finally, those who criticized the 1924 legislation on account of its treatment of Japanese immigration feared that Japan might pose a threat to international peace. Such thinking dovetailed with the push for disarmament during the early 1920s. No one wanted to see the world at war a second time. According to the *Presbyterian*, “Nothing could be more unwise than to alienate further the great Mongolian peoples at this hour of coveted peace. It would be hostile to all our professed principles of Christianity and

⁸¹“The Trend of Events,” *Herald of Gospel Liberty* 116 (October 1924), 989. Northern Baptist missionaries voiced their protest as well: “We, American citizens, members of the Japan mission of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, in annual conference assembled, wish to place ourselves on record as deploring the recent action of the congress of the United States, which results in an unjust discrimination against the people of Japan. While recognizing the need in the United States for more stringent immigration laws, we feel that the discrimination measure just passed is uncalled for and unworthy of the ideals of the American people. We are facing a situation in which America’s recent action threatens to undo the good effect of the Washington Conference and America’s generosity following the recent earthquake, jeopardizes America’s moral and spiritual influence, and not only imperils the success of the entire Christian movement in Japan, but disturbs the cooperative and friendly relations of the two great powers of the Pacific.” *The Baptist*, May 31, 1924, 436-37. See also “Exclusion and Missions,” *Missionary Review of the World* 47 (September 1924), 742; William Axling, *Japan Wonders Why?: A Challenging Chapter in American Japanese Relations* (New York: Commission on International Justice and Goodwill, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 1924), American Baptist Historical Society Archives; and Disciples of Christ, *1925 Year Book* (St. Louis, MO: United Christian Missionary Society, 1925), 104.

statesmanship.”⁸² In another issue, the *Presbyterian* suggested the 1924 legislation “forced [Japan] to look for an enlargement of their race and commercial opportunities elsewhere,” thus further perpetuating aggressive expansion.⁸³ These fears would prove to be prescient as Japan invaded China during the next decade and attacked Pearl Harbor seventeen years later.

The Northern Baptist Convention provides a good example of a Protestant denomination that protested the legislation in 1924. One editorial in the *Baptist* argued that while nations are entitled to concerns over assimilation, aggressively pursuing national agendas only encourages war. Instead, the Baptist editorial suggested, “In the family of nations there must be the interchange of common courtesies if good-will is to be preserved.” Instead, Congress chose to exclude Japanese immigrants without consulting the Japanese government. The editorial concluded that “it seems to us ill-advised to slap Japan in the face. . . . By the action of congress a problem that was largely sectional may become international and set in motion a long train of difficulties which will seriously set back the progress that was begun by the disarmament conference in Washington in 1922.”⁸⁴ Northern Baptist protest, however, was not confined to editorials alone. The president of the Northern Baptist Convention, Corwin S. Shank, was in Japan at the time Congress considered the legislation.⁸⁵ He came back to America and passionately condemned the legislation in his annual address to the convention,

⁸²“‘The Gentleman’s Agreement’ with Japan,” *The Presbyterian*, April 24, 1924, 13.

⁸³“The Japanese Army and Navy,” *The Presbyterian*, May 1, 1924, 13.

⁸⁴“Immigration and Assimilation,” *The Baptist*, April 26, 1924, 296.

⁸⁵James H. Franklin, “As Others See Us,” *The Baptist*, May 17, 1924, 383.

declaring that a Christian America must embrace the principle of brotherhood. His speech was followed by a “deafening and prolonged applause.”⁸⁶

Of course, such efforts to engage politics caught the attention of some observers who feared that institutional religion and politics were mixing. Massachusetts Congressman John H. Tinkman decried the petitions the FCC sent to legislators criticizing the legislation and argued that they abridged the separation of church and state. Speaking in defense of the FCC, General Secretary Charles S. Macfarland responded that the church must not renege on its responsibility to advocate justice. In fact, Macfarland claimed that the 1924 immigration legislation “runs counter to the efforts of the churches to maintain social justice.” Associate General Secretary Samuel McCrea Cavert went on to frame the issue as such: “The Administrative Committee of the Federal Council was in effect taking the position that all of the Church’s talk about international morality and brotherhood would be rendered sterile if it were to acquiesce” to the violation of Japanese sovereignty and previous treaty obligations. For FCC spokesmen, the church’s moral duty required it to speak to political concerns, though not tamper with legislation.⁸⁷

What is telling is that Protestants did not challenge the underlying rationale for a quota system established in the 1921 and 1924 laws, but rather focused their attention on Japanese exclusion. In 1922, the Methodist Episcopal *Woman’s Home Missions* recognized the quota law passed in 1921 “favors immigration from the northern

⁸⁶Corwin S. Shank, “Annual Address of the President of the Northern Baptist Convention,” *The Baptist*, June 7, 1924, 447-50; “The Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Northern Baptist Convention,” *The Baptist*, June 14, 1924, 475. Southern Baptist E. C. Routh, editor of the *Baptist Standard*, affirmed his northern counterpart’s criticism of the 1924 law. E. C. Routh, “The Northern Baptist Convention,” *Baptist Standard*, June 5, 1924, 7.

⁸⁷“The Trend of Events,” *Herald of Gospel Liberty* 116 (April 1924), 317. Brooks also recognized this in his book on Americanization. He wrote, “As a nation we are committed irrevocably to the separation of church and state; but that does not involve the divorcement of religion from the national life.” *Christian Americanization*, 155.

Protestant countries of Europe,” but the journal did not provide further reflection on this observation.⁸⁸ An editorial in the PC(USA) women’s *Home Mission Monthly* suggested that the 1921 legislation should be extended so that the nation could “[select] the type of immigrant that is needed and can be most readily absorbed.”⁸⁹ While mainline Protestant leaders opposed outright racial discrimination towards Japanese, they did not attack the prejudice towards southern and eastern Europeans in the quotas established in 1924.⁹⁰ This suggests Protestants generally believed restriction across the board was necessary, and were only willing to offer resistance when certain nationalities were targeted for outright exclusion. Writing in the *Reformed Church Review* in July 1924, E. H. Zaugg admitted, “I would not like to be taken as an advocate of unrestricted Japanese immigration. The admission of a large number of Japanese into our country would doubtless create a very serious race problem. But all that the Japanese desire is that they be treated on an equality with other nations.”⁹¹ For many American Protestants the total immigration during last several decades was staggering, and the predominantly Catholic and Jewish backgrounds of many of these immigrants did not set Protestant minds at ease.

⁸⁸“Editorial,” *Woman’s Home Missions* 39 (November 1922), 16.

⁸⁹“Editorial Notes,” *Home Mission Monthly* 37 (April 1922), 131.

⁹⁰Hirobe notices this as well, *Japanese Pride, American Prejudice*, 225. The executive secretary of the World Student Christian Federation did suggest quota laws should be adjusted to allow more foreign students to come to America. Muriel Day, “The Foreign Student in America,” *Woman’s Home Missions* 40 (December 1923), 8.

⁹¹E. H. Zaugg, “The Present Race Problem,” *Reformed Church Review* 3 (July 1924), 281.

The Aftermath

The 1924 Immigration Act stirred Protestant concerns and signaled a level of political commitment over immigration not seen since forty years earlier when some Protestant leaders expressed concern over the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882.⁹² After Congress passed the 1924 law and codified Japanese exclusion, American Protestant leaders continued their opposition and were inclined to keep a close eye on legislation. The FCC passed in December 1925 a statement on Japanese exclusion, continuing to criticize its diplomatic ramifications and racial basis. The Federal Council statement expressed the conviction that the “dictates of humanity and the welfare of the world demand the recognition by all governments of the brotherhood of man and the inherent right of all nations and races to treatment free from humiliation.” Despite these lofty claims, however, the statement still conceded the “need of restriction of immigration in order to conserve American standards of labor and living,” and argued that Asian immigrants should simply be held to the same quota, which would allow a paltry 350 Asian immigrants to enter the country.⁹³

Denominations also continued to protest the 1924 legislation. The Protestant Episcopal Church went on record in 1928 noting that “present immigration and naturalization laws discriminate against oriental nations and are therefore not only a hindrance to missionary work but also a barrier to good will between ourselves and these

⁹²Phalen, 76-81.

⁹³Executive Committee, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, *Declaration Regarding Asiatic Exclusion*, December 11, 1925, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America Records, box 35, folder 14, NCC RG 18.35.14, PHS.

nations.”⁹⁴ Even Southern Baptists, ever reluctant to address political matters, voted at their 1925 convention to condemn Asian exclusion, noting their desire to “prove our Christianity by exercising the spirit of brotherhood toward our Chinese brethren.” Though it acknowledged the need to restrict “undesirable immigrants,” the Southern Baptist statement concluded, “The Committee regrets that the recently enacted Immigration Law did not treat the citizens of China and Japan, as they did other nations.”⁹⁵

Meanwhile, home missions to immigrant communities and ethnic Americans continued. Efforts to evangelize and Americanize immigrants persisted, as native Protestants recognized the large foreign born population still within the nation inherited from earlier immigration. While most of the nation embraced immigration restriction, Protestants continued to support the principle of Americanization in their ministries to foreigners; it remained a viable solution for what they saw as America’s immigration problem. In the crucible of home missions, white Protestants encountered varied forms of cultural and religious pluralism. The coming decades would serve as a key period for Protestants as they continued to formulate their approach to pluralism. If the presidential election of 1928 and its Catholic candidate Al Smith is any indicator, white Protestants were still far from embracing a religious pluralism that included Catholics and Jews.⁹⁶

⁹⁴Protestant Episcopal Church, *Journal of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, 1928 (New York: Abbott Press & Mortimer-Walling, 1929), 126, 145, quote from 126.

⁹⁵Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1925), 125-26.

⁹⁶For the election of 1928 and responses to Al Smith’s candidacy, see Barry Hankins, *Jesus and Gin: Evangelicalism, the Roaring Twenties and Today’s Culture Wars* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 187-212.

Even cultural pluralism was still held in question as the nation emerged from World War I with a patriotism premised largely on Anglo-Saxon culture norms.

Conclusion

“America now has achieved almost complete isolation, by her high tariff wall, her more than half closed gates, and by her refusal to join the League of Nations,” concluded Christian professor and former immigrant Edward Steiner in 1929. “America is not to be any more the dumping-ground, refuge, or war ally of Europe. She has chosen to be her sovereign self; but no nation lives to itself or dies to itself, and her influence upon the future of mankind will continue to be a blessing or a curse, as she herself decrees.”⁹⁷ As Steiner and others observed, the United States would never be able to follow through with its isolationist agenda following World War I; continued immigration and vibrant ethnic communities made this abundantly clear. Most Americans did not find this cause for celebration, but rather concern. Protestants at the time the 1924 Immigration Act passed, however, were not knee-jerk nativists hellbent on keeping foreigners out of the country, but they were also not immune to nativist ideals. They demanded Americanization and accepted the quota system that put at a disadvantage immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. At the same time, however, some Protestant leaders were vocal advocates of justice, as seen in their defense of Japanese immigrants following the passage of the 1924 law. Protestants often coupled this hope with their Christian duties. This fervor for home missions and social gospel ideals tempered potential nativist inclinations among Protestant groups.

⁹⁷Edward A. Steiner, *The Making of a Great Race: Racial and Religious Cross-Currents in the United States* (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1929), 29.

Too often historians use the 1920s as a convenient capstone to developments in American culture. Protestant fundamentalism falls to its knees in Dayton, Tennessee, the rebirth of the Ku Klux Klan comes to an end by 1925, and the Immigration Act of 1924 marks the dissipation of concern over immigration. Yet, Protestant fundamentalism survived the 1920s by developing its own subculture, and while the Klan lost political momentum by 1925, it continued as a fragmented organization and reared its racist head again during the midcentury civil rights movement.⁹⁸ Furthermore, the legislation Congress passed in 1924, while limiting immigration, did not end public discussion over the foreigner in America or close the nation off entirely to immigration. Over the course of the next forty years, native Protestants continued their home mission work among immigrants and ethnic Americans and remained attentive to forms of pluralism.

⁹⁸For interwar Protestant fundamentalism, see Joel A. Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

CHAPTER FOUR

The Trying Thirties

“But the ‘melting pot,’ which for so many years bubbled merrily, now only simmers. . . . The first period of our national life comprised years of pioneering. The next was one of assimilation. The immediate future will be years of stabilization. That period has already started. America, in the homely parlance of the housewife, is beginning to ‘jell.’”

—Louis I. Dublin, “The American People: The Census Portrait”¹

The United States closed its gates in 1924, resulting in restriction for the next four decades. Five years after Congress passed the Immigration Act, Edward A. Steiner, a former Jewish immigrant and later Christian minister who taught Applied Christianity at Grinnell College, published *The Making of a Great Race*. Clearly meant to upend Madison Grant’s *Passing of a Great Race* published thirteen years earlier, Steiner acknowledged that racial diversity was no threat to America. In his book Steiner focused on American religion and the nation’s ethnic and cultural makeup inherited from earlier immigration. Though acknowledging the persistence of diversity, Steiner was confident in the nation’s ability to produce a “cultural homogeneity.” He concluded, “This culture will be influenced less by what the immigrant brings than by what he finds and into what he can grow.”²

¹Louis I. Dublin, “The American People: The Census Portrait,” *New York Times*, October 11, 1931.

²Steiner referred to culture as “the result of a certain form of spiritual life in the three dominant religious groups in the United States—Jews, Roman Catholics, and Protestants—and, to a lesser degree, culture as an expression of racial inheritance and national tradition.” Edward A. Steiner, *The Making of a Great Race: Racial and Religious Cross-Currents in the United States* (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1929), 7-8; Edward A. Steiner, *From Alien to Citizen: The Story of My Life in America* (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1914).

Meanwhile, other Americans were less certain that the nation could truly absorb recent immigrants. Nine years later as America trudged through the Great Depression, the President General of the Sons of the American Revolution announced over the radio that hard economic times necessitated continuing immigration restriction. He commented on the high number of legal and undocumented immigrants and stated bluntly, “American jobs should be for Americans.” He also declared that much work was still needed in the area of assimilation. He concluded, “Until they have lost their hyphens they are not assimilated.”³ Despite restriction and the supposed closure it brought to concerns over immigration, foreigners, soon joined by refugees, remained in the public eye.

Many white, native Protestants had to grapple with the competing visions of Steiner and the Sons of the American Revolution. Rather than drop immigrant mission programs entirely following the 1924 Immigration Act, Protestant home missionaries continued to focus on immigrant communities during the 1930s. While fewer immigrants entered the country, the millions of foreign born who came since the late nineteenth century were a noticeable presence in American society. Native Protestants considered this a missional challenge that must be met.⁴ Oftentimes white Protestants responded to immigrant and ethnic communities through a robust home mission program that represented a diffusion of social gospel ideals with evangelistic aspirations, resulting in an often ambivalent attitude towards pluralism. Social gospel principles from decades prior beset societal prejudices and beckoned a vision for brotherhood that for some

³Messmore Kendall, “America’s Place in International Affairs,” *Vital Speeches of the Day*, December 15, 1938, 159.

⁴See Hermann N. Morse, ed., *Home Missions Today and Tomorrow: A Review and Forecast* (New York: Home Missions Council, 1934), 123-24.

Protestants included the immigrant, and commingled with these social gospel aspirations was the traditional gospel message of a relationship with Jesus Christ. The denominational ministries of Northern Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and even Southern Baptists, to an extent, reflected these dynamics.⁵

Home Missions and Social Concern

Christian home missions offered a point of contact between white Protestants and immigrant communities that joined social work with the evangelical mainstays of evangelism and religious education. Christian missionaries on the home front believed their message resonated with the immigrant. One missionary, after spending time with a Greek immigrant who had obtained a collection of Bible stories, recalled, “The first one is of Abraham making a home in a new country for his family. She appreciated that for she too was a stranger in a strange land.”⁶

The social gospel inheritance was a central component of Protestant home missions during the interwar years, including programs directed towards “strangers.” The mainstays of settlement house work and port-of-entry ministries remained strong into the 1930s. The Home Missions Council (HMC) sponsored 533 community centers employing 1,240 staff by 1935.⁷ The Protestant Episcopal Church maintained settlement houses in seventeen locales, including centers in Alabama, Los Angeles, Chicago, and

⁵Together, the church membership of these denominations reflected nearly 10 percent of the U.S. population during the 1930s. This percentage is based upon the 1936 Census of Religious Bodies and overall 1940 Census for the Continental United States. United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Religious Bodies: 1936, Vol. I, Summary and Detailed Tables* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941), 19; United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States, 1789-1945* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1949), 25.

⁶Mary Martin Kinney, *The World at My Door* (Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1938), 76.

⁷Hermann N. Morse, *Toward a Christian America: The Contribution of Home Missions* (New York: Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement, 1935), 162.

New York.⁸ Episcopal women continued their efforts on Ellis Island, and Methodists on the West Coast conducted similar programs on Angel Island.⁹ Social gospel language also permeated Protestant endeavors. References to the “brotherhood of man,” or at least its implication, reflect the continued presence of the social Christianity prevalent during the Progressive era. The Episcopal Church in 1931 declared, “Essentially, a democracy is the political expression of the spirit of human brotherhood. It ought, therefore to mean, always, a development of the sense of social and community responsibility and duty.”¹⁰ Hermann Morse, a Presbyterian home missionary since 1912 and leader within the HMC, also challenged the practice of racially and ethnically segregated churches on the basis of the “universality of Christian brotherhood.”¹¹

But Protestant work among immigrants diffused these social gospel ideals with the traditional evangelistic message that had always been at the heart of Protestant missions. At the forefront of Protestant denominations who sponsored evangelistic

⁸Episcopal Church, “Church Settlements,” *Living Church Annual, Year Book of the Episcopal Church, 1935* (Milwaukee, WI: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1934), 137.

⁹Diocese of New York, *Journal of the One Hundred and Fifty-Sixth Convention of the Diocese of New York, New York: Synod Hall, May 9, 10, 1939*, 146, Archives of the Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas; Woman’s Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, *Fifty-Fifth Annual Report, For the Year 1935-1936* (Cincinnati, OH: Woman’s Home Missionary Society, Methodist Episcopal Church, n.d.), 159.

¹⁰Protestant Episcopal Church, *Journal of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, 1931* (Saint Louis, MO: Frederick Printing and Stationary Co., 1932), 546, Archives of the Episcopal Church.

¹¹Morse, *Toward a Christian America*, 105. Hermann N. Morse was an articulate advocate for immigrant ministry. He served the Presbyterian Church U.S.A.’s home mission department starting in 1912 and later become the chairman of the Five-Year Program of Survey and Adjustment sponsored by the HMC, Council of Women for Home Missions, Federal Council of Churches, and Community Church Workers. Morse was a dauntless advocate for home missions, and was convinced that the fate of the nation was tied to Protestant efforts. Morse edited *Home Missions Today and Tomorrow* published in 1934. The report, a product of the Five-Year Program, provided a detailed analysis of home mission work among immigrant groups in America. Morse, ed., *Home Missions Today and Tomorrow*, viii-ix, 122-61; *Toward a Christian America*, iv. I would like to especially thank historian Mark Edwards for bringing Morse and the Home Missions Council to my attention.

missions were Southern Baptists. Often Southern Baptists prioritized evangelism well above social ministry. One report asserted, “Social programs will not rebuild the world. If we turn our holy faith into a social gospel, . . . we turn our backs on . . . the fearful and universal fact of sin and man’s desperate need for redemption.”¹² Southern Baptists, however, were not alone in stressing evangelism. The Episcopal Church and Methodist Episcopal Church both sponsored Commissions on Evangelism, and most other mainline Protestant denominations continued to stress a message of conversion. The Federal Council of Churches (FCC) even maintained a department devoted to evangelism.¹³

By the 1930s most Protestant interpretations of evangelism included a social component. A report sponsored by multiple mainline home mission organizations acknowledged in 1934 that New Testament forms of evangelism were essential. But rather than resort simply to sharing the Gospel message by word of mouth, the report called for a multifaceted interpretation of evangelism and stressed the social significance of personal salvation.¹⁴

Christ expected that from a redeemed personality would come a redeemed society, that the love which He awakens in the heart of the individual will always express itself socially. . . . There is no conflict in New Testament Christianity between personal regeneration and social regeneration, between evangelism and social service. They must go together in the program of the Christian Church if the Kingdom of God is to come into the life of the nation and into the life of the world.¹⁵

¹²“A Vital Gospel,” *Home Missions* (Southern Baptist) 9 (February 1938), 2.

¹³For the Methodist Department of Evangelism and General Conference Commission on Evangelism, see Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journal of the Thirty-First Delegated General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, ed. John M. Arters (New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1932), 575, 713-15; Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journal of the Thirty-Second Delegated General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, ed. John M. Arters (New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1936), 967.

¹⁴The report identified the following categories: Open-Air, Printed Page, Laymen, Industrial and Social, Personal, Rural, Pastoral and Visitation, Preaching Mission, Educational Evangelism, and Youth. Morse, ed., *Home Missions Today and Tomorrow*, 265-75, quote from 269.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 269.

Such an interpretation of evangelism reflects the gradual spreading of social gospel aspirations to the lower reaches of the Protestant church. Social concern had always been part and parcel with the evangelistic agenda of Protestants in America, but during the first half of the twentieth century, notions of evangelism alongside more concerted, structural social reform took new forms. A diffusion of social gospel tenants with the traditional gospel message was occurring. No longer did social gospel ideals remain the domain of theologians distant from the average Protestant in the pew, nor were social gospel tenants only the refrain of groups at the forefront of social protest. In many respects, what historian Susan Curtis identifies as the commodification of the social gospel had been realized by the 1930s, and the notions of advancing the Kingdom of God through social reform and brotherly love were repackaged for the regular Protestant church member during the interwar period.¹⁶

This hybrid form of home mission was ubiquitous among Protestant denominations during the 1930s, especially within their work with immigrants. A section of a Presbyterian program that considered Mexican missions demonstrated this diffusion of the social gospel with traditional evangelism when it noted, “The soul of man must be saved. But how, if the body and the spirit of the man are crushed by a cruel and heartless social and industrial order?”¹⁷ Even with a more overtly evangelistic emphasis, Southern

¹⁶Heath W. Carter, *Union Made: Working People and the Rise of Social Christianity in Chicago* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015); Susan Curtis, *A Consuming Faith: The Social Gospel and Modern American Culture* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991).

¹⁷Board of National Missions, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. [hereafter PC(USA)], *The Church in the Changing City* (New York: Board of National Missions, PC(USA), 1938), 27, United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 10, folder 5, RG 301.7.10.5, Presbyterian Historical Society (hereafter PHS), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Baptists did not avoid social concerns.¹⁸ They tied to evangelization the notion of a “Christian America,” sponsored Americanization among immigrants, and recognized that home missionaries were not only religious, but also cultural interpreters to foreigners who came to America.¹⁹ This missiology was often manifested through the community center work directed towards immigrants, where religious and social concern went hand in hand. Morse recognized that the work of Protestant community centers drew upon the earlier settlement house movement, but he asserted they were “much more definitely and avowedly religious.”²⁰ Clearly, at the level of home missions, the social gospel promoted at the turn of the century had not displaced the evangelical task of sharing the gospel, contrary to the fears of fundamentalist Protestants at the time. Instead, evangelism continued, but with broader perceptions of its social significance.

While this melding of the social gospel with evangelistic missions was a component of the Protestant home mission programs, this missional orientation was also the result of immigrants who practiced traditional forms of Christianity while settling in America. This process reflects the trends historian Philip Jenkins identifies by the end of the twentieth century whereby southern hemispheric Christianity and its traditional, more conservative theology and religious practice were returning to western nations and

¹⁸Keith Harper argues that Southern Baptists practiced multiple forms of “social Christianity” in their missions work at the turn of the twentieth century. *The Quality of Mercy: Southern Baptists and Social Christianity, 1890-1920* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1996).

¹⁹See J. F. Plainfield, *The Stranger Within Our Gates* (Atlanta, GA: Home Mission Board, SBC, [1938?]). See also Una Roberts Lawrence, “Kingdom News,” *Home Missions* (Southern Baptist) 9 (March 1938), 4.

²⁰Morse, *Toward a Christian America*, 163; see also Morse, ed., *Home Missions Today and Tomorrow*, 136.

shaping Christianity there.²¹ This process was already occurring incrementally by the early twentieth century as immigrant groups came practicing more traditional forms of Christianity at a time when American mainline leaders were turning to more liberal theology and progressive agendas. According to mainline reports, Protestant “evangelical” work among Italians was largely an internal affair. A report produced by the Survey Committee on Italian Evangelization acknowledged “the fact that the initial drive came very largely from the awakened purpose and passion of the Italians themselves has led to the conclusion that what we have is an Evangelical Movement among Italians and not a missionary project thrust by Americans from outside on an unreceptive population.”²² This process largely explains the evangelistic nature of work among Spanish-speaking groups in the Southwest as well.

Much of the work white, native Protestants conducted among immigrant communities occurred through denominational channels. Southern Baptists facilitated a sweeping home mission program, working among Spanish-speaking populations, Italians, Chinese (particularly in the Mississippi Delta), Jews, and immigrants in urban communities as far north as Illinois. Despite being based in the more rural South, and thus with less of a context for immigration, Southern Baptists claimed they had before

²¹Philip Jenkins, *The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity*, Revised and Expanded Edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

²²The report was sponsored by the Federation of Churches of Greater New York and Brooklyn Church and Mission Federation, and published by the Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church(USA). Henry D. Jones, *The Evangelical Movement among Italians in New York City: A Study* (New York: Unit for City, Immigrant and Industrial Work Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church, 1935), in *Protestant Evangelism among Italians in America*, ed. Francesco Cordasco, et al. (New York: Arno Press, 1975), 4.

them “nearly five million foreigners from twenty-nine countries.”²³ By the 1930s, Southern Baptists, like most other denominations, employed immigrants themselves to help facilitate their work. Joseph Gartenhaus, a convert from Judaism and immigrant from Austria, led Southern Baptist work among Jews, a predominantly immigrant group at this time.²⁴ Another example was Donato Ruiz, who worked for the Southern Baptist Home Mission Board in Texas. Earlier in life, he had a Protestant conversion while in Mexico and was temporarily jailed due to connections he had with two American missionaries believed to be spies, but he was later released, remarkably on account of a man who took his place and was eventually executed. Once free in the United States, Ruiz conducted expansive missions work in the central Texas town of San Angelo. He broadcasted a radio program three nights a week in which he preached in Spanish, and his wife led the San Angelo Mexican Baptist Church choir. The radio program reportedly reached as far off as El Paso and northern Mexico, blurring the boundaries of foreign and home missions.²⁵

Perhaps the most prominent Southern Baptist home missionary who promoted immigrant work was Joseph Piani. Piani trained for the Catholic priesthood earlier in life at a Salesian seminary in northern Italy. He later traveled to Brazil as a Catholic

²³The February issue of *Home Missions* in 1938 provides a good example of the many fronts of Southern Baptist work among foreigners. *Home Missions* 9 (February 1938).

²⁴Lauren E. Wheeler, “Southern Baptists and Their Missions to Jews: 1930-1960,” unpublished paper, Baylor University, 2012; Jacob Gartenhaus Collection, AR 759, Southern Baptist Historical Library and Archives, Nashville, Tennessee. Gartenhaus wrote often within *Home Missions* during the 1930s and also published several books. For examples of Jewish responses to his work, see Chas. H. Joseph, “Random Thoughts,” *Jewish Criterion*, August 23, 1929, 12-13; Chas. H. Joseph, “Random Thoughts,” *Jewish Criterion*, September 20, 1929, 8-9; Chas. H. Joseph, “Random Thoughts,” *Jewish Criterion*, April 1, 1932, 6, 39; Chas. H. Joseph, “Random Thoughts,” *Jewish Criterion*, May 13, 1932, 6.

²⁵Una Roberts Lawrence, *Winning the Border: Baptist Missions among the Spanish-Speaking Peoples of the Border* (Atlanta, GA: Home Mission Board, SBC, 1935), 125-29. See also “D. Ruiz Describes Fruitful Months in Mexican Missions,” *Home Missions* (Southern Baptist) 9 (April 1938), 6; “Home Missionaries on the Air,” *Home Missions* (Southern Baptist) 9 (April 1938), 15.

missionary, but there began to doubt his Catholic faith and chose to become Baptist. He then immigrated to the United States in 1906. While his brother eventually became the Archbishop of the Philippines, Piani remained Baptist and eventually changed his name to Plainfield when he was naturalized. He would go on to study at Southern Baptist Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, where he completed a doctoral thesis in theology in 1911. With his particular background, Plainfield offered valuable insight for Southern Baptists seeking to reach their immigrant neighbors. Plainfield completed a manual by 1938 for Southern Baptists on missions work to immigrants, titled *The Stranger Within Our Gates*.²⁶

Within this text Plainfield called for both concerted evangelism and Americanization, whereby the Southern Baptist was an “interpreter of the Gospel and of America to the foreigners.” While his evangelistic agenda far outpaced many mainline home missionaries, his appeal to Americanization was not far removed from other Protestant contemporaries. Plainfield quoted Charles A. Brooks’s *Christian Americanization* in the Southern Baptist manual and referenced other mainline voices, while occasionally mentioning the kingdom of God and brotherhood of man. Plainfield believed immigrants posed a challenge in the form of a “conflict of interests.” For Plainfield, the solution was home missions: “It can be done largely by training the foreigners and their children the obligations of American citizenship over and above any

²⁶Plainfield, *The Stranger Within Our Gates*; Joseph Frank Plainfield Papers, AR 821, Southern Baptist Historical Library and Archives. Plainfield wrote periodically in *Home Missions*; see especially “Heart Hungers Brought Europeans to America,” *Home Missions* (Southern Baptist) 9 (March 1938), 10-12. For a response to his book *The Stranger Within Our Gates*, see “Helps for a Home Mission Program,” *Home Missions* (Southern Baptist) 9 (February 1938), 15.

other foreign obligation, and by teaching all Americans to be patient, sympathetic and kind to the foreigners in their midst. It is peculiarly a Home Mission task.”²⁷

Northern Baptists, much more comfortable with ecumenical and progressive Protestantism than their southern counterparts, also sponsored multiple fronts of missions work among immigrants. These included foreign-language churches and associations, mission centers, and settlement houses. One report claimed that as of 1933, Northern Baptists maintained 101 centers for Slavic people, 46 for Italians, 31 for Magyars (Hungarians), and 69 for Mexicans. These endeavors were often led by immigrant ministers themselves, particularly among Italians.²⁸ In a speech before the Italian Baptist Association in Brooklyn, the Baptist Reverend A. Di Domenica outlined an expansive Baptist movement among Italians in New York in recent decades, including industrial classes, Sunday Schools, evening English classes, street preaching, Christian Centers, and stereopticon slides. Di Domenica observed, however, that many programs were steadily declining, largely on account of reduced immigration and increasing competition with other social service providers (e.g., public schools). Yet, he acknowledged that Protestant work among Italians was still fruitful: the immigrants who returned to Italy carried with them their Protestant faith; Italian Protestants were less prone to commit capital crimes; they “enrich[ed] American churches”; and Protestant work among Italians strengthened home life and reduced divorce rates. And in his remarks, Di Domenica

²⁷Plainfield, *The Stranger Within Our Gates*, 11, 20-21, 41, 55. Plainfield quoted Charles A. Brooks’s *Christian Americanization* in the Southern Baptist manual and referenced other mainline voices, while occasionally mentioning the kingdom of God and brotherhood of man.

²⁸See Jones, *The Evangelical Movement Among Italians*.

advocated an evangelistic approach, “following the method of Jesus in dealing with individuals and not with the masses as the lovers of cold statistics would wish to see.”²⁹

In many respects, women were at the forefront of Northern Baptist missions to immigrants. They channeled this portion of their work through a ministry formed in 1919 that they labeled Christian Americanization, later renamed Christian Friendliness in 1936. Christian Friendliness missionaries worked according to the guiding principle: “For active good will, mutual understanding and Christian fellowship between individuals and groups of different national background.” This organization was denominationally supported, but structured in a way that allowed for more local involvement and leadership, with a special emphasis on personal engagement indicative of the evangelical heritage of Baptists. Christian Friendliness executive secretary Mary Martin Kinney outlined their work in *The World at My Door*, published in 1938. Her description reflects both an optimistic penchant for social reform and continued stress upon personal conversion as they worked with foreigners.³⁰

The women who served the Christian Friendliness ministry devoted their time to assisting immigrant women, and often promoted traditional roles for women and family life. Kinney was keen to note in her assessment, “Mothers in the foreign families were often more seriously handicapped than the men and children.” For Kinney, women did not have the same opportunities to learn English, as did the men while working and the children at school. Kinney noted that Northern Baptist women also encountered other

²⁹“Foreign Language Churches and Missions,” August 16, 1933; A. Di. Domenica, “Retrospect and Prospect of Our Work,” 35th Annual Convention Italian Baptist Association, Brooklyn, N.Y., September 12-14, 1933, “Protestant Home Missions to Catholic Immigrants”—Abel Corresp—FASmith re impressions, 43-3, ABHMS, G. Pitt Beers, American Baptist Historical Society Archives, Atlanta, Georgia.

³⁰Beverly Carlson, “Chronology of the American Baptist Churches, USA,” *American Baptist Quarterly* 14, no. 2 (June 1995): 146; Kinney, *The World at My Door*, 20, 167-77, quote from 176.

needs in their work: “There was the Mexican wife whose husband wanted her to find out how to make American pie. Then there was the mother who said in bewilderment, ‘Babee—no grow—no seeck—jus no grow.’” Christian Friendliness work at times circumscribed more paternalistic forms of ministry. Rather than becoming the “Lady Bountiful bestowing knowledge,” Kinney suggested, “The kind of courtesy most acceptable is not that which *does* for people; it is the courtesy that makes it possible for friends to *do things together*.” But efforts to counsel immigrant women in “baby care” toed the line of paternalism and were likely an attempt to inculcate American childrearing practices. Finally, as Christian Friendliness workers aided immigrant women, they hoped that through their relationships they would also inspire men and youth to take part in the church.³¹

The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. [PC(USA)] also worked diligently among immigrant communities under the umbrella of its National Missions program. During the interwar period, Presbyterians recognized a miniscule increase in immigration, but noted the real challenge was in assimilating the children of former immigrants who came over before World War I. Their work stressed the importance of generational awareness and language aptitude, and they sponsored work among Italians, Hungarians, Jews, Mexicans, Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos. Through their missions endeavors, they held out hope that foreign language churches would eventually become “self-sustaining,” despite the challenges they faced. Like most of their other Protestant counterparts, Presbyterians also promoted neighborhood houses. A neighborhood house conference hosted by Presbyterians in 1937 described the breadth of their work, which included “the

³¹Kinney, *The World at My Door*, 43-44, 128, 167-68, 170-71, 174; first quote from 167; second quote from 171; third quote from 128; fourth quote from 171.

experience of a polyglot neighborhood in Baltimore along with that of a Russian community in San Francisco, and a home of neighborly service in a congested Mexican quarter of Los Angeles.” Between 1935 and 1936 alone, Presbyterians budgeted \$505,280 for their work among the foreign population.³²

The Episcopal Church ministered to immigrants in ways similar to its fellow Protestants, and the 1930s proved to be a period of continued focus on immigrant communities. There remained an Episcopal missionary active on Ellis Island to reach out to the immigrant and refugee coming from Europe. The New York Diocese that sponsored Ellis Island work reported in 1934 that 927 immigrants were assisted that year.³³ But Episcopalians also recognized newer sources of immigration. In 1935, the Episcopal Church conceded, “Only recently have we begun to realize that our Church has some responsibility for evangelization of the Orientals in America. The Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos, most of whom live on the Pacific coast, constitute a problem of national importance.” The Episcopal Church then noted, “We are beginning a work with the Mexican people who are coming across the border in large numbers.” With these foreign populations in their midst, Episcopalians felt it was their national and Christian duty to help them assimilate. “We owe it to the alien in our midst as well as to our

³²Board of National Missions, PC(USA), *The Church in the Changing City*, 3, 10-20, 24-32; first quote from 12; second quote from 13; United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 10, folder 5, RG 301.7.10.5, PHS.

³³Diocese of New York, *Journal of the One Hundred and Fifty-First Convention of the Diocese of New York, New York: Synod Hall, May 8, 9, 1934*, 202; Diocese of New York, *Journal of the One Hundred and Fifty-Sixth Convention*, 146, Archives of the Episcopal Church.

country that he be trained with a Christian purpose for the responsibilities of citizenship.”³⁴

Finally, the Methodist Episcopal Church remained committed to ministering to immigrants as an extension of its home missions. In 1932 Methodists noted the urban tensions created by earlier immigration: “The American city is a cross-section of all nationalities. . . . In these situations and until the process of amalgamation has been completed, race prejudice and hatred constantly appear.” Determined to face this challenge, Methodists conducted work along several fronts. During the 1930s, Methodists sponsored home missions among Japanese and Chinese Methodists on the West Coast. A 1932 report noted that work among the Japanese “stresses aggressive evangelism, self-support, buildings and equipment, second generation work, and international relations, contemplating a revision of the unjust exclusion act.” A Chinese Home in San Francisco assisted 35 young female residents and 125 kindergarten students. Methodists also focused on the Spanish-speaking population, Filipinos, Italians, and the fruits of American imperialism, Hawaii and Puerto Rico. And the Methodist Woman’s Home Missionary Society remained devoted to domestic work among the immigrant population; in its description of activities, the Society reported that “[a]ll settlements contribute to the training in Christian citizenship of the foreigner in our country.” Among its many programs was assistance to immigrant girls arriving in New York, Boston, and Angel Island on the West Coast. Methodists also ran schools, clinics,

³⁴Episcopal Church, “National Council, Department of Domestic Missions,” *Living Church Annual, Year Book of the Episcopal Church, 1935*, 443-44. See also Thomas Burgess, “Decennial Report of the Foreign-Born Americans Division” and W. C. Emhardt, “Report of the Field Director, Foreign-Born Americans Division,” *Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Original Minutes, Meeting of the National Council, Apr. 30, May 1, 1930*, 66-73, Archives of the Episcopal Church.

settlement houses, and community centers, including locations in Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and Pennsylvania to “teach American ideals and Christian citizenship to the foreign-born” working in local mines. Indicative of contemporary conditions, Methodists in 1932 did choose, however, to discontinue publishing foreign language material in light of immigration restriction, the Great Depression, and the fact that more immigrants were using English.³⁵

Despite the continuity of mission and practice among denominational programs, some denominations claimed that they were in a better position to serve certain immigrant church networks in the United States than other Protestant organizations. Presbyterians maintained that they were well-suited theologically to assist members of the Reformed Church of Hungary who had moved to the United States.³⁶ The Southern Baptist preacher Plainfield concluded that Baptists also supported a distinctive mission to immigrants: “Being the champions of religious freedom and democracy, professing no allegiance of the soul to any human authority, and recognizing no creed formulated by man, Baptists with the Bible can make a very strong appeal to the conscience of the foreigners.”³⁷ American Protestants, despite the ecumenical spirit of the age, still retained denominational identities.

The Episcopal Church demonstrated a strong affinity to various Orthodox groups in America, including the Russian Orthodox Church, Greek Orthodox Church, Serbian

³⁵Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journal of the Thirty-First Delegated General Conference*, 575, 1252-1304, 1480-81; first quote from 1260; second quote from 1284; third quote from 756; Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journal of the Thirty-Second Delegated General Conference*, 953-1013; fourth quote from 1010.

³⁶Board of National Missions, PC(USA), *The Church in the Changing City*, 12, United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 10, folder 5, RG 301.7.10.5, PHS.

³⁷Plainfield, *The Stranger Within Our Gates*, 96.

Orthodox Church, Armenian Apostolic Church, and Polish National Catholic Church.³⁸ This relationship reflected a trend during the 1920s and 1930s among the Episcopalians' counterparts across the Atlantic in the Church of England. Anglican leaders during the interwar period aimed to facilitate ecumenical ties with Orthodox leaders displaced by developments in Russia, eastern Europe, and the Middle East.³⁹ The Episcopal Church considered itself a steward of these transplanted Orthodox churches in America. This was demonstrated when the Armenian Archbishop Leon Tourian was assassinated in New York City in 1933. One Episcopal report commented that "the Protestant Episcopal Church lost a sincere friend and the Armenian Church a gifted leader." The Episcopal cathedral in New York City provided its sanctuary for the funeral service, for which the Episcopal sponsors had to open up the nave, crossing, and choir sections inside the church for the fifteen thousand people who attended the Armenian Archbishop's funeral.⁴⁰

While Protestant denominations maintained specific ministries within their own organizations, oftentimes during the interwar period, mainline Protestant denominations

³⁸"Foreign Churches in America with Which the Episcopal Church is Co-operating," *Living Church Annual, Churchman's Year Book, and American Church Almanac, 1931* (Milwaukee, WI: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1931); Burgess, "Decennial Report," and Emhardt, "Report of the Field Director," *Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Original Minutes, Meeting of the National Council, Apr. 30, May 1, 1930*, 68, 72-73, Archives of the Episcopal Church.

³⁹Bryn Geffert, *Eastern Orthodox and Anglicans: Diplomacy, Theology, and the Politics of Interwar Ecumenism* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010). During this time, other mainline American Protestants began cooperating with Orthodox churches. According to a Christian Friendliness missionary working with a Greek family in Chicago, "it was easy for a Greek Orthodox Christian and a Baptist to pray together." Kinney, *The World at My Door*, 76. Much of this presaged later inclusion of Orthodox Christians within the National Council of Churches.

⁴⁰Episcopal Church, *The Annual Report of the National Council for the Year 1933, The Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America*, 75; Diocese of New York, *Journal of the One Hundred and Fifty-First Convention*, 102, Archives of the Episcopal Church.

conferred with one another on home missions. Ecumenical Protestant work, centered in the Federal Council of Churches, provided much momentum for mainline American Protestantism by the 1930s.⁴¹ A conference of Christian social workers held in Chicago towards the end of 1932, referred to as the Interdenominational Conference on the City and the Church in the Present Crisis, serves as an example. The HMC, Council of Women for Home Missions, Chicago Church Federation, and FCC all sponsored the event. Over four hundred people took part, and the conference included multiple scholars, prominent ministers and church leaders, a Chicago attorney, dean of the Rockefeller Memorial Chapel at the University of Chicago, and the social gospel stalwart Jane Addams, who spoke on the challenges of diversity in the city, having just received the Nobel Peace Prize the year before. The continuity and diffusion of the social gospel with evangelistic missions was manifested at this conference. The final conference reports proclaimed, “Preaching which thus bases itself upon human need, and endeavors to bring men and women to seek the consolation and power of the Christian gospel, is evangelistic in the very best sense.” The conference agreed, “In our work with individual New Americans we recognize two methods of approach,—the religious and social service, as complementary to each other, and as very practical and effective.”⁴² Overall,

⁴¹See North American Home Missions Congress, *Reports of Commissions, Addresses and Findings, Washington, D.C., December 1-5, 1930* (1930). For home missions to immigrants, see x-xi, 34-35, 75-79, 83, 91-96, 114-15. See also Arthur V. Casselman, *Making America Christian: A Guide in the Study of the Home Mission of the Church Based on the Research and Findings of the North American Home Missions Congress, Washington, D. C., December 1-5, 1930* (New York: Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement, 1930), 47-51, 68-72.

⁴²Home Missions Council and Council of Women for Home Missions, *Findings of the Interdenominational Conference on the City and the Church in the Present Crisis, Chicago, Illinois, November 29, 30, December 1, 2, 1932*, quote from 7, United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 10, folder 2, RG 301.7.10.2, PHS.

the conference incorporated a social science approach to ministry inherited from the earlier days of the social gospel, alongside the mission to share the Gospel of Christ.

Whether denominational or ecumenical, most home mission programs during the interwar period were adjusted to account for generational dynamics Protestants perceived were at work among recent immigrants. By the 1930s, often at the center of home missions among immigrant communities was a strong focus on the children of immigrant parents. The Methodist General Conference declared in 1936, “The children of the second and third generations of the immigrants are now accessible to the gospel of Jesus Christ as they have never been before.”⁴³ For Southern Baptist home missionary Una Roberts Lawrence, the later immigrant generations had proven their national loyalty during World War I. Speaking of Mexican immigrants along the southern border, Lawrence commented, “Like them, the Mexican boy was unconscious of any national or racial peculiarity. He was simply an American, eager to do his part, willing to die if need be for his country. Many of them did die. Many came back with wounds that make them living sacrifices to their country’s call.”⁴⁴ Reflecting the contemporary theory outlined by the scholar Marcus Hansen, Protestants had faith that the second generation was consistently learning English and accepting American cultural norms.⁴⁵ Thus, many

⁴³Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journal of the Thirty-Second Delegated General Conference*, 439. See also 976-77, 994.

⁴⁴Lawrence, *Winning the Border*, 52-53.

⁴⁵Marcus L. Hansen, *The Problem of the Third Generation Immigrant* (Rock Island, IL: Augustana Historical Society, 1938); Jay P. Dolan, “Immigration and American Christianity: A History of Their Histories,” in *A Century of Church History: The Legacy of Philip Schaff*, edited by Henry W. Bowden (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1988), 126-27; James P. Shenton and Kevin Kenny, “Ethnicity and Immigration,” in *The New American History*, Revised and Expanded Edition, ed. Eric Foner (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997), 363; Peter Kivisto and Dag Blanck, eds., *American Immigrants and Their Generations: Studies and Commentaries on the Hansen Thesis after Fifty Years* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990). See also Marcus Lee Hansen and Arthur M. Schlesinger, *The Immigrant in American History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940).

programs targeted immigrant youth less inclined to use their parents' native tongue, and Protestant home missionaries either assumed the second generation was already proficient in English or provided English instruction to facilitate further assimilation.⁴⁶ Kinney repeatedly noted the legacy of succeeding generations of immigrants. She observed, "Living in two worlds, attempting to make of two cultures something finer than either, keeping one's roots in the old while still having as many contacts as possible with the new, is far from easy. These are the youth who need the confidence and encouragement that older Americans can give, if they will."⁴⁷ According to native Protestants, as the second and third generations assimilated and learned English, there was less of a need for separate churches. "Twenty years ago we began to give large and worth-while emphasis to the foreign-language peoples. We now must definitely turn to the English-speaking children of these people. This cannot be done solely with foreign-speaking churches."⁴⁸ Within the complicated process of immigrant settlement and acculturation, Protestants believed the younger generations were dislocated and in need of religious guidance. The 1932 Chicago Conference lamented that many immigrants "have lost interest in the faith of their fathers"; thus, native Protestants felt they had a mandate to "mak[e] religion more effective in the life of New American youth."⁴⁹

⁴⁶See Presbyterian work among Chinese youth on Pacific Coast. Board of National Missions, PC(USA), *Oriental in an Occidental Church* (New York: Board of National Missions, PC(USA), 1938), United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 10, folder 21, RG 301.7.10.21, PHS; Board of National Missions, PC(USA), *The Church in the Changing City*, 3, 10-20, 24-32, United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 10, folder 5, RG 301.7.10.5, PHS. See also Jones, *The Evangelical Movement among Italians*, 29, 31, 36-37.

⁴⁷Kinney, *The World at My Door*, 150. See also 18.

⁴⁸Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journal of the Thirty-Second Delegated General Conference*, 976-77.

⁴⁹Home Missions Council and Council of Women for Home Missions, *Findings of the Interdenominational Conference*, 14, United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission

While the second generation provided its own challenges, the catastrophic economic crisis of the 1930s also tested Protestant home missions.⁵⁰ The Episcopal Church began to retrench spending and divert more responsibility to local dioceses. The denomination's Foreign-Born Americans Division was dissolved in 1930, probably more on account of declining immigration, but its work was already declining at the start of the Great Depression. In 1924 the Episcopal Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society spent \$47,011 on work among the foreign-born. By 1930 when it was closed, this was nearly cut in half to \$27,566.⁵¹ Southern Baptists had their hands tied during the 1930s on account of increasing debt during the 1920s and the embezzlement of over \$900,000 by the Home Mission Board's treasurer in 1928. The depression only compounded these issues. In 1927, the combined total of Home Mission Board spending for ministry to immigrants, Native Americans, and African Americans was \$104,839, but by 1935, this was reduced to \$38,055.⁵² By 1932 the Methodist Episcopal Church had to combine

Development Records, box 10, folder 2, RG 301.7.10.2, PHS; Board of National Missions, PC(USA), *The Church in the Changing City*, 14, United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 10, folder 5, RG 301.7.10.5, PHS.

⁵⁰For more on American religion during the Great Depression, see Kevin M. Kruse, *One Nation Under God: How Corporate America Invented Christian America* (New York: Basic Books, 2015); Alison Collis Greene, *No Depression in Heaven: The Great Depression, the New Deal, and the Transformation of Religion in the Delta* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016); and Kevin M. Lowe, *Baptized with the Soil: Christian Agrarians and the Crusade for Rural America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015).

⁵¹Episcopal Church, *Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Original Minutes, Meeting of the National Council, Feb. 12-13, 1930*, 112-13; Episcopal Church, *Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Original Minutes, Meeting of the National Council, Apr. 25, 26, 1939*, 55; Episcopal Church, *The Annual Report of the National Council for the Year 1930, The Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America*, 7, 13, 15; Episcopal Church, *The Annual Report of the National Council for the Year 1924, The Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America*, 13, Archives of the Episcopal Church. See also Episcopal Church, "National Council, Department of Domestic Missions," *Living Church Annual, Year Book of the Episcopal Church, 1935*, 443-46.

⁵²J. B. Lawrence, *History of the Home Mission Board* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1958), 110, 114-128, 133-34 ; Lawrence, *Winning the Border*, 139-41; Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the*

several departments conducting work among immigrant groups to help with funding and to cut down on the number of superintendents employed by the denomination. The Methodist Board of Home Missions and Church Extension also reassigned some immigrant ministries to district superintendents. In keeping with trends among other Protestant denominations, total disbursements for Methodist Home Missions and Church Extension went from \$2.5 million in 1928 to \$1.03 million in 1935.⁵³ Finally, for some Protestant groups, the economic challenges of the 1930s only heightened the need for more ecumenical work.⁵⁴

Despite the economic setbacks, home missions continued. The global context of the interwar period made international matters more prescient, and Protestants were keen to note the close relationship between home missions and foreign missions. This became a demographic reality between 1932 and 1935, when there were more emigrants leaving the United States than immigrants entering; many home missionaries saw the opportunities of return immigration.⁵⁵ As America's global role increased, the domestic and foreign were further conflated. Kinney noted, "The quality of life which the

Southern Baptist Convention (n.p.: The Convention, 1927), 325; Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1935), 288, 290.

⁵³Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journal of the Thirty-First Delegated General Conference*, 1277, 1296, 1299; Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journal of the Thirty-Second Delegated General Conference*, 967, 991, 1001. The Methodist Church merged "bilingual" work into the "Departments of City and Rural Work."

⁵⁴Home Missions Council and Council of Women for Home Missions, *Findings of the Interdenominational Conference*, 14, United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 10, folder 2, RG 301.7.10.2, PHS.

⁵⁵Roger Daniels, *Coming to America: A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper Perennial, 2002), 288. See Di. Domenica, "Retrospect and Prospect of Our Work," 6, "Protestant Home Missions to Catholic Immigrants"—Abel Corresp—FASmith re impressions, 43-3, ABHMS, G. Pitt Beers, American Baptist Historical Society.

Christian religion can produce here in the midst of class and race friction, nationality antagonisms and group ambition, will determine in large measure how convincing Christian missionaries can make their message everywhere.”⁵⁶ Such logic helped temper nativist dispositions. One Southern Baptist missions program announced, “A person has no love for foreigners in other lands—no matter how much he may profess it—if he despises the foreigners in this land. (I John 4:20)”⁵⁷ As Americans witnessed the rest of the world inching closer to another world war, national life and missions, both home and foreign, were made all the more pertinent. The Episcopal Church concluded, “We now dedicate ourselves to the task of winning America for Christ that America may fulfill her mission to the world.”⁵⁸ This argument would become more frequent among Protestants as the twentieth century progressed and the United States assumed global leadership, and framers of U.S. foreign policy worked from a similar logic.

Interpreting National Identity

As the 1930s presented both domestic and global challenges, native Protestants in the United States turned to a national identity grounded in a common religious identity. Morse concluded in 1935, “In the attempt to create a national unity on the basis of a common allegiance to Jesus Christ and a common acceptance of the righteousness revealed in him, is perhaps the greatest significance of home missions as a service of the

⁵⁶Kinney, *The World at My Door*, 23; see also 21-23.

⁵⁷“Outline and Illustration for a Mission Talk,” *Home Missions* (Southern Baptist) 9 (February 1938), 6.

⁵⁸Episcopal Church, “National Council, Department of Domestic Missions,” *Living Church Annual, Year Book of the Episcopal Church, 1935*, 445-46.

church to our nation.”⁵⁹ As the 1930s brought economic trials and international tumult, the “evangelical nationalism” of the late nineteenth century, identified by historian Derek Chang, remained.⁶⁰

Whether ecumenical or denominational, most forms of home missions by the 1930s reflected strong overtures to the nation’s wellbeing, often envisioning a Christian nation. One Methodist denominational leader declared that domestic Christian work is “committed to the composite purpose of making the mind and heart of America truly Christian.”⁶¹ Episcopalians acknowledged that their church “must do her part to make America Christian.”⁶² Playing off of the New Deal efforts to alleviate agricultural woes, a Southern Baptist missions report declared, “The trouble with America is not soil erosion, but soul erosion. . . . A genuine revival of character based on a new birth from heaven through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ is the only thing that will create the kind of citizen that will build the right type of national life.”⁶³ While conservatives opposed to the New Deal, as described by historian Kevin Kruse, heavily promoted the idea that America was a Christian nation at this time, the notion that the nation had a Christian identity was also the product of robust Protestant home missions.⁶⁴ It was only a small

⁵⁹Morse, *Toward a Christian America*, 190.

⁶⁰Derek Chang, *Citizens of a Christian Nation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010).

⁶¹Methodist Episcopal Church, “Report of the Executive Secretary,” *Reports Presented at the 1936 Annual Meeting of the Board of Home Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Year Ending October 31, 1936*, 5.

⁶²Episcopal Church, *The Annual Report of the National Council for the Year 1933, The Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America*, 11, Archives of the Episcopal Church.

⁶³“The American Peril,” *Home Missions* (Southern Baptist) 9 (April 1938), 3.

⁶⁴Kruse, *One Nation Under God*. See Morse, *Home Missions Today and Tomorrow*, 5.

step to connect these national ideals with immigrant ministry. “We owe it to the alien in our midst as well as to our country,” reported the Episcopal Church in 1935, “that he be trained with a Christian purpose for the responsibilities of citizenship.”⁶⁵

In some home mission circles, the assimilation, or Americanization, of immigrants remained a vital goal well into the 1920s and early 30s. The first two decades of the twentieth century witnessed concerted efforts among Protestant home missions to incorporate immigrants into the national framework through English and citizenship classes, with the hope that the supposed melting pot would do its work. Some Protestants, however, feared that assimilation was not working. While not repudiating the legacy of immigration, the Chicago social worker conference in 1932 paused for concern when it considered urban immigrant populations and America’s future. “The wholesale change in racial stock or national background has profoundly altered the psychology of our urban life and is therefore of the deepest significance to the urban church. Moreover, it has seriously disturbed the spiritual foundations of America, foundations as laid during the 300 years, particularly the last 100 years, before 1890.”⁶⁶ And while sympathetic to the plight of Mexican immigrants, the Home Mission Council did note, “If, however, there is again a considerable increase of Mexican immigration, the new group will not only present a constantly recurring problem, but will also retard the assimilation of those who are already here.”⁶⁷ For those Protestants who held firm to Americanization, they were still set apart from the public wave of nativism that resulted

⁶⁵Episcopal Church, “National Council, Department of Domestic Missions,” *Living Church Annual, Year Book of the Episcopal Church, 1935*, 443-44.

⁶⁶ Home Missions Council and Council of Women for Home Missions, *Findings of the Interdenominational Conference*, 3-4, United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 10, folder 2, RG 301.7.10.2, PHS.

⁶⁷Morse, ed., *Home Missions Today and Tomorrow*, 153.

in the 1924 Immigration Act. The Southern Baptist minister Plainfield noted, “No foreigner can truly become Americanized who is not Christianized. Christianity is the golden gate. The task falls upon the churches.” Yet, Plainfield warned against “ramming the American flag down the immigrant’s throat and forcing him to foreswear all his traditions as well as his political allegiance.”⁶⁸

By the 1930s other Protestant social workers began to entertain hopes that assimilation had run its course. A 1936 Methodist report believed immigrants were slowly assimilating: “the solid foreign-speaking sections of our cities are steadily being reduced,” in part because of the “decline in the use of the old-country tongue, as the children are American born.”⁶⁹ For many denominational leaders, a perceived decline in the use of foreign languages was a strong indicator of assimilation. In his report for the HMC, Morse remarked, “From a practical standpoint, language is a first concern in the approach to the New American. It opens the door as well to his cultural background.”⁷⁰ And for those ethnic churches and home mission programs still using languages other than English, it was only a matter of time before they embraced English. The endgame was to merge foreign language churches into native congregations. Yet, on occasion a few home missionaries were more flexible and realized that using foreign languages was necessary for home missions and for training immigrant pastors.⁷¹

⁶⁸Plainfield, *The Stranger Within Our Gates*, 95.

⁶⁹Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journal of the Thirty-Second Delegated General Conference*, 976-77.

⁷⁰Morse, ed., *Home Missions Today and Tomorrow*, 124.

⁷¹C. A. Richardson, “Department of City Work,” *Reports Presented at the 1936 Annual Meeting of the Board of Home Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Year Ending October 31, 1936*, 73-75; Morse, ed., *Home Missions Today and Tomorrow*, 134; John D. Essick, “The

During the 1930s Americanization programs appear to have tapered and lost some of their earlier appeal. Mabel A. Brown wrote a scathing critique of Americanization efforts in an article the *Christian Century* published in October 1930. Reflecting on her settlement house work among Italians, Brown contested, “Tastes, both in aliens and in apple pies, differ, and to those who have actually assisted in applying the veneer of American civilization to the newly-arrived immigrant, misgivings occasionally occur—not about the motives of those who promote the work, nor about the technique of the process of Americanization, but about the effect of this process on the alien.” She critiqued American standards expected of immigrants that stripped them of their cultural traits and left them “sacrificed on the altar of Americanism.”⁷² It is telling that in 1936 Northern Baptist women chose to rename their Americanization program, calling it “Christian Friendliness” instead. Their caution with using the word “Americanization” can be seen in Kinney’s frank admission: “For the naturalized citizens, for the American-born second and third generations, for the Orientals born abroad who cannot be naturalized, the word ‘Americanization’ seemed inadequate.”⁷³

In the place of Americanization was a more favorable approach to national diversity and a limited amount of respect for cultural and religious pluralism. The HMC acknowledged in 1934 its aim for “[c]ontinued appreciation of the background and culture of the various races which are becoming a part of the New America.”⁷⁴ In a 1933 pamphlet, the Chicago Presbytery proudly listed the names of workers within its Church

International Baptist Seminary: A Baptist Attempt at Americanization, Education, and Missions in East Orange, New Jersey,” *Baptist History and Heritage* 40, no. 1 (Winter 2005): 96-103.

⁷²Mabel A. Brown, “Aliens a la Mode,” *Christian Century*, October 15, 1930, 1247-49.

⁷³Kinney, *The World at My Door*, 175-76.

⁷⁴Morse, ed., *Home Missions Today and Tomorrow*, 139.

Extension Board who represented over thirty different nationalities.⁷⁵ A Methodist community center in Portland conducted a wedding for a Japanese woman that “was a combination of American and Oriental custom.” The same center also promoted a program for boys that brought in Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish lecturers.⁷⁶

Una Roberts Lawrence’s text, *Winning the Border*, on Southern Baptist missions to Spanish speakers in the Southwest further demonstrates growing cultural sensitivity. At first glance, common themes to be expected are found, including evangelism, descriptive analysis of the border region, aversion to Catholicism, and even the common Protestant ambivalence towards the Mexican Revolution and its suppression of the Catholic Church during the prior decade. But in her examination of border history and missions efforts, Lawrence attempted to display sympathy for her subjects and their culture, contrary to the nativist inclinations of many of her contemporaries in the South. She instructed her readers on how to pronounce “Mexico,” as “May-heé-coh.” Lawrence also commented on using the term “Americans” in the context of the United States. “In using that name as an exclusive and distinctive designation we lay ourselves liable to the just charge of arrogance and self-conceit. . . . [W]e are fully conscious that ‘American’ belongs alike to all the peoples of the twenty-two nations of the two Americas.” Concerning race prejudice, Lawrence concluded, “The history of missions shows that war and race prejudice are enemies of the Kingdom of God.”⁷⁷

⁷⁵Chicago Presbytery, *Presbyterian Progress in 100 Years*, University of Chicago Library, www.lib.uchicago.edu/ead/pdf/century0389.pdf (accessed January 8, 2017).

⁷⁶Woman’s Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, *Fifty-Fifth Annual Report, For the Year 1935-1936*, 157.

⁷⁷Lawrence, *Winning the Border*, first quote from 34; second quote from 51; third quote from 131.

Increasing respect for immigrant culture among some Protestant home missionaries came in the form of what historian Robert Fleegler labels “contributionism.” This concept taught that America’s history was closely tied to the immigrants who helped contribute to the nation’s cultural identity.⁷⁸ Northern Baptist home missionary Kinney communicated this principle while observing the challenges the foreign born faced: “Living in two worlds, attempting to make of two cultures something finer than either, keeping one’s roots in the old while still having as many contacts as possible with the new.” Kinney believed, “The migration of the forty million people to the United States during the past one hundred years means for this country the opportunity which few new countries have had, a chance for a many-sided culture to which most of the world has contributed.”⁷⁹ In essence, this appeal to a “many-sided culture” was a tacit acknowledgement of cultural pluralism.

But even amidst overtures for cultural diversity, the earlier paternalistic threads of Americanization could still be found. During one social event hosted by Northern Baptists that recounted American history and displayed a picture of Columbia, a procession of people reflecting various nationalities was led by an “American child holding by the hand two little Japanese children, and on the other side two little Chinese children!” According to the account, “It made an unforgettable picture. . . . Nationality seemed to be forgotten as mothers and fathers talked with one another.”⁸⁰ While such notions of American superiority would never fully disappear from Protestant discourse,

⁷⁸Robert L. Fleegler, *Ellis Island Nation: Immigration Policy and American Identity in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

⁷⁹Kinney, *The World at My Door*, first quote from 150; second quote from 12.

⁸⁰*Ibid.*, 70.

mainline Protestants gradually grew more comfortable acknowledging the nation's diversity.

Evangelistic and social aspirations promoted by mainline Protestantism were made more important, if not problematic, in light of the diversity that immigrants had brought to the nation by the 1920s. An understanding of American religious pluralism that acknowledged that the nation would always retain a sizable demographic of Catholics and Jews was prevalent among many mainline Protestant leaders by the 1930s.⁸¹ How did home mission programs square with such a pluralistic reality? Largely, Protestant home missionaries acknowledged the place of Catholics and Jews in America, but they still worked from a paradigm that interpreted the nation as Protestant and attempted to bring Catholics and Jews into the Protestant fold. The HMC acknowledged the complexity of "Inter-faith Relations," noting that the nation consisted of four distinct non-Protestant faiths: Catholics, Mormons, Jews, and "the comparatively small numbers of adherents of other religious faiths like Buddhism or the original religions of the American Indians." The report articulated the concern that many people of various "races" were "adrift" and recognized the importance of evangelizing groups outside of Christianity. While commenting on Catholicism's failures, the HMC still held out hope that its work would encourage reform within the Catholic Church. The report

⁸¹David Mislin, *Saving Faith: Making Religious Pluralism an American Value at the Dawn of the Secular Age* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015); Kevin M. Schultz, *Tri-Faith America: How Catholics and Jews Held Postwar America to Its Protestant Promise* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Matthew Hedstrom, *The Rise of Liberal Religion: Book Culture and American Spirituality in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).

ultimately called for “spiritual unity,” not in “doctrine or polity” but in “objectives and controlling points of view.”⁸²

Such an outlook on religious pluralism reflected a Protestant hubris that often led to misinterpretation of other faiths. Despite attempts to work with its Catholic counterparts, the HMC report took a dim view of Catholicism. This led to a misinterpretation of the Catholic Church and its relationship to immigrant communities. The Home Missions Council noted that Protestant churches served as centers of local community for immigrants, while Catholic churches were simply locations for worship. Clearly, Protestant home mission leaders did not understand Italian Catholic immigrant communities and the resources that the Catholic Church provided immigrants as they settled in America. Instead, Protestant home missionaries resorted to the common perception that Catholicism was not “enlightened Christianity,” but rather a staid institution.⁸³

With such an ambivalent interpretation of pluralism, in addition to the diffusion of social gospel and evangelistic aspirations, Protestant home missions entered a liminal period during the interwar years. Should home missionaries aim to convert immigrants, or respect their native faith and accept a religiously plural nation? Were home missionaries duty bound to expect immigrants to Americanize upon accepting Protestant Christianity, or rather celebrate the nation’s cultural pluralism? A debate surrounding a book published in 1933 helps shed light on these questions. A sociology professor at

⁸²Morse, ed., *Home Missions Today and Tomorrow*, 227-29. See also 134 for how they believed the Catholic Church had adopted Protestant measures to reach Italians. See also Plainfield’s take on this matter in *The Stranger Within Our Gates*, 114-16.

⁸³Morse, ed., *Home Missions Today and Tomorrow*, 134, 152, 228-29. For a description of an Italian Catholic community during this time, see Robert A. Orsi, *The Madonna of 115th Street: Faith and Community in Italian Harlem, 1880-1950*, 3rd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).

Columbia University, Theodore Abel, published a book titled *Protestant Home Missions to Catholic Immigrants*, a project sponsored by the Institute of Social and Religious Research. Abel declared in his preface that Protestant work among Catholic immigrants “represents an aspect of the struggle of Protestantism to retain its religious supremacy in this country” and “is carried on with the aim of promoting Americanization and breaking down the isolation of immigrants from American society by bringing them into the fellowship of the Protestant church.” And in his conclusion, Abel noted, “The evangelization of Catholic immigrants was undertaken by the Protestant churches in the belief that the ideals and principles of government and social life in America were derived from and supported by the spirit of Protestantism.”⁸⁴

Little did this social scientist realize the storm he would create with these conclusions. A Home Missions Council report in 1934 cited Abel’s work negatively, and contended, “Such an ulterior purpose is true neither to the genius of Christian missions, nor to the historical development of the new mission among immigrants; it is not the thing for which ministers and lay workers on the field unselfishly poured out their service.” Instead, Protestant home missionaries ministering to Catholic immigrants “were engaged in something far different; to share experience, to be a good neighbor; to help all immigrants to become and to live as Christians; to assist them in making their adjustments to American life; to aid them in establishing churches for Christian fellowship and service and for the worship of God in a language which they could understand.”⁸⁵ While Abel’s book concerned the HMC, its most strident critics were

⁸⁴Theodore Abel, *Protestant Home Missions to Catholic Immigrants* (New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1933), viii, 103.

⁸⁵Morse, ed., *Home Missions Today and Tomorrow*, 125-26.

home missionaries on the front lines. Frank A. Smith, representing the American Baptist Home Mission Society, circulated a copy of Abel's book among fellow Baptist workers and asked them for their thoughts. What has survived is a flood of, sometimes lengthy, book reviews by upset Northern Baptist missionaries engaged in local work across the country. In their correspondence with Smith, the home missionaries, often representing various nationalities, communicated an evangelistic focus, serious misgivings with Catholicism, reticence towards Americanization, and reluctance to embrace Abel's strictly social scientific perspectives.⁸⁶

Many of those who responded to Smith's request refused to acknowledge that Protestants were out to steal converts from Catholic churches. Rather, those immigrants who became Protestant were already outside the Catholic fold. One worker with the Hungarian Baptist Union of America, Jos Matuskovits, noting he was a former Catholic, argued that the Catholics Protestant missionaries reached were not Catholic in the first place, but were rather anarchists who threatened both society and the Catholic Church itself. The Italian Ministers Association of Greater Chicago wrote challenging Abel's assertion that home missionaries were trying to impose "Protestant supremacy." Rather, the Italian association stated that sharing the Gospel message was its primary concern, asserting that "evangelical Christianity has something to offer to 'Catholic Immigrants' which they have not in Roman Catholicism, namely: a knowledge of the Bible, a vital, closer, and friendly relationship with Jesus Christ, the founder of Christianity, and a better, more practical appreciation of the ethical values of His teaching." Edwin Dolan, Field Secretary of the Massachusetts Baptist Convention, also denied any intent for

⁸⁶"Protestant Home Missions to Catholic Immigrants"—Abel Corresp—FASmith re impressions, 43-2, 43-3, ABHMS, G. Pitt Beers, American Baptist Historical Society.

“supremacy”; instead, Baptist missions were “governed by the sincere desire to bring the Gospel message to a neglected and needy people.” Home missionaries on the West Coast involved in work with Mexicans also chimed in, acknowledging the legitimacy of their work in light of evangelistic principles. One respondent bluntly noted, “The trouble has been that our Protestant leaders have been too willing to soft pedal anything that looked like anti-Catholicic [*sic*] propaganda.” Throwing caution to the wind, the writer linked Catholic immigrant children to crime, and concluded, “As you say in your letter, it is grist from the same mill that furnishes criticism of missionary work among the Jews and advocates the same point of view expressed in the Laymen’s Report on Foreign Missions about not proselyting Hindus or Mohammedans.”⁸⁷ The responses of Northern Baptist workers to Abel’s suggestion that they were simply vying with Catholics to increase membership and proclaim America a Protestant nation demonstrate a commitment to evangelism and lingering reproach of Catholicism that curbed their enthusiasm for a religiously plural nation.

Other respondents criticized Abel’s assertions concerning Americanization and home missions. In a sixteen-page review, Antonio Mangano, a minister of an Italian Baptist church, denied Americanization was the end goal, arguing instead that it was only the natural result of evangelization. Mangano wrote, “Had Prof. Abel dug down below the surface of his subject, he would have discovered that Protestant church membership and Americanization were the inevitable by-product of communicating the gospel message to these people.” Mangano deduced that Abel did not perceive the spiritual element, for “[i]t cannot be grasped by the scientific social investigator.” Frank L.

⁸⁷“Protestant Home Missions to Catholic Immigrants”—Abel Corresp—FASmith re impressions, 43-2, 43-3, ABHMS, G. Pitt Beers, American Baptist Historical Society.

Anderson, one of the denominational faithful with a long career in home missions in Chicago who later served as president of the International Baptist Seminary in New Jersey, wrote another scathing response to Abel's book. Concerning Abel's comments on Americanization, Anderson concluded, "The patriotic motive is over done Missionary boards or their representatives have rightly made Americanization one of the talking points, but the religious motive, namely, that of having men and women come into direct relationship to Jesus Christ as their Lord and Saviour, has been the supreme, dominating motive." While Americanization had become passé among some Protestant home missionaries, the earlier notion that Protestant Christianity and assimilation reinforced each other endured during the 1930s.⁸⁸

Political Statements and World Crisis

While continuing to foster home mission work among immigrants, some Protestant leaders also turned to political matters. In its denominational reports, the Methodist Episcopal Church continued to challenge the 1924 Immigration Act. The Methodist Woman's Home Missionary Society declared in 1932, "Unjust discrimination is a disturbing element to international understanding and world peace, therefore, we endorse the action of the General Conference of 1928 that we urge all Christian citizens to unite in removing such legislation as restricts immigration and the rights of citizenship on grounds of race and color." That same year, the Methodist California Conference even sent a Japanese delegate to the General Conference, and a Methodist Preachers' Meeting of Southern California called for revision of the immigration act and

⁸⁸"Protestant Home Missions to Catholic Immigrants"—Abel Corresp—FASmith re impressions, 43-3, ABHMS, G. Pitt Beers, American Baptist Historical Society. See also Essick, "The International Baptist Seminary," 100.

naturalization laws.⁸⁹ By 1936 Methodists concluded, “We appeal for such modification of the present Immigration Act as will place Orientals on the same quota basis as now governs immigration from European countries.”⁹⁰ Methodist leadership was convinced that the “immigration law has still its evil effects between our two nations; and it must be evident to you all that it compromises the Christian spirit. . . . Over against racial discrimination we Christians must stand before the people of the Orient.”⁹¹ In Protestant circles, the issue of Japanese exclusion was not going away any time soon.

In 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt assembled a commission to consider naturalization policy and then advise Congress. The mainline Protestant dignitary Sidney Gulick, that indomitable voice on matters of immigration during the 1910s and 1920s, remained active in the area of immigration policy as Executive Secretary of the FCC’s Department of International Justice and Goodwill. In 1933 he wrote to immigration officials in the Bureau of Immigration (under the Department of Labor), the Department of Justice, and the Secretary of State. In his letters, he continued to oppose Asian exclusion and the threat such restriction posed to international diplomacy. Gulick wrote to the Secretary of Labor concerning the government’s decision to deny naturalization to Asian Americans on account of race, pointing out that Native Americans and African

⁸⁹Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journal of the Thirty-First Delegated General Conference*, 1294, 1303. See also 648, 1759, and “Memorial to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Atlantic City, May, 1932,” State of the Church V – Immigration, 1932, Records of the General Conference, 1345-2-1:3, United Methodist Church Archives-GCAH, Madison, New Jersey.

⁹⁰Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journal of the Thirty-Second Delegated General Conference*, 521. See also 617, 1206.

⁹¹*Ibid.*, 620.

Americans could become citizens.⁹² Besides Gulick, another important voice at this time for mainline Protestantism was Walter Van Kirk, who had been serving in the FCC's Department of International Justice and Goodwill since 1925. Van Kirk wrote in 1933 to immigration officials concerning the requirement that when immigrants applied for citizenship, they must also be willing to serve in the U.S. military if needed. FCC officials found this requirement onerous and a violation of an immigrant's rights of conscience.⁹³

In addition to Gulick and Van Kirk, the FCC's Executive Committee also recommended to the Department of State several revisions, including bestowing naturalization to immigrants who were conscientious objectors to military service and providing citizenship to immigrants who had applied for naturalization prior to *Ozawa v. United States* (1922), the Supreme Court case that barred Japanese from attaining citizenship because they were not considered "white." The FCC proclaimed, "Such action will remove the stigma inflicted on other great races by our present race-discriminatory naturalization laws. It will also at the same time enable the Government and people of the United States to resume their moral leadership of the world in the recognition of the inherent dignity of humanity and the rights of man as man." The FCC

⁹²Presbyterian Historical Society, "Biographical Note/Administrative History," Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America (hereafter FCC) Records, NCC RG 18, <http://www.history.pcusa.org/collections/research-tools/guides-archival-collections/ncc-rg-18> (accessed January 10, 2017); Sidney L. Gulick to Bureau of Immigration, March 29, 1933; Harry E. Hull to Gulick, April 3, 1933; A. R. Archibald to Gulick, August 9, 1933; Gulick to Commissioner of Immigration, September 6, 1933; D. W. MacCormack to Gulick, September 19, 1933; Gulick to Secretary of State, November 27, 1933; Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., to Gulick, December 1, 1933; Benedict M. English to Gulick, December 2, 1933; Albert Levitt to Gulick, December 6, 1933; Gulick to Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., December 6, 1933, FCC Records, box 33, folder 18, NCC RG 18.33.18, PHS.

⁹³Presbyterian Historical Society, "Biographical Note/Administrative History"; Walter W. Van Kirk to Daniel W. McCormack, November 23, 1933; D. W. MacCormack to Van Kirk, December 4, 1933; Van Kirk to MacCormack, December 15, 1933; MacCormack to Van Kirk, December 21, 1933, FCC Records, box 33, folder 18, NCC RG 18.33.18, PHS. See also Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journal of the Thirty-First Delegated General Conference*, 648.

assured the State Department, “These suggested changes are needed for the true welfare of the United States and also of the world.”⁹⁴ Such efforts, however, would prove fruitless in changing current immigration policy at this time.

Then in 1936, Congress considered legislation known as the Kerr-Coolidge bill that would have extended grace to undocumented immigrants without a criminal record, particularly those whose family members were legal immigrants living in America.⁹⁵ This meager overture to liberal immigration reform caught the attention of mainline Protestant leadership, along with other religious groups such as the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Young Women’s Christian Association, and National Council of Jewish Women. FCC officials believed this bill would “humanize our immigration laws, and especially avoid unnecessary breaking up of families of immigrants of good character,” while also continuing to deport aliens who posed a threat to the nation. FCC officials wrote the recently formed Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) within the Department of Labor. Their hope was that the government would act on the Kerr-Coolidge bill before March 1, 1936, when nearly three thousand immigrants were scheduled to be deported. The INS Commissioner, D. W. MacCormack, evidently concurred, even assuring, “Today we have the support of every important religious group in the United States, without regard to creed or denomination. . . . For a long time it did not appear to me that the public generally were taking any interest in this problem, but I am now advised by members of Congress that they are receiving many communications

⁹⁴General Secretary to Benedict M. English, December 8, 1933; “On Amending the Naturalization Law”; “Conscience and Citizenship, Administrative Committee, May 23, 1930,” FCC Records, box 33, folder 18, NCC RG 18.33.18, PHS.

⁹⁵Sheldon Spear, “The United States and the Persecution of Jews in Germany, 1933-1939,” *Jewish Social Studies* 30, no. 4 (October 1968): 226.

in support of the bill.” In the meantime, the FCC contacted ministers across the nation, soliciting their signatures for a statement approving the Kerr-Coolidge bill. 2,208 ministers from forty-eight states signed the statement, which represented 29.7 percent of the total number the FCC originally contacted. The Joint Statement produced was a compromise of sorts, acknowledging that the Kerr-Coolidge bill “would make stricter provision for the deportation of criminal aliens and at the same time remove certain hardships to which aliens of good character and their innocent families in this country are now subject.”⁹⁶ Such efforts proved futile, however, as the bill was never passed.

By the end of the 1930s, Protestant denominations soon encountered a development that tested their devotion to the church and nation, and signaled a new challenge for home missions. When theologian Paul Tillich spoke at New York City’s Riverside Church in October 1936, he described an opportunity for Protestants to challenge the understanding that national identity was premised on racial and ethnic composition. This opportunity came in the form of increasing numbers of refugees fleeing Europe. Tillich, a German refugee himself, instructed the ministers in his audience that “support of emigres is a support of this prophetic protest against the demonic energy of religious nationalism,” a force he was all too familiar with while living in Nazi Germany. Tillich appealed to his Protestant audience to assist the developing refugee crisis and left them with a haunting question. If emigration repeatedly defined the Christian experience and Protestant churches were instead becoming enmeshed in “occidental civilization,” Tillich wondered, “Are they prepared

⁹⁶Deportation of Immigrants (Kerr Bill), FCC Records, box 50, folder 15, NCC RG 18.50.15, PHS, quotes from Worth M. Tippy to Pastors, Church Officials and Councils of Churches, February 20, 1936; D. W. MacCormack, February 21, 1936; “Joint Statement on Kerr Bill.”

for it or have they become so immovable, spiritually and practically, that the wild stream of coming history will overflow them or throw them away?”⁹⁷

Several Protestant groups chose to act. Beginning in 1939, Northern Baptists and Episcopalians began to turn their attention to Christian and Jewish refugees fleeing Germany.⁹⁸ Led by the Diocese of Southern Ohio in 1938, the Episcopal Church formed a Committee for European Refugees, whose aim was to assist other organizations, such as the American Committee for Christian Refugees, educate parishioners, help refugees with affidavits, and facilitate resettlement. In December 1938, the Episcopal Woman’s Auxiliary noted, “At this Christmas Season when we remember a Jewish family for whom there was no room in the inn at Bethlehem, we are sorrowfully aware of the countless numbers of their race who are today seeking shelter for themselves and their children,” and the Woman’s Auxiliary appealed to Episcopal women to advocate for the refugee. But rather than abide by Tillich’s admonition and justify their work solely on the ground of Christian mission, their response to the refugee crisis was rather a fusion of national mission and Christian purpose. An Episcopal report pointed to “a realization that all of these refugees, whether Christian or Jewish, were symptoms of a world revolution striking at the basis of Christianity and democracy.”⁹⁹

⁹⁷Paul J. Tillich, “Christianity and Emigration,” *Presbyterian Tribune*, October 29, 1936, 13, 16. See also Tillich, “Mind and Migration,” *Social Research* 4 (September 1937): 295-305.

⁹⁸“11/14/55,” Woman’s American Baptist Home Mission Society, Christian Friendliness, Historical Publicity, 32-6, American Baptist Historical Society Archives.

⁹⁹Episcopal Church, “National Council—Department of Christian Social Relations,” *Living Church Annual, Year Book of the Episcopal Church, 1941* (New York; Milwaukee: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1940), 50; “Call to Aid German Refugees,” *Spirit of Missions* 104 (March 1939), 24; “G.F.S. Helps German Refugees,” *Spirit of Missions* 104 (March 1939), 30; Episcopal Church, *Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Original Minutes, Meeting of the National Council, December 13, 14, 15, 1938*, 142-43, 164; *Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Original Minutes, Meeting of the National Council, February 14, 15, 16, 1939*, 148-49; *Domestic and Foreign Missionary*

Conclusion

Published in 1939, *Christ in Concrete* is a novel about an Italian immigrant family in America coping with the tragic loss of their father who died on the job while working as a bricklayer. Rivaling John Steinbeck's *Grapes of Wrath* also published that year, the popularity of *Christ in Concrete*, written by second-generation Italian Pietro di Donato, reflects the persistence of America's immigrant heritage in the public eye.¹⁰⁰ Public attention to immigration never dissipated following the restriction of the 1920s. The history of Protestant home missions to immigrants offers further insight into these developments and demonstrates the various ways that Protestant figures considered pluralism. They were beginning to arrive at a pluralistic bargain in which they tried to juggle both greater acceptance of immigrant cultures and the ideal of a Christian nation.

By the beginning of World War II, a potent diffusion of evangelistic hopes and social gospel ideals meant that Protestant home missions remained a primary concern when approaching ethnic Americans and immigrant communities. By 1940 the Episcopal Church recognized the opportunities at hand. "This matter of Christianizing America has assumed a place of vital importance in these days of world turmoil and world disaster. . . . In a world of rapid changes like the present, it is quite conceivable that the American Continent may become an oasis of Christian culture and the sole hope of Christian

Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Original Minutes, Meeting of the National Council, April 25, 26, 1939, 133, 154; Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Original Minutes, Meeting of the National Council, Oct. 10, 11, 12, 1939, 196; Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Original Minutes, Meeting of the National Council, Dec. 5, 6, 7, 1939, 200, Archives of the Episcopal Church.

¹⁰⁰Dennis Wepman, "di Donato, Pietro," *American National Biography Online*, <http://www.anb.org/articles/16/16-03520-print.html> (accessed January 6, 2017); Pietro Di Donato, *Christ in Concrete* (Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill, 1939).

survival.”¹⁰¹ Such an “oasis,” according to Protestant thinking, required home mission programs that continued to reach out to immigrants. In *Toward a Christian America* published in 1935, Morse, drawing from his service for the HMC, considered the relationship between home missions and national unity. He believed this was accomplished in part by missions among immigrants. Morse suggested Protestant missions was tasked with the work of “interpretation” and “practical assistance to the alien in helping him to negotiate the transition from old world to the new and to break through walls of prejudice and misunderstanding which, if permitted to stand, would make us not a unified people, but an aggregate of contrasting and conflicting groups.”¹⁰²

Such thinking proved to be a potent blend of nationalism and religion as America emerged from a period of self-induced isolation. The next decade would witness such perspectives seek to further define America’s position in a world threatened by fascism and communism. America was entering a period when foreign ideologies, rather than religions or races, were the primary threat.¹⁰³ Noting the international context, one Southern Baptist in 1938 concluded, “The rivals of Christianity today are not Buddhism, Confucianism and Mohammedism but communism, nationalism and humanism.”¹⁰⁴

¹⁰¹Episcopal Church, “National Council—Department of Domestic Missions,” *Living Church Annual, Year Book of the Episcopal Church, 1941*, 48.

¹⁰²Morse, *Toward a Christian America*, 188.

¹⁰³ David H. Bennett, *The Party of Fear: From Nativist Movements to the New Right in American History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 3.

¹⁰⁴Roland Q. Leavell, “Wider Evangelistic Visions,” *Home Missions* (Southern Baptist) 9 (April 1938), 5.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Huddled Masses the War Produced

“If ever the world needed the principles of Christ exemplified in the democratic ideal of our churches, the ideal of brotherhood in social life, the foundation of stewardship in the economic world and a gospel which has at its heart the spiritual and the personal regeneration of men, it is this hour in which we now live.”

—Southern Baptist Convention, 1942 *Annual*¹

In his book *Protestantism's Hour of Decision*, Baptist Justin Wroe Nixon claimed that America in 1940 was entering tumultuous times and argued for the advancement of Christianity and democracy. Nixon inherited grand visions for American society from one of the foremost leaders of the social gospel movement, having studied under Walter Rauschenbusch earlier in life and later served with him on the faculty of Rochester Theological Seminary. By the start of World War II, Nixon melded his social gospel upbringing with American democracy. Writing on the eve of America's entrance into the war, Nixon appealed to “true brotherhood” and argued that “American Protestantism has an obligation to the world.” Nixon believed America's “democratic way of life” was in a precarious position, “engaged in a struggle for existence. Can we Protestants remain mere spectators of that struggle?” As Nixon confronted a world spiraling into chaos, he

¹Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1942), 94-95.

appealed to his Protestant readers, “There they stand, Protestantism confronting democracy, each like the side of an arch, hardly able to stand alone.”²

For Nixon, America’s European immigrant past contributed to the nation’s democratic legacy. Past immigrants brought with them both Protestant faith and democratic ideals. “Here the representatives of the most virile European stocks came together, under favorable material conditions and under the influence of ideals which emphasized the worth of the individual and the equal rights of men to share in the processes of government.”³ As Nixon demonstrated, the “democratic way of life” captured the imaginations and agendas of many Protestants during the World War II era and infused their work among the nation’s immigrants. Historians Philip Gleason and Robert Fleegler note that this form of nationalism created an environment in which both toleration and unity were expected. Despite the apparent contradiction, many native Protestants elevated both ideals while fostering denominational and ecumenical work among immigrants. Immigrant ministries continued much the same, but Protestant home missionaries began laying more stress on social and racial harmony, despite the challenges the war produced. White Protestant leaders promoted an “American Way of Life” during the global upheaval of World War II while also working to respect different cultures and races.⁴

²Justin Wroe Nixon, *Protestantism’s Hour of Decision* (Philadelphia, PA: Judson Press, 1940), first quote from 27; second and third quotes from 50; fourth quote from 143; Gary Dorrien, *Soul in Society: The Making and Renewal of Social Christianity* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1995), 75-77.

³Nixon, 72.

⁴Philip Gleason, “American Identity and Americanization,” in *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, edited by Stephan Thernstrom (Cambridge: Belknap Press, Harvard University Press, 1980), 50; Robert L. Fleegler, *Ellis Island Nation: Immigration Policy and American Identity in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

As the Second World War erupted, American Protestants turned to the founding principle of their earlier immigrant work, Christian brotherhood, and stressed universal dignity and humanity in response to the racism witnessed overseas.⁵ The Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) concluded in 1948, “Our homeland has been called the racial meltingpot of the world because we have all races in our citizenship. This furnishes us, as no other nation is furnished, the material for a clinic in working out the Christian principle of brotherhood.”⁶ Earlier concerns over immigrant hordes coming to dilute the Anglo-Saxon racial order in America dissipated as political ideologies were seen as the primary threat. And for the racism that remained, some white Protestants began challenging racist assumptions many Americans took for granted. One Presbyterian appealed to a spiritual brotherhood in his ministry that transcended race: “They say blood is thicker than water, but I believe love in Christ is thicker than blood and we must prove it.”⁷ Concerns foreign and domestic collided by 1939 as war erupted in Europe. The always close relationship between domestic and foreign missions was heightened during this time. This translated into continued concern over immigration policy as it affected foreign missions and shaped overseas perceptions of the United States. In turn, mainline

⁵For more on the prominence of toleration and emphasis on a common humanity during World War II, see Fleegler’s chapter “The Quest for Tolerance and Unity” in *Ellis Island Nation*, 59-84.

⁶Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1948), 170.

⁷Jacob A. Long, *Scotch, Irish, AND—* (New York: Board of National Missions, PC(USA), 1943), 35, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. [hereafter PC(USA)] Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 10, folder 5, RG 301.7.10.5, Presbyterian Historical Society (hereafter PHS), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Gleason, “American Identity and Americanization,” 47-52; David H. Bennett, *The Party of Fear: From Nativist Movements to the New Right in American History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 3. Southern Baptists, however, still reflected anti-Catholic concerns as well when listing subversive ideologies: “communism, fascism, political ecclesiasticism, and anti-Semitism.” Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1948, 57.

Protestants through the ecumenical Federal Council of Churches (FCC) remained active in the political sphere, working to ensure America served as an “arsenal for democracy.”

Foreign Wars, Domestic Missions

As war began in Europe, Protestant home missionaries, often through community centers, continued to minister to the foreign born and try to mold them into the nation’s future citizenry.⁸ Ministry to Asian communities was especially acute at this time, and the increasing numbers of Latin American immigrants also took precedence in native Protestant programs. The social gospel tenet of the “brotherhood of man” and evangelism continued to direct much of home missions. But running throughout the 1940s was a sense of imminent change and mounting challenges. A Methodist report in 1940 highlighted these themes. “Christianity’s attitude toward, interest in, love for, and ministry to these various national and family racial groups who have come here from every-whither, as your people and my people came, to make this their home, their country and their flag, is bound to determine the character and the quality of future American citizenship.” The report continued, “However important it may be to make the world safe for Democracy, it is absolutely imperative to develop Democracies that are safe for the world.” The means to this end were what this Methodist report identified as the “fundamental teachings of Christianity: the Fatherhood of God, the Saviorship of Jesus Christ; the Brotherhood of Man; and the infinite value of human life, regardless of

⁸See for example Woman’s Division of Christian Service, Methodist Church, *First Annual Report of the Woman’s Division of Christian Service, 1940-1941* (New York: Woman’s Division of Christian Service, Methodist Church), 100.

national or racial considerations.”⁹ As the war raged on, Protestants believed the hour was at hand when they must reaffirm America’s providential purpose in the world, both outside and within the nation’s borders.

In this climate, Protestants, and American culture at large, promoted an American Way of Life that many believed was at stake. This notion was ripe with cultural and religious expectations, and it only reinforced the decision to continue Americanization within home missions.¹⁰ One booklet published by the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. [PC(USA)] recognized that “its ministry to the peoples of diverse language and racial groups has had a considerable part in this Christian Americanization process” still at work by the 1940s.¹¹ Oftentimes, the theater for American ideals was the community center or neighborhood house.¹² A Maryland Southern Baptist report commenting on Americanization efforts noted the threat immigrants posed who “care less for our American way of life.”¹³ Protestant home missionaries were convinced that their best chance for inculcating the American Way of Life within immigrant communities was through assimilating the second and third generations.¹⁴

Home missionaries remained diligent in working with earlier European immigrant groups, including Italians and eastern Europeans, but there was also increasing attention

⁹Methodist Church, *Composite Annual Report, Section of Home Missions, Division of Home Missions and Church Extension*, November 22-29, 1940 (Philadelphia, PA: Board of Missions and Church Extension, Methodist Church, 1940), 15-17; first quote from 16; second and third quotes from 17.

¹⁰See for example Long, *Scotch, Irish, AND—*, 13.

¹¹Long, *Scotch, Irish, AND—*, 40.

¹²See for example Long, *Scotch, Irish, AND—*, 36-39.

¹³Carolyn G. Henderson, “The Report of the Social Service Committee,” *Minutes of the One Hundred and Seventh Annual Session of the Maryland Baptist Union Association*, 1942, 34-35.

¹⁴Long, *Scotch, Irish, AND—*, 37.

to newer groups, such as Asians and Latin Americans. As of 1940, Methodist work in California proliferated among Chinese, Korean, Filipino, and Japanese populations, aided by the merger of the Methodist Episcopal Church and Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1939.¹⁵ Protestant home missionaries also turned their attention to Filipinos. A territory of the United States until 1946, this status gave residents in the Philippines the opportunity to migrate to America outside of Asian exclusion. As population centers developed along the West Coast, Protestants redirected home mission work. In addition to Methodists, the Episcopal Church also sponsored work among Filipinos during the 1940s, even reutilizing buildings formerly used in Japanese missions for Filipino programs following Japanese relocation after 1942.¹⁶ In their work among Asian immigrants, Protestants especially tailored their programs for the second generation. This often came in the form of English language services, though in the case of several Presbyterian centers, workers did try to educate the second generation in their own ethnic language and culture in order to ameliorate the concerns of the first generation and equip the younger generation to find employment in immigrant communities.¹⁷

Despite setbacks in Mexican immigration due to repatriation efforts during the Great Depression, Mexican immigration resumed during the war, in large part due to the Bracero program initiated in 1942 between the U.S. and Mexican governments. This

¹⁵Methodist Church, *Composite Annual Report*, November 22-29, 1940, 83-87.

¹⁶Diocese of California, *Journal of the Ninety-Third Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of California, Grace Cathedral, San Francisco, February 2-3, 1943*, 66-67, Archives of the Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas; Episcopal Church, "National Council—Department of Domestic Missions," *Living Church Annual, Year Book of the Episcopal Church, 1941* (New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1940), 48.

¹⁷H. Paul Douglass, "Report on Presbyterian Oriental Churches on the Pacific Coast," 2, United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 12, folder 33, RG 301.7.12.33, PHS.

initiative authorized migrant laborers who registered to enter the United States and work in the agricultural sector during the labor shortages of World War II. Besides incoming Bracero workers, Mexicans who had immigrated earlier were by the 1940s beginning to establish distinctly Mexican American communities.¹⁸ Many denominations replicated the efforts of Presbyterians, who by 1943 conducted a multifaceted work among Spanish-speaking populations, including day schools and health care.¹⁹

Often this work melded social and evangelistic ministry with patriotism during the war years. One Southern Baptist survey of Mexican churches along Texas's southern border during 1943 applauded the patriotism of Baptist Mexicans in the region. The report declared, "It was gratifying to see how truly American our Mexican friends are." The report described kindergarteners who saluted the flag and noted the absence of Mexican men who were away loyally fighting in the war.²⁰ Later, Southern Baptists purported that Hispanic immigrants who converted to Christianity became better workers, improved local public health, and made the nation Christian. Indeed, the report claimed, "If we are ever to have a Christian America from the political standpoint, in the Southwest at least, it is imperative that the Spanish-speaking voting populace be evangelized."²¹ And as soldiers fought the Axis powers overseas, some Protestants continued to wage spiritual war against the Roman Catholic Church. Southern Baptists

¹⁸See George J. Sánchez, *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

¹⁹Long, *Scotch, Irish, AND—*, 27-29; Methodist Church, *Composite Annual Report*, November 22-29, 1940, 67-73, 89-91; Episcopal Church, *Living Church Annual, 1941*, 48; Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1947), 148-49; Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1948, 178-79, 182; Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1949), 177-79, 183.

²⁰Mrs. J. I. Freeman, "Mingling with the Mexicans," *Southern Baptist Home Missions* 14 (April 1943), 10-11.

²¹Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1949, 177-78.

frequently acknowledged resistance they faced among Catholic clergy in local towns, and one Presbyterian report noted the challenges Catholicism and Pentecostalism presented to its work among the Portuguese in Massachusetts.²²

During the 1940s, Protestants continued their time-honored form of settlement work, often referred to as community centers. The Caspian Community Center operated by Presbyterians in a polyglot iron mining region in Michigan demonstrates the maintenance of home missions to immigrants during the war. Described as “unselfish social service with a deeply religious background,” the center provided numerous cultural and social resources to the local community, including clubs, Sunday School, music, Boy Scouts, sports, drama, and film, in addition to opportunities to participate in programs sponsored by the National Youth and Works Progress Administrations. As the seasons changed, the center was there to reinforce American culture among its disparate groups, including “bobbing for apples” for Halloween, skating during the winter, and singing carols for Christmas, including “God Bless America,” for the nearby village to hear. According to the title of one article describing its work, the Caspian Community Center was “Where the Melting Pot Bubbles.” As the rest of the world succumbed to racial and religious divisions, Caspian maintained a peaceful disposition among such diverse elements as “Catholic or Protestant, Jew or Gentile, white, black, red or yellow. For all are sons of God and brothers of Christ, trying to live in love and charity with our neighbors as true Americans.” The center combined the goals of home missions and settlement work in an effort to “foster tolerance, both religious and racial. It combats

²²For an example of Southern Baptist attention to local Catholic resistance, see Ann Huguley, “Home Missions Made Vital,” *Royal Service* 40 (May 1946), 9; “The Work of Two Missionaries in New Bedford, Mass.,” United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 12, folder 26, RG 301.7.12.26, PHS.

caste pride and an exalted sense of nationalism wherever they crop up. It is trying to build a 'sense of community,' which is prerequisite to any lasting peace." A commixture of American ideals, Protestant beliefs, and communion with nature made Caspian a vital center for Presbyterian work in an area sequestered from the raging global turmoil overseas.²³

While many Protestants were confident that evangelization and assimilation would run their course, some were still wary of the effect the immigrant had on the nation if evangelization did not occur. An SBC Home Mission report in 1948 declared, "The races and nationalities and religions of all the countries of the world will in the future be coming to our land and will more and more affect our national, social and religious institutions and life unless these alien races are evangelized."²⁴ Southern Baptists were concerned about the growing pluralistic nature of America, but hoped to take advantage of the opportunity while the immigrant generation was supposedly still impressionable. One report suggested, "This is the crucial generation of so-called Americanization when the people are amenable to new concepts. They are changing to new things and in religion what they come to be will depend on what they have to choose from. They cannot choose Christ unless we preach the gospel to them."²⁵ Baptists demonstrated an urgency in their ministry that reflected both national and spiritual concerns.

Other Protestants were also less than sanguine about the impact immigration had on America. Some members of the Episcopal Church kept a watchful eye on immigrant

²³United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 11, folder 54, RG 301.7.11.54, PHS.

²⁴Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1948, 170.

²⁵Ibid., 178-179.

demographics and how their numbers affected church membership. The Joint Commission of the General Convention on Strategy and Policy published Walter Herbert Stowe's *Immigration and Growth of the Episcopal Church* in 1942, though with the disclaimer that it did not reflect everyone's views. Stowe suggested various cultural, social, and religious factors were responsible for limiting Episcopal growth during the denomination's history. "But the one enormous handicap," concluded Stowe, "which it could not overcome until after 1930—and the one most responsible for the slowing up of its rate of growth since 1846, and more especially since 1890—was immigration." Now that immigration was stabilized, Stowe believed foreigners would gradually assimilate, the nation could achieve "assimilation" and "homogeneity," and the Church would recover its losses. Stowe was certain that now following the restriction of the 1920s, the Episcopal Church was in a better position to consolidate its position in America. While the year 1920 was a "low water mark," Stowe believed "the dawn came with the Johnson Act of 1924." (Stowe recognized in a footnote, however, that he still opposed the Asian exclusion of that law, in keeping with the common position among native Protestants that while quotas were necessary, Asian exclusion went too far.) By the end, Stowe remained hopeful that European immigrants from prior decades would contribute to the nation. "The unchurched among this foreign white stock is one of the Episcopal Church's frontiers of the future and its opportunity."²⁶

Whether they remained skeptical or hopeful, Protestants dedicated to home missions were drawn to the international implications of their work at a time when America was a rising superpower. Protestant attention to home and foreign missions

²⁶Walter Herbert Stowe, *Immigration and the Growth of the Episcopal Church* (Richmond, VA: Joint Commission of General Convention on Strategy and Policy, 1942), 3, 6, 35-36; first quote from 6; second and third quotes from 35; fourth quote from 36.

during a century of global turmoil led them to take seriously the international reputation of America. “To the Latin American nations,” claimed a 1946 SBC report, “the things we do here in the States as a people are speaking much louder than all that our missionaries in their own countries can say.”²⁷ Baptists were aware that their treatment of minorities would hinder or help their work overseas and also shape outside perceptions of America. The SBC later recognized in its 1949 convention reports that foreign missions could only begin after the foreigner in America was reached.²⁸

This confluence of the international and domestic were an inevitable byproduct of the Second World War, and Protestants often imbibed the spirit of the times. A year before America entered the war, Methodists acknowledged that their “missionary task is characterized by both home and foreign field environments, problems and service opportunities.” Their aim was to bring together “peoples from every part of the planet, who are resident in and potential citizens of the United States, almost the only remaining country in the world, where oppressed and persecuted contingents of humanity have anything like a fair chance for the normal pursuit of their happiness and welfare.”²⁹ Episcopal leadership in 1945 likewise used the theme “The Christian Fellowship: International and Interracial Understanding” for one of their programs that year.³⁰

²⁷Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1946), 336.

²⁸Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1949, 170-71, 178. See also Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1947, 141; *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1946, 336.

²⁹Methodist Church, *Composite Annual Report*, November 22-29, 1940, 15-16.

³⁰Episcopal Church, “Forward in Service,” *Living Church Annual, Year Book of the Episcopal Church, 1945* (New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1944), 42.

These internationalist themes coincided with social gospel sentiments and World War II era tolerance to support a limited respect for cultural pluralism in Protestant missions to immigrants while also maintaining a united nation. An American Baptist drama written for churches titled “Mrs. Mayflower and Mrs. Quota Talk It Over” demonstrates such a convergence. In the play Mrs. Mayflower attends Pilgrim Church located on Washington Avenue, and visits Mrs. Quota, an Italian American. The drama portrays Mrs. Quota as an eager, sincere Italian immigrant who speaks broken English, and who has a son off fighting in the war. The drama admires Italian cultural identity and even provides footnotes with Italian pronunciations to aid English readers unfamiliar with the language. During the course of the play, Mrs. Quota discusses the difficulties she faced in raising her second generation daughter who was determined to become more American and less Italian. Mrs. Mayflower later instructs Mrs. Quota’s daughter on the importance of her Italian background, stating, “But really the American way that we talk so much about is something that has grown and been added to as each new group of immigrants came to our shores.” While cultural pluralism is acknowledged, a cultural understanding of the American Way of Life is also present. During the course of their visit, Mrs. Quota describes the assistance she had been receiving from another American Baptist woman, Miss Friendly, who was active in immigrant work and refugee relief. Friendly taught Mrs. Quota to use English, boil milk for her infant, make apple pie, “put butter on vegetables,” and shop for dresses, while also preparing Mrs. Quota for her

citizenship test. Overall, the play holds immigrants to a standard that included both melting pot assimilation and ethnic cultural retention.³¹

Conditions the War Produced

The United States officially entered World War II on December 8, 1941, the day after Japanese pilots bombed Pearl Harbor. Over the next several years the war unleashed a host of challenges on the domestic front. Protestant home missionaries continued earlier forms of ministry, while also responding to new demands. Before the United States entered the war, European refugees, particularly Jews in Germany and eastern Europe, were a contentious topic among the American public. Regrettably, when it comes to America's record on aiding Jewish refugees prior to the war as much of Europe succumbed to fascist regimes, the United States chose not to be a haven for the oppressed. Denying entry to a boatload of refugees on the *St. Louis* in 1939 and failure to pass the Wagner-Rogers Bill that would have facilitated the resettlement of several thousand Jewish children attest to America's intransigent disposition.

The growing refugee crisis did, however, draw more attention after America entered the war, though by that time many persecuted Jews and other minorities were left without options. Often American agencies provided relief overseas, but occasionally they aided refugees coming to America. As the war continued, the refugee crisis became more acute for some Protestants.³² A Southern Baptist women's periodical noticed in

³¹"Mrs. Mayflower and Mrs. Quota Talk It Over," 90-12, HM-Immigration, Christian Friendliness, American Baptist Historical Society, Atlanta, Georgia. Fleegler refers to this as a "modified version of Zangwill's melting pot," 124, 105.

³²The Federal Council of Churches did indicate in 1943 its support for a bill proposed by Congressman Samuel Dickstein on relocating some Jewish refugees to America. Samuel McCrea Cavert to Samuel Dickstein, September 28, 1943, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America (hereafter FCC) Records, box 11, folder 8, NCC RG 18.11.8; United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of

1942, “Our land is filled with refugees. Since the war began there has poured into our country a stream of humanity that makes America a potential ‘Land of Destiny’. From the persecutions of Europe have come men and women of science, of finance, of arts and letters. For a period they are our mission opportunity.”³³ Denominations occasionally sponsored work, seen in the organization of the Episcopal Committee for European Refugees.³⁴ Czech Presbyterians within the PC(USA) aided their own who had fled Europe through the Jan Hus Presbyterian Church and Neighborhood House in New York City, and New York’s Second Presbyterian Church offered some assistance to Jewish refugees in America.³⁵ Oftentimes, work was channeled through the American Christian Committee for Refugees. Initially referred to as the American Committee for Christian Refugees, it changed its name in 1944 to reflect the committee’s efforts “in caring for refugees without discrimination as to race or creed.”³⁶

The refugee crisis stemming from the European front was not the only ministry opportunity during the war. Shortly after the United States declared war on Japan, Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066, displacing an entire population of Japanese Americans living on the West Coast. As historian Anne M. Blankenship has

Mission Development Records, box 15, folders 43, 46, RG 301.7.15.43, 46, PHS. See also Robert W. Ross, *So It Was True: The American Protestant Press and the Nazi Persecution of the Jews* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1980).

³³Mrs. W. J. Cox, “My Alabaster Box,” *Royal Service* 36 (February 1942), 7.

³⁴Episcopal Church, *Living Church Annual, 1941*, 50; Episcopal Church, *Living Church Annual, Year Book of the Episcopal Church, 1943* (New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1942), 73-74.

³⁵Long, *Scotch, Irish, AND—*, 20-21, 24, 40-41.

³⁶Episcopal Church, *Living Church Annual, 1943*, 74; October 2, 1944, American Christian Committee for Refugees, Inc., Records of the War Refugee Board, 1944-1945, box 1, folder 10, Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library & Museum, http://www.fdrlibrary.marist.edu/_resources/images/wrb/wrb0010.pdf (accessed March 21, 2016). The organization was also consulted for Gerhart Saenger, *Today’s Refugees, Tomorrow’s Citizens: A Story of Americanization* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941), xiii.

demonstrated, Protestant work among relocated Japanese Americans reflected the general temper of their approach to immigration: measured concern that often followed the government's lead, while still advocating for equality and relief for those affected. Native Protestant Christians aimed to alleviate the hardships Japanese faced rather than challenge internment itself.³⁷

While many Protestants simply accepted the government's decision to intern Japanese, a few examples survive of meager attempts to challenge this policy.³⁸ According to an American Baptist Christian Friendliness pamphlet, "Many letters were written to the United States Department of Justice concerning the release of true Americans."³⁹ At the outset of Japanese internment, at least one Protestant organization even advocated for "selective evacuation."⁴⁰ According to a denominational spokesperson later in 1948, "The Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., has officially been on record by action since 1942 that rights and justice be given to Japanese-Americans and all

³⁷Anne M. Blankenship, *Christianity, Social Justice, and the Japanese American Incarceration during World War II* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016); Beth Hessel, "Keeping Silence: Executive Order 9066 at 75," PHS, <http://www.history.pcusa.org/blog/2017/02/keeping-silence-executive-order-9066-75> (accessed April 1, 2017). For general surveys of this topic, see Richard Reeves, *Infamy: The Shocking Story of the Japanese-American Internment in World War II* (New York: Henry Holt, 2015); Greg Robinson, *By Order of the President: FDR and the Internment of Japanese Americans* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).

³⁸Others, however, were less inclined to criticize the government. One Southern Baptist periodical in 1943 noted that Japanese internment camps were not comparable to European concentration camps. A Presbyterian description of their work wrote favorably of the government: "While the Government authorities sought to be as kindly and as considerate as possible in their dealings with the Japanese, only the Christian forces could deal with the problems of the inner life." Mrs. W. C. James, "Current Missionary Events," *Royal Service* 37 (January 1943), 35; Gordon K. Chapman, "Meeting the Unexpected," 2, United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 12, folder 3, RG 301.7.12.3, PHS.

³⁹Frances Priest, *Christian Friendliness* (New York: American Baptist Home Mission Society, Woman's American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1948), 90-12, Christian Friendliness, American Baptist Historical Society. See also "11/14/55," WABHMS 32-6, Christian Friendliness, Historical Publicity, American Baptist Historical Society.

⁴⁰Chapman, "Meeting the Unexpected," 2; Frank Herron Smith, "Some Results Achieved by the Protestant Commission for Japanese Service, February—December, 1942," United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 12, folder 11, RG 301.7.12.11, PHS.

those upon whom enforced segregation was placed by our government early in the war.”⁴¹ Some Presbyterians even aided Japanese who were being evacuated by storing their possessions and accepting power of attorney to watch over Japanese property.⁴² Prominent mainline figures such as Harry Emerson Fosdick and Reinhold Niebuhr became increasingly vocal as the camps continued.⁴³ One Presbyterian noted that he was “a member of the California Church Council, which is taking steps to rally the churches to oppose unjust anti-Japanese legislation, and also appears at the judicial hearings in behalf of the Japanese.” The same person later wrote, “Our most sacred Christian and democratic principles are truly at stake in the policy of the evacuation and resettlement of the people of Japanese ancestry in America.”⁴⁴ While writing in 1942 to a Japanese minister, a Methodist lamented, “We have read of your experiences with deep chagrin over the fact that such things happen to American citizens and we devoutly pray for the day when democracy may be so clear and so strong in our country that things like this will never happen again.”⁴⁵

The Federal Council of Churches and Home Missions Council (HMC) organized most forms of Protestant relief at Japanese internment camps. Ecumenical efforts included the Western Protestant Church Commission for Japanese Service that cooperated with the government’s War Relocation Board in facilitating work in assembly

⁴¹Fern M. Colborn to John Sherman Cooper, May 19, 1948, United PC(USA) Board of Christian Education, Council on Church and Society Records, box 12, folder 23, RG 78.12.23, PHS.

⁴²Chapman, “Meeting the Unexpected,” 3.

⁴³Fellowship of Reconciliation, *American Refugees*, 8, Japanese Relocation, 1942, Records of the United Methodist Church (hereafter UMC) General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, 2628-6-2:13, UMC Archives-GCAH, Madison, New Jersey.

⁴⁴Chapman, “Meeting the Unexpected,” first quote from 10; second quote from 12.

⁴⁵H. D. Bollinger to Hideo Hashimoto, October 6, 1942, Japanese Relocation, 1942, Records of the UMC General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, 2628-6-2:13, UMC Archives-GCAH.

centers where Japanese were located before being sent to permanent camps. It was later renamed the Protestant Commission for Japanese Service. In 1942, another Protestant organization was formed, the Committee on Resettlement of Japanese Americans, with the intent to facilitate settling Japanese Americans outside the camps. Denominations continued to sponsor work as well. As of 1943, Presbyterians fielded “thirteen ordained Presbyterian ministers, two theological students, and six women workers,” and it provided \$20,000 the year prior for work in the camps. The Episcopal Church also turned its attention to the camps where it witnessed not only material needs, but also an “evangelistic opportunity.”⁴⁶

During the war, Japanese internment camps tested the extent to which Protestants were willing to acknowledge cultural and religious pluralism. The Protestant Commission of Japanese Service began translating a hymnal into Japanese, and during Christmas it provided for the needs of children in the camps, “Christian and Buddhist alike.”⁴⁷ The Committee on Japanese Resettlement, another Protestant relief organization, even accused the Protestant Commission of conceding too much to Japanese culture.⁴⁸ Religious services in the assembly centers and camps also compelled

⁴⁶Long, *Scotch, Irish, AND—*, 34-35; Chapman, “Meeting the Unexpected,” 8, box 12, folder 3, RG 301.7.12.3; box 12, folder 4, RG 301.7.12.4; box 11, folder 42, RG 301.7.11.42, United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, PHS; Episcopal Church, *Living Church Annual, 1943*, 72; Diocese of California, *Journal of the Ninety-Third Convention, 1943*, 67-69, Archives of the Episcopal Church. See also Missionary Files: Methodist Church, 1912-1949, Japan Conf., Roll No. 115, UMC Archives-GCAH.

⁴⁷Smith, “Some Results Achieved by the Protestant Commission,” box 12, folder 11, RG 301.7.12.11; box 11, folder 42, RG 301.7.11.42, United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, PHS.

⁴⁸These two Protestant organizations maintained a tenuous relationship in part over authority and lack of coordination. Mark A. Dawber to Gordon K. Chapman, October 16, 1942; Mark A. Dawber to Members of the Committee on Administration of Japanese Christian Work, January 26, 1943; “Minutes of the Committee on Administration of Japanese Work,” United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 12, folder 4, RG 301.7.12.4, PHS.

Protestant ecumenism. Weekly religious services were organized along Protestant, Catholic, and Buddhist lines, and the Protestant denominations were required to offer “union” services together. Episcopalians, however, were concerned over this format since it might lead to the “loss of identity and the heritage which our fellow churchmen greatly value.” The union services also tested the boundaries of midcentury Protestantism, as Seventh Day Adventists were not allowed to participate and Jehovah Witnesses’ publications were restricted.⁴⁹

Religious services in the assembly centers and camps, however, provided opportunities not just for Protestant ecumenism, but also for a broader form of religious pluralism as Protestant, Catholic, and Buddhist services were offered. According to the report of one Protestant missionary, Buddhism should be permitted, since it posed no serious threat to Protestant work. The same report, however, could not say the same for Shintoism, which it tied to militant nationalism. After Japanese internment ended in 1945, the HMC helped organize a meeting of the National Conference on Japanese Americans in New York, where “[a]mong those attending were representatives of Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish and Buddhist Churches.”⁵⁰ Despite their concerns, Protestants had to come to terms with this form of religious pluralism outside of the Judeo-Christian framework they were more accustomed to.

⁴⁹Diocese of California, *Journal of the Ninety-Third Convention, 1943*, 67-68, Archives of the Episcopal Church; Chapman, “Meeting the Unexpected,” 3-10, United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 12, folder 3, RG 301.7.12.3, PHS. See also the description of Protestant work by Japanese minister Hideo Hashimoto in “Dear Friends,” September 23, 1942, Japanese Relocation, 1942, Records of the UMC General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, 2628-6-2:13, UMC Archives-GCAH.

⁵⁰Chapman, “Meeting the Unexpected,” 4; Episcopal Church, *Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Original Minutes, Meeting of the National Council, Dec. 4, 5, 6, 1945*, 115-16, Archives of the Episcopal Church.

As resettlement ensued and Japanese internees were forced to return to an American society reluctant to accept them, native Protestants remained actively involved. The Committee on Resettlement of Japanese Americans and a few denominations already had experience aiding Japanese resettlement, as Japanese Americans were allowed to resettle farther east outside of the camps shortly after they were evicted from the West Coast if they had sponsors. Many Japanese students left for institutions of higher education during the internment years.⁵¹ For those church members eager to help Japanese transition out of the camps, the Committee on Resettlement, representing the FCC, HMC, and Foreign Missions Conference of North America, printed a booklet in November 1944 titled “How Can We Help Japanese American Evacuees?: Suggestions for Church Women” and another in January 1945 titled “Relocating the Dislocated.”⁵² The Southern California Council of Protestant Churches and Church Federation of Los Angeles called on Californians to “take a positive stand for a true demonstration of Christian and democratic principles” as they welcomed returning Japanese Americans.

⁵¹Episcopal Church, *Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Original Minutes, Meeting of the National Council, Feb. 8, 9, 10, 1944*, 114, Archives of the Episcopal Church; “To Wesley Foundations and Methodist Colleges on the West Coast”; Elizabeth F. Johnson to Harvey C. Brown, November 27, 1942, Japanese Relocation, 1942, 2628-6-2:13; Japanese Re-Location, 1943-1944, 2598-5-1:24; 1941 Student Refugee Scholarship Fund, 1941-1942, 2594-6-3:45, Records of the UMC General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, UMC Archives-GCAH; *Japanese American Student Relocation: An American Challenge*, United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 11, folder 67, RG 301.7.11.67, PHS. Baptists also sponsored a Buddhist student at Drake University. Hideo Hashimoto to H. D. Bollinger, October 9, 1942, Japanese Relocation, 1942, 2628-6-2:13, Records of the UMC General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, UMC Archives-GCAH. See also “Christian Friendliness, State Summary Sheet, April 1944-April 1945,” American Baptist Historical Society (box and folder numbers unavailable; copy in author’s possession).

⁵²Committee on Resettlement of Japanese Americans, “Relocating the Dislocated”; Gracia D. Booth, *How Can We Help Japanese American Evacuees?: Suggestions for Church Women* (New York: Committee on Resettlement of Japanese Americans, 1944), United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 12, folder 4, RG 301.7.12.4, PHS.

Presbyterians and American Friends even started a hotel to help returning Japanese.⁵³ When the government considered compensating Japanese in 1948, the PC(USA) wrote congressman John S. Cooper wanting such action, which would be a “minimum by way of reparation that our government can make to these people.”⁵⁴ And reflecting interest in Japanese Americans after the internment years, Texas Southern Baptists continued to sponsor an annual Nisei Assembly, a summer camp offered to Nisei and “persons of any Japanese generation.”⁵⁵

Midcentury Social Sensibilities

A century earlier, the 1844 riots in Philadelphia targeting immigrant Catholics led many religious leaders to denounce militant nativism. Violent attacks on ethnic communities were more than they could stomach.⁵⁶ A similar response is evident following World War II as many American Protestants were even less inclined to support forms of nativism that appeared racist or politically extreme, whether perpetrated by Nazis in Europe or the Klan at home. Along the way, white Protestants developed certain social sensibilities and an increasing openness to cultural diversity.

At the same time that Congress was passing restrictive legislation during the 1920s, some Protestants were promoting greater awareness of racial and ethnic

⁵³United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 11, folder 64, RG 301.7.11.64, PHS. See also Episcopal Church, *Living Church Annual, 1945*, 50.

⁵⁴Fern M. Colborn to John S. Cooper, March 11, 1948; Ina Sugihara to Fern Colburn, April 20, 1948; Fern M. Colborn to John Sherman Cooper, May 19, 1948, United PC(USA) Board of Christian Education, Council on Church and Society Records, box 12, folder 23, RG 78.12.23, PHS.

⁵⁵“Program, Nisei Summer Assembly, Corpus Christi, Texas, August 26-29, 1948, For Nisei and Their Friends,” Una Roberts Lawrence Collection, box 20, folder 22, AR 631, Southern Baptist Historical Library and Archives, Nashville, Tennessee.

⁵⁶Ray Allen Billington, *The Protestant Crusade: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism, 1800-1860* (1938; repr., Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964), 234.

inequality. This was demonstrated as early as 1922 when the FCC began hosting Race Relations Sunday every year to encourage racial inclusiveness among U.S. churches, a practice that continued into the 1940s. Outside of the FCC, many denominations also turned their attention to race relations during this time. The Methodist Church hosted a Conference on the Status of Minority Groups in a Christian Democracy in 1942.⁵⁷ An American Baptist pamphlet played off of the themes of health in “Christianity’s Formula as Sure as Vitamins” to promote a religious remedy to social and racial ills. Another American Baptist pamphlet, “Will You Help,” encouraged building relationships with minorities in one’s community, instructing its readers on the first page, “Look for an opportunity to start another acquaintance with someone of another language or race.”⁵⁸ Even some voices within the Southern Baptist fold began to challenge the entrenched racism of the South. A 1942 *Royal Service* issue included the following call to prayer: “Pray that He may deliver us from racial prejudice, that would draw a circle and shut them out, and that His spirit may help us draw a love-circle and take them in.” It continued, “The five million strangers within our gates, the majority unchurched and unsaved, are our peculiar responsibility. They are in ‘our wave-length’-neighbors to whom we can tell the Good News with ease and understanding.” The SBC went on to pass a Charter of Principles in Race Relations in 1947.⁵⁹

⁵⁷See Episcopal Church, *Living Church Annual, 1945*, 49; Race Relations - Folder 1, 1942-1950, 2583-2-3:7; Charter for Racial Policies, 1948-1962, 2587-6-5:1, Records of the Women's Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, UMC Archives-GCAH. See also National Council of Churches, “Brethren—Dwell Together in Unity,” Race Relations Sunday, February 13, 1955, The King Center, <http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/race-relations-sunday#> (accessed April 23, 2017).

⁵⁸“Will You Help,” 90-12, Christian Friendliness, “Prescription,” American Baptist Historical Society.

⁵⁹Mrs. W. J. Neel, “With Jesus through the Homeland,” *Royal Service* 36 (February 1942), 6. Concerning Southern Baptists, see also *Royal Service* 40 (May 1946); T. B. Maston, “*Of One*”: *A Study of*

Protestant reaction to the Zoot Suit Riots in 1943 is also telling. *Christian Century* covered the series of mob attacks U.S. sailors carried out on Mexican Americans in Los Angeles that summer. The *Christian Century* criticized the mainstream press for downplaying the issue of race; the *Century* referred to the confrontation according to what it was, a series of “race riots.” The *Century* tried to empathize with the trials of minorities and believed the press should be comparing both Japanese internment and the Zoot Suit Riots to developments in fascist Italy and Nazi Germany. “No voice was raised to point out that what the native fascists of California had started with the exile of 112,000 Japanese-Americans, they and their agents were now continuing with at least twice as many Mexican and Negro Americans.” The article then noted the international ramifications of such racism. “No other aspect of our national life has proved so vulnerable to Axis propaganda.”⁶⁰ A month later, *Christian Century* challenged those who were complaining about Mexican officials troubled over the treatment of Mexican Americans. The editorial claimed that critics were “utterly blind to the fact that no nation can any longer oppress or endanger the racial minorities within its borders without creating an international crisis and adding to the danger of war. Hitler should have taught them that.”⁶¹

Speech was another component of evolving Protestant social sensibilities. A Christian Friendliness pamphlet delineated “ten tips to tactful talkers.” The pamphlet proscribed such terms as “Darky,” “Wop,” “Dago,” “Pickaninny,” “Chink,” “Jap,”

Christian Principles and Race Relations (Atlanta, GA: Home Mission Board, Southern Baptist Convention, 1946); Mark Newman, *Getting Right with God: Southern Baptists and Desegregation, 1945-1995* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2001), 72-73, 112, 172.

⁶⁰“Portent of Storm,” *Christian Century*, June 23, 1943, 735-36.

⁶¹“Our Race Riots Create an International Incident,” *Christian Century*, July 28 1943, 861.

“Coon,” “Nigger,” “Bohunk,” “Greaser,” and “Kike,” names which the pamphlet found “unpardonable.” It also warned against phrases that reflected “an unconscious belief in white supremacy or anti-Semitism” such as “Indian giver,” “Nigger in a woodpile,” “White man’s time,” “Chinaman’s chance,” and “Jew me down.” The document went on to denounce stereotypes, such as “Jews are mercenary” or that “Catholics are bigots.” It also discouraged separating people into groups; rather, the pamphlet counseled its readers to refer to others as “Americans” and “fellow citizens.” The pamphlet, however, also admonished fellow Baptists who were quick to apologize for minorities; instead, it noted, “What is needed is equality of opportunity—not immunity from responsibility.”⁶²

Home missions during the war continued to provide Protestant women with opportunities to minister to immigrant women, providing subtle forms of empowerment in denominational work at the same time as the iconic “Rosie the Riveter” inspired women to join the American workforce. One American Baptist pamphlet for women announced, “The Christian Friendliness missionary must have the ability and confidence to meet emergencies as they arise.” The publication explained, “She must be informed concerning current laws, news and population changes. She must be able to recruit and train volunteers. She must be a counselor and a public speaker. She must live her message.”⁶³ Many Protestant women active in home missions continued their work among immigrant communities during the war, and once the war was over, Protestant women turned their attention to war brides of both white and ethnic servicemen. One American Baptist pamphlet noted, “Japanese-Americans and Chinese-Americans

⁶²“Ten Tips to Tactful Talkers,” 90-12, *Christian Friendliness*, American Baptist Historical Society.

⁶³Priest, *Christian Friendliness*.

returning to their homeland from service in World War II bring with them their wives from Japan and China; only to find discrimination in a so-called Christian nation.”⁶⁴

Women involved in home mission work often aimed to meet the particular needs of immigrant women, and in the process appealed to a “spiritual bond of our common motherhood.”⁶⁵

During the war and immediately following, society at large stressed the role that families and childrearing played in stable societies. In fact, *Parents' Magazine* in 1947 described one nursery program in New Haven, Connecticut, as an “Incubator of Democracy.” The nursery, aided by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, strove to bring together middle class Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish children, black and white, in an effort to instill the virtues of tolerance in the next generation. The article demonstrates the convergence of postwar religious pluralism, racial concerns, and childrearing at the beginning of the baby boom.⁶⁶ Within this climate, Protestant ministry to immigrants often stressed the role of families.⁶⁷ Some Protestant missionaries recognized the service of ethnic Americans in the war and the price their families paid. A Christian Friendliness report encouraged women to assist immigrant families who either lost men in the war or welcomed back injured servicemen. “Mothers need help where

⁶⁴Priest, *Christian Friendliness*; Booth, *How Can We Help Japanese American Evacuees?*, 11. For material on war brides, see Dana M. Albaugh, *Who Shall Separate Us?: A New Dimension in Christian Witness; Relief, Resettlement, Rehabilitation, Reconstruction* (Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1962), 43; “Bible Class for Brides,” *Home Missions* 31 (October 1960), 24-25.

⁶⁵Booth, *How Can We Help Japanese American Evacuees?*, 12.

⁶⁶Eugene H. Kone, “Incubator of Democracy,” *Parents' Magazine* 22 (January 1947), 26-27, 81-82.

⁶⁷On mainline Protestant family values, see Margaret Bendroth, *Growing Up Protestant: Parents, Children, and Mainline Churches* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2002).

they have become heads of families and have gone to work.”⁶⁸ Such an emphasis on family helped define forms of ministry during this period and later encouraged Protestants who kept up with immigration policy to advocate on behalf of family reunification.

Race relations, inclusive language, the role of women, and the importance of family all helped define Protestant social sensibilities during and after the war. One final value stressed during this period was a limited form of religious pluralism. In December 1948, Benson Y. Landis, an active leader in the FCC, was riding on a train when he spotted Msgr. Luigi Ligutti a couple seats down, a moment he ascribed to a “kind providence.” The Protestant Landis and Catholic Ligutti discussed several topics on that trip; Landis later confessed that his wife “was never able to get a word in edgewise.” During their impromptu conversation, Ligutti mentioned his hope to produce a statement by representatives “within the three faiths” concerning immigration policy. Ligutti then referenced the work of another Catholic figure, William J. Gibbons, S. J., who was open to meeting with FCC officials on the matter.⁶⁹ This chance encounter highlights another key ideal often at the nexus of Protestant home missions and immigration, a Judeo-Christian religious pluralism that remained in vogue following the war.

The assurance of a “Tri-Faith” America, as historian Kevin Schultz has noted, was reinforced often through the work of the National Committee for Christians and Jews. It is no coincidence that the organization recognized every year this tri-faith religious pluralism in what was referred to as Brotherhood Week, incorporating a word

⁶⁸“C.F. Conference, February 15-17,” 3, American Baptist Historical Society (box and folder numbers unavailable; copy in author’s possession).

⁶⁹Benson Y. Landis to Dr. Barnes, December 17, 1948, FCC Records, box 33, folder 19, NCC RG 18.33.19, PHS.

already ubiquitous among Protestant social reformers.⁷⁰ A striking example of this form of religious pluralism was demonstrated during World War II. In 1943, Catholic, Jewish, Protestant, and Eastern Orthodox representatives signed a Declaration on World Peace that outlined seven principles touching on rights and morals. The Protestant signers acknowledged in a separate statement that they shared with other religious leaders an understanding that “moral and religious convictions should guide the relations of nations.” They concluded their statement, however, with a Protestant admonition: “Beyond these proposals we hold that the ultimate foundations of peace require spiritual regeneration as emphasized in the Christian Gospel.” Many ecumenical and denominational figures eventually signed the statement, including FCC President and Episcopal Bishop Henry St. George Tucker, Methodist G. Bromley Oxnam, John Foster Dulles, and “Mrs.” Norman Vincent Peale.⁷¹ Such relationships among the three faiths often fostered concerted efforts to address immigration reform and refugee needs in the coming years, but as the above statement made by Protestants suggests, they held this ideal in tension with their own distinct religious convictions.

Exclusion on Its Way Out

The war may have spurred various social sensibilities, but it also encouraged mainline Protestants to pay careful attention to legislation affecting immigrants. Rather than calling for a complete overhaul of immigration policy, Protestants often through

⁷⁰Kevin M. Schultz, *Tri-Faith America: How Catholics and Jews Held Postwar America to Its Protestant Promise* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 65-66, 69, 75, 78, 105; Fleegler, *Ellis Island Nation*, 38, 43-44, 69-70, 74, 76-77.

⁷¹*Pattern for Peace: Catholic, Jewish and Protestant Declaration on World Peace* (New York: Church Peace Union, World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, 1943), W. E. B. Du Bois Papers (MS 312), Special Collections and University Archives, University of Massachusetts Amherst Libraries, <http://credo.library.umass.edu/view/pageturn/mums312-b101-i493/#page/3/mode/1up> (accessed April 10, 2017); “Religious Leaders Issue Peace Plan,” *New York Times*, October 7, 1943.

piecemeal attempts strove to open America's doors to previously excluded groups. They first set their sights on overturning Chinese exclusion that had been in place since 1882. In their efforts to pressure Congress to end exclusion, Protestants demonstrated their loyalty to the war cause as they recommended admitting only wartime allies. They also communicated their tacit approval of the national origins system by acknowledging only miniscule quotas for Chinese immigrants if exclusion were overturned. Some Protestants stressed the importance of family values by advocating naturalization for Chinese men, which would allow wives back in China to reunite with their husbands in the United States.⁷² Along the way, mainline Protestants aimed to be "politically practicable," rather than make unrealistic demands. General Secretary of the Church Peace Union Henry A. Atkinson acknowledged, "I think the time has come for us to base our appeal definitely upon the proposal that China be put immediately on the quota system, instead of making a general appeal for a liberalization of the law."⁷³ Many Protestant dignitaries wanted such liberalization, but understood that political change in America required patience and calculation.

By the end of 1942, many Protestants like Atkinson approached the political sphere with caution, reflecting careful attention to the political climate. Others, however, were ready to take immediate action. The Church Federation of Los Angeles announced its intent to "create and stir up sentiment against the oriental exclusion laws of the United States." By the spring of 1943 FCC leaders met with Immigration and Naturalization

⁷²Wynn C. Fairfield to Walter W. Van Kirk, September 2, 1941; William Ernest Hocking to Henry St. George Tucker, March 14, 1943, FCC Records, box 34, folder 1, NCC RG 18.34.1, PHS.

⁷³Francis B. Sayre to Van Kirk, November 7, 1942; "To the Members of the Committee on International Relations of the Foreign Missions Conference of N.A.," April 22, 1943; L. J. Shafer to Van Kirk, February 15, 1943; George Gleason, "Dr. Walter W. Van Kirk—#2"; Henry A. Atkinson to Van Kirk, June 2, 1943, FCC Records, box 34, folder 1, NCC RG 18.34.1, PHS.

Service (INS) officials and began crafting a plan to challenge Asian exclusion. This also involved forming alliances with such groups as the Catholic Welfare Conference and Chinese United Associations. With congressional hearings nearing, the FCC then voted on a statement in May 1943 that leaders sent out to potential supporters for their signatures. The statement denounced “discrimination on account of race” in Asian exclusion, claiming that “such racial discrimination does violence to the Christian view of one humanity under God, is contrary to the democratic principles upon which this country was founded, and to proved scientific facts.” It called upon Congress “to allow natives of all friendly countries, otherwise admissible, to enter this country under the existing quota system and become citizens on the same terms as immigrants from non-Oriental countries.”⁷⁴ FCC officials mailed the statement to 55,000 ministers, eliciting support from numerous individuals and church councils. The declaration soon received press coverage in the *New York Times* and *New York Herald Tribune*.⁷⁵ In correspondence with an FCC official, the Executive Secretary of the Committee for Church and Community Cooperation in Los Angeles County even anticipated, probably prematurely, that “[m]illions of church people would like to see the change made.”⁷⁶

That summer, mainline Protestant leaders worked on numerous fronts. FCC representatives spoke before a congressional committee on May 26, 1943, following after the American Legion whose testimony at the hearing ran counter to the FCC’s

⁷⁴FCC Records, box 34, folder 1, NCC RG 18.34.1; “Resolution adopted by the Executive Committee . . . May 18th 1943,” FCC Records, box 33, folder 18, NCC RG 18.33.18, PHS.

⁷⁵Van Kirk to George Gleason, March 22, 1943, and passim, FCC Records, box 34, folder 1, NCC RG 18.34.1, PHS.

⁷⁶George Gleason to Van Kirk, June 11, 1943, FCC Records, box 34, folder 1, NCC RG 18.34.1, PHS.

positions.⁷⁷ As momentum continued in Congress into the summer of 1943, Protestants also contacted their congressmen. The Wisconsin Council of Churches wrote Samuel Dickstein, chair of the House Immigration Committee, that such exclusion was tied to recent U.S. conflicts with China and Japan and that the “removal of this racial slur would go a long way toward convincing the peoples of the world of the honesty of our war aims.” In another letter sent to other congressmen that summer, the Wisconsin Council drew upon the ideal of brotherhood and acknowledged that it “believes that all men are members of one great family under God, and that all racial discrimination is contrary to the Divine will, as well as to the democratic principles upon which our country was founded.”⁷⁸ U. G. Murphy from Seattle wrote Roswell Barnes in the FCC that he was concerned over the role the United States would have in promoting peace after the war if Asian exclusion was not addressed. He went on to express both missional and patriotic concern. “Unless the Church of Christ in America very promptly and clearly cuts itself loose from our present national attitude toward Orientals, the Cause of Christ in all of Asia will get a violent set back.” Murphy then assured Barnes, “I am praying for you men, up on the front line, and am hoping that we, as followers of Christ, as well as Americans, shall be able to present our case so clearly to our fellow citizens that something will be done to rectify some of the harm done by our totally unchristian and un-American attitude toward Orientals and all persons of color.”⁷⁹ That summer FCC

⁷⁷FCC, “For Immediate Release,” May 28, 1943, FCC Records, box 11, folder 8, NCC RG 18.11.8, PHS.

⁷⁸Luman J. Shafer, May 28, 1943; Wisconsin Council of Churches to Samuel Dickstein, June 22, 1943; Wisconsin Council of Churches to Alexander Wiley, June 22, 1943, FCC Records, box 34, folder 1, NCC RG 18.34.1, PHS.

⁷⁹U. G. Murphy to Roswell P. Barnes, June 28, 1943, FCC Records, box 11, folder 8, NCC RG 18.11.8, PHS.

officials even put pressure on the president of the American Federation of Labor, William Green, who was less inclined to support the legislation. He shot back suggesting the FCC respect the AFL's "same right to present the point of view of labor regarding Immigration Legislation" that the FCC had in promoting its position.⁸⁰

Minnesota congressman Walter H. Judd proved to be the leading congressional ally the FCC had in this fight to end Chinese exclusion. His concern over Asian restriction found willing support among mainline Protestant figures, but Judd's former work in China as a medical missionary made him a brother in arms. Though a freshman congressman, Judd put his former experiences in China to good use and took the lead in winning support for ending Chinese exclusion.⁸¹ Judd's close ties to mainline Protestants and his affinity to many of their midcentury ideals came to a head in 1949 when he spoke at an interracial rally in Chicago sponsored by Christian Friendliness workers of the American Baptist Convention. He gave a speech titled "How Build Unity," and according to a Christian Friendliness report, Judd urged "at every point that the Christian way is the only way." The report noted that at the rally there were Muslim and Jewish attendees who expressed interest in Christianity and that the event included presentations

⁸⁰James Myers to Barnes, June 17, 1943; to William Green, June 17, 1943; William Green to Roswell P. Barnes, July 2, 1943, FCC Records, box 11, folder 8, NCC RG 18.11.8, PHS.

⁸¹Albert Lee to Van Kirk, February 4, 1943; Van Kirk to U. G. Murphy, April 28, 1943; "To the Members of the Committee on International Relations of the Foreign Missions Conference of N.A.," April 22, 1943; Van Kirk to George Gleason, March 22, 1943, FCC Records, box 34, folder 1, NCC RG 18.34.1; Walter H. Judd to Roswell P. Barnes, March 4, 1943; Barnes to U. G. Murphy, June 15, 1943, FCC Records, box 11, folder 8, NCC RG 18.11.8, PHS; Laura M. Calkins, "Judd, Walter H. 1898-1994," in *Encyclopedia of Chinese-American Relations*, ed. Yuwu Song (Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Co., 2009), http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/mcfcham/judd_walter_h_1898_1994/0?institutionId=720 (accessed April 12, 2017).

by Displaced Persons, foreign students, and war brides.⁸² FCC officials relied heavily on their ties to this likeminded statesman in the years to come.

As the summer of 1943 progressed, the FCC kept the churches abreast of legislative prospects during the next session of Congress that fall. “This allows,” proclaimed the FCC, “our Christian forces two months in which to carry on an education work in the interest of letting members of Congress know how strongly Christian sentiment supports the principle that our immigration policies should no longer retain the stigma of racial discrimination.” On the precipice of legislative action, church councils and denominations continued to send in their support to the FCC. The Council of Church Women of Rochester and Monroe County (New York) resolved to support ending Chinese exclusion, and noted its “hope that there will be further revision of the immigration laws to permit the admission on a quota basis and the naturalization of all Orientals.” The Episcopal Church passed a resolution in October 1943 also backing principles established earlier by the FCC on Asian exclusion. A Methodist even expounded in a missive that October that “Christian morality and political strategy seem at this moment to coincide.” Walter Van Kirk, Executive Secretary of the FCC’s Department of International Justice and Goodwill and the foremost leader in the FCC on matters of immigration reform, wrote in October 1943 that despite the “inadequate” nature of the current bill he hoped it was a first step in immigration and naturalization reform.⁸³

⁸²“News of Christian Friendliness Coast to Coast,” March 1949, 1, WABHMS, 53-18 Christian Friendliness, American Baptist Historical Society.

⁸³Samuel McCrea Cavert to Secretaries of Councils of Churches, July 14, 1943; Mrs. Lester P. Wager to Cavert, September 18, 1943; General Convention, Protestant Episcopal Church, “Chinese Exclusion Act”; Charles F. Boss Jr., October 14, 1943; Van Kirk, October 11, 1943; and passim, FCC Records, box 34, folder 2, NCC RG 18.34.2; “To the Congress of the United States of America”; FCC

As Congress reconvened that fall, many observers hoped Chinese exclusion was destined to end. Congressman Judd kept the FCC informed throughout the proceedings, and in October, Van Kirk sent out another FCC petition, which eventually solicited nearly one thousand signatures, including that of such mainline dignitaries as Georgia Harkness, Reinhold Niebuhr, Harry Fosdick, and G. Bromley Oxnam. At this time Van Kirk concluded, "It will be impossible after the war to establish a world community based on justice and brotherhood unless we take steps now to remove from our statutes discrimination against the Chinese on account of color." Van Kirk observed the contradictory nature of exclusion when the United States also considered the "Chinese as military allies." Upon receiving the petition, Indiana Senator Raymond E. Willis commented, "The names are impressive, and your suggestion cannot but be heeded, couched as it is. It looks at this time as though the requested outcome of the bill mentioned would be favorable." Writing to Luman Shafer who was serving on the FCC's Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace in November 1943, Congressman Judd acknowledged a Senate vote was likely, but suggested "we ought not to rest on our oars."⁸⁴ The following month after the bill passed through the Senate, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed it into law, officially ending Chinese exclusion.

The following year Protestants did not "rest on" their "oars." They instead began promoting a bill to end Indian exclusion, a measure sponsored by Senator Emmanuel Celler and Representative Clare Boothe Luce. In this new legislative battle, the FCC

Records, box 34, folder 3, NCC RG 18.34.3; Samuel McCrea Cavert to Basil Mathews, October 8, 1943, FCC Records, box 11, folder 8, NCC RG 18.11.8, PHS.

⁸⁴FCC, "A petition signed by 800," October 21, 1943; Raymond E. Willis to Cavert, November 1, 1943; Walter H. Judd to Luman J. Shafer, November 1, 1943; and passim, FCC Records, box 34, folder 2, NCC RG 18.34.2, PHS.

cooperated closely with the India League of America.⁸⁵ Van Kirk went before Congress again, a task he would carry out repeatedly over the next several years, and presented a statement that had the backing of many denominational figures. Van Kirk appealed to America's "declared purpose to establish amongst the nations a new world order of justice and of human brotherhood," while also noting that the meager quota that Indians would receive meant that "the action here proposed could be taken without any risk whatever to our economic, political, and cultural patterns of living." Following his comments, he faced stiff questioning from politicians at the hearing, and his answers elucidate several positions of one of the FCC's most prominent spokesmen. First, Van Kirk acknowledged that quota numbers were not as significant as removing racial barriers. When asked about the prospect of Japanese immigration, Van Kirk affirmed that only Asian nations not at war with America should be allowed immigration. While he largely dodged the question of an eventual Japanese quota, he did hint that Japanese should be treated equally. To this point, the chairman of the hearing curtly noted, "So far as I am concerned, I would not want to see a quota for Japan for the next thousand years." Van Kirk then commented, "That is not under discussion." Apparently oblivious to Van Kirk, the chairman, Samuel Dickstein, then added, "That goes for the Germans, too. I think something should be done about cutting the German quota." The questioning then turned to decreasing overall quota numbers, and though acknowledging that the primary issue was ending racial exclusion, Van Kirk argued that he was not in a position to speak

⁸⁵ FCC Records, box 34, folder 5, NCC RG 18.34.5; Van Kirk, "Statement made before the House Committee," March 7, 1945, FCC Records, box 34, folder 3, NCC RG 18.34.3; "Action of the Woman's Division," September 2, 1948, FCC Records, box 33, folder 19, NCC RG 18.33.19; "Luce-Celler Bills HR1584 and HR 173," FCC Records, box 33, folder 20, NCC RG 18.33.20, PHS. See also "Memorandum on Proposed Legislation," South Asian American Digital Archive, <http://www.saada.org/sites/all/themes/saada/bookreader.php?title=TWVtb3JhbmR1bSBvbiBQcm9wb3NlZCBMZWdpc2xhdGlvbiA=&folder=MjAxMy0wMQ==&object=aXRlbS1iYWdhaS1hYmct&pages=NDM=#page/1/mode/1up> (accessed April 2, 2017).

on the matter but that the “Federal Council does not ask that our immigration restrictions against peoples of other countries be relaxed.” Van Kirk’s responses largely reflect the historic position of white Protestants that immigration restriction and quotas were necessary, as long as they were not racially discriminatory.⁸⁶ Indian nationals would have to wait another two years, however, before Congress rescinded their exclusion.

As the war came to a halt in 1945, white Protestants continued their drive for immigration reform in the legislative arena, largely in response to congressmen looking to take advantage of a postwar climate that had historically aided restrictionists, as seen in the passage of the 1921 and 1924 laws following World War I. In July 1945 Texas Congressman Ed Gossett sponsored a bill proposing to cut current quotas in half over the next ten years. While Protestant leaders generally supported limited restriction through set quotas, drastically reducing total immigration went too far. Once the bill made it to the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization by February 1946, Protestants voiced their opposition. The American Christian Committee for Refugees communicated its concerns to Committee Chairman John Lesinski. Oxnam, now president of the FCC, also telegraphed Lesinski, noting that the FCC’s Executive Committee “recommends that no downward alteration of existing quotas in immigration laws be undertaken at this time.” Van Kirk and the Methodist Woman’s Division of Christian Service also opposed such measures.⁸⁷ Mainline Protestant leaders were unwilling to lose ground to nativist forces following World War II.

⁸⁶U.S. House of Representatives, 79th Congress, First Session, *To Grant a Quota to Eastern Hemisphere Indians and to Make Them Racially Eligible for Naturalization; Hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1945), 12-17.

⁸⁷Read Lewis to Van Kirk, February 14, 1946; Van Kirk to Social Action Secretaries, February 19, 1946; Leland Rex Robinson to John Lesinski, February 26, 1946; G. Bromley Oxnam to Lesinski, March

Though Gossett's bill never passed, mainline leaders believed more work remained as long as Japanese immigrants were excluded from entering the country and denied naturalization. In the years that followed, mainline leaders worked to overturn Japanese exclusion now that the United States was no longer at war with Japan. In keeping with their fruitful relationship earlier, Van Kirk reached out to Judd in 1946 to discuss the "propriety of the churches taking action now on the matter of repealing our exclusion legislation with respect to the Japanese."⁸⁸ While the FCC relied on its ties to Judd, other groups at this time considered the FCC an ally, including the Japanese American Citizens League. FCC leaders were also in touch with the Committee for Equality in Naturalization. The FCC moved forward in 1947, passing a resolution calling on the government to "complete Congressional action in removing the principle of discrimination in our immigration and naturalization laws respecting Orientals."⁸⁹ At the same time, the Protestant Council of the City of New York published an editorial in the *New York Times* calling for ending Asian exclusion, especially in light of human rights and America's role in the world, and the Methodist General Conference passed a resolution in May 1948 supporting Japanese and Korean immigration.⁹⁰ Most Americans, however, were not ready to open the nation to Japanese immigrants. Ruth

19, 1946, FCC Records, box 33, folder 18, NCC RG 18.33.18; Van Kirk to Beverly Boyd, June 28, 1948; "Action of the Woman's Division," September 2, 1948, FCC Records, box 33, folder 19, NCC RG 18.33.19, PHS.

⁸⁸Van Kirk to Judd, January 22, 1946, FCC Records, box 33, folder 18, NCC RG 18.33.18, PHS.

⁸⁹FCC, clipping, "Resolution Adopted by the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of Churches, November 18, 1947"; and passim, FCC Records, box 34, folder 3, NCC RG 18.34.3. See also FCC Records, box 35, folder 14, NCC RG 18.35.14; box 33, folders 18, 19, NCC RG 18.33.18, 19, PHS.

⁹⁰"Lifting the Immigration Ban," *New York Times*, March 4, 1949; Methodist Church, *Journal of the 1948 General Conference of the Methodist Church*, 741-42. For other denominational responses, see "Re Elimination of Considerations of Race and Color from Immigration and Naturalization Laws," FCC Records, box 33, folder 19, NCC RG 18.33.19, PHS.

Isabel Seabury of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Mission noted in a letter to Van Kirk that some people she talked to feared “that hordes of Orientals will be coming to the country as a result.”⁹¹

As Congress took up legislation during the spring of 1948 that proposed reopening immigration to Japan and other Asian nations, Judd wrote Van Kirk, “Knowing the active interest of yourself and the Federal Council of Churches in the elimination of racial barriers in our immigration and naturalization laws I would like the testimony of your organization [sic] at the hearings.”⁹² Van Kirk, however, was unable to go this time, and Judd chose instead to read a statement Van Kirk wrote for the congressional hearing that April. The Japanese American Citizens League later wrote Van Kirk thanking him for his “excellent statement.”⁹³ A couple of months later as the bill was now in the Senate, Van Kirk went before a Senate subcommittee to advocate for further immigration reform for Asians.⁹⁴ Before the committee members in July 1948, Van Kirk appealed to both national and spiritual interests. “This is an action dictated by the ethical precepts of the Christian religion and by the concern of the American people that the principle of democracy and fair play shall become operative throughout the world.” Van Kirk then counseled the Senators at the hearing, “I can assure the members

⁹¹Ruth Isabel Seabury to Van Kirk, October 30, 1947, FCC Records, box 33, folder 18, NCC RG 18.33.18, PHS.

⁹²Judd to Van Kirk, April 15, 1948; Robert M. Cullum to John Foster Dulles, June 16, 1948, FCC Records, box 33, folder 19, NCC RG 18.33.19, PHS.

⁹³Judd to Van Kirk, April 21, 1948; Mike Masaoka to Van Kirk, April 29, 1948, FCC Records, box 33, folder 19, NCC RG 18.33.19, PHS.

⁹⁴Beverly M. Boyd to Robert E. Bondy, June 18, 1948, FCC Records, box 33, folder 19, NCC RG 18.33.19, PHS.

of this Committee that the action here recommended has the unqualified approval of the great majority of the Protestant churches of the United States.”⁹⁵

Six days later, Alson J. Smith, a representative of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, also spoke before the same Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the matter of immigration reform. His statement wove together multiple themes reflecting both the progress and inertia within Protestant positions on race, immigration, and pluralism since the early twentieth century. He assured his interlocutors that he valued the nation’s heritage, even acknowledging the “Anglo-Saxon nature of our laws, customs, and traditions.” Alson noted, however, that “we believe that it is more important to preserve the spirit of Anglo-Saxon fair-play and justice . . . than it is to preserve the Anglo-Saxon racial strain.” He then challenged the national origins policy from 1924. Alson recognized that such quotas favored northern Europeans and concluded that the system “seems to us not only unChristian in that it sets up judgments which are in violation of both the letter and the spirit of the New Testament, but also unAnglo-Saxon in that it violates the very spirit of the Magna Carta.” Alson then drew from recent history: “Furthermore, the ‘National origin’ provision makes us subscribe as a nation to a doctrine of racial difference the best-known exponent of which was the late Adolph Hitler and which we know to be biologically ridiculous as well as ethically outrageous.” Alson asked, “Have we, in two world wars, spent our treasure and the blood of our sons to make the world safe for a democracy which we ourselves refuse to practice?” Alson then turned to Asian exclusion. He reminded the committee of the ways that Japan during World War II used such racism to tarnish America’s image. But in keeping with many

⁹⁵Van Kirk, “Statement made before the Staff of the Senate Subcommittee,” July 8, 1948, FCC Records, box 33, folder 19, NCC RG 18.33.19, PHS.

other Protestant leaders, Alison acknowledged that he was not advocating “unrestricted immigration.” Alison pointed to labor concerns and assimilation challenges, even admitting that “as a Protestant church group we are interested in maintaining the predominantly Protestant character of the country.” But Alison believed this was best left to the marketplace of American religion, rather than immigration restriction.⁹⁶

A flurry of letters by local church councils was sent to Congress following the FCC’s appeal in 1948 for ending Japanese exclusion. A spokesperson for the Church Federation of Indianapolis suggested immigration reform for Asians was “in keeping with our Judeo-Christian and democratic political and ethical principles.”⁹⁷ The Council of Churches in Quincy, Massachusetts, and the Erie (Pennsylvania) Council of Churches chimed in on the issue, and farther south, the San Antonio Council, Missouri Council, and Oklahoma City Council of Churches also sent their support for overturning Asian restriction.⁹⁸ While supporting the cause of Asian immigrants, the Council of Churches of Buffalo and Erie County also took the opportunity to call for legislation to aid Displaced Persons following World War II.⁹⁹ The postwar refugee crisis could not be ignored, and many mainline Protestants called for action, a topic covered in the next chapter.

⁹⁶Alson J. Smith, “Testimony,” July 14, 1948, FCC Records, box 33, folder 19, NCC RG 18.33.19, PHS.

⁹⁷Howard J. Baumgartel to Louis Ludlow, March 20, 1948, FCC Records, box 33, folder 19, NCC RG 18.33.19, PHS.

⁹⁸Bedros Baharian to Richard B. Wigglesworth, March 24, 1948; Baharian to Van Kirk, March 24, 1948; Kenneth I. Clawson to Paul J. Kilday, April 21, 1948; G. Weir Hartman to Walter Judd, April 21, 1948; John C. Mayne to Van Kirk, April 23, 1948; Virgil F. Dougherty to Dept. of International Justice and Goodwill, FCC, May 27, 1948, FCC Records, box 33, folder 19, NCC RG 18.33.19, PHS.

⁹⁹“Resolutions Adopted by the Program Board of the Council of Churches of Buffalo and Erie County,” April 7, 1948, FCC Records, box 33, folder 19, NCC RG 18.33.19, PHS.

By 1949, a bill sponsored by Judd that aimed to end Japanese exclusion made it before the Senate. Despite efforts like those of the Methodist Church which called upon its members to write their senators to support the legislation, it was clear to many observers that the bill would face strong resistance. Nevertheless, Judd and Van Kirk stayed in touch that spring. Van Kirk traveled to Washington, D.C., and met with several other senators, but soon discovered Senator Pat McCarran's strong resistance to the bill would be insurmountable. For another round of Senate hearings that July, Van Kirk resubmitted the FCC's 1947 statement and outlined several points that comprised the FCC's position on Asian exclusion. The statement demonstrated succinctly elements of mainline Protestant concern over immigration policy that had been in place since the 1920s. Van Kirk first acknowledged that the "Christian gospel which has played such a vital part in the evolution of our nation exhorts [*sic*] the dignity and worth of man regardless of race or color." He noted that the fate of missions was closely tied to political decisions concerning race in America. Van Kirk then turned to international relations and the nation's ties to the United Nations, asserting, "The churches believe that the removal of the stigma of racial discrimination from our immigration and naturalization laws will vastly strengthen the moral position of our nation before the world." Finally, Van Kirk justified the FCC's position on the basis of American diplomacy in the region and East Asia's stability.¹⁰⁰ Despite the work of Judd and Van Kirk, the bill did not make it out of the Senate. Japanese immigration would have to remain a concern of mainline Protestants for a couple more years.

¹⁰⁰Judd to Van Kirk, April 1, 1949; Thoburn T. Brumbaugh to Board Member, April 26, 1949; Van Kirk to Ina Sugihara, April 27, 1949; Van Kirk to Judd, April 27, 1949; Van Kirk to J. Howard McGrath, July 14, 1949; "Statement by Dr. Walter W. Van Kirk," July 20, 1949, FCC Records, box 33, folder 20, NCC RG 18.33.20, PHS.

Conclusion

In 1946, President Truman publically demonstrated the liberal ties he had forged with mainline Protestant leadership. He spoke before the FCC biennial session held in Columbus, Ohio, that year and was introduced by one of mainline Protestantism's leading progressive ministers, Bishop Oxnam. In his speech, Truman brought together the themes that had defined much of Protestant work among immigrants. Truman acknowledged the social gospel heritage of his audience when using such expressions as "social justice" and "Brotherhood of Man." Truman stressed the close ties between religion and democracy and acknowledged the grave challenges these two ideals faced following World War II. And with references to "dignity," "decency," "righteousness," and "liberty," Truman alluded to the American Way of Life that home missionaries worked to preserve as they ministered to immigrants. Truman even acknowledged the Judeo-Christian pluralism that many Protestants had accepted by midcentury. "The Protestant Church, the Catholic Church, and the Jewish Synagogue—bound together in the American unity of brotherhood—must provide the shock forces to accomplish this moral and spiritual awakening." And though never specifically mentioning immigration, he still recognized America's diverse heritage: "We have this America not because we are of a particular faith, not because our ancestors sailed from a particular foreign port."¹⁰¹ Truman's speech before mainline Protestants here in 1946 affirmed much of their work in the realm of immigration and ethnic communities over the past twenty years.

¹⁰¹Harry S. Truman, "Address in Columbus at a Conference of the Federal Council of Churches," March 6, 1946, *American Presidency Project*, edited by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=12599> (accessed April 17, 2017); Chesly Manly, "Truman Pleads for a Rebirth of Golden Rule," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, March 7, 1946.

Truman's speech also came at a time when the United States and the rest of the world found itself stumbling into the Cold War. Indeed, the day before arriving at the FCC meeting, Truman had been in Fulton, Missouri, where former British Prime Minister and wartime ally Winston Churchill gave his "iron curtain" speech. As the Cold War set in, Americans continued to grapple with national identity. For most Protestants, America was bound to serve a providential purpose as a supposedly Christian nation while atheistic communism took root in Russia and China. Mainline Protestants embraced this calling in 1950 when they restructured their ecumenical ties and renamed the Federal Council of Churches. Now taking the title "National Council of Churches," the organization's attendees at its inaugural session met under a banner proclaiming "This Nation under God" and used the theme "building of a Christian America in a Christian world." The opening statement of the convention acknowledged the National Council's mission: "By word and deed and in the name of Christ who gave his life for all mankind it affirms the brotherhood of men and seeks by every rightful means to arrest those forces of division which rend the nation along the lines of race and class and stay its growth toward unity." In the coming years, immigration would test Protestant commitments to improving race relations and promoting national accord. Native Protestants considered how they treated the foreigner, whether immigrant or refugee, in a context intimately tied to the nation's new role as a superpower becoming entrenched in a Cold War.¹⁰²

¹⁰²Elesha J. Coffman, *The Christian Century and the Rise of the Protestant Mainline* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 175-81; Mark Edwards, *The Right of the Protestant Left: God's Totalitarianism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 1-2; "This Nation under God," *Christian Century*, December 13, 1950, 1478-79; "Inaugural Message of the National Council," *Christian Century*, December 13, 1950, 1484-85.

CHAPTER SIX

Strangers in Mayberry

“The Church of Christ has provided a way of salvation not only through a faith and fellowship adequate even for the wandering refugee; it has been as well the friendly Christian hand reaching across the sea to welcome the refugee to a new home of opportunity and hope in America.”

—Roland Elliot, “Article on Refugees”¹

The radio and film commission of the Methodist Church produced in 1955 a thirty-minute episode called *The Tourist*. In this short film, a church decides to sponsor a displaced person (DP) from war-torn Europe. The episode’s location resembles the stereotypical American community largely popularized by the Andy Griffith Show; even Howard McNear, who performed the role of the local Methodist minister, was the same actor who starred as Mayberry’s fidgety barber. As the plot unfolds, a local mechanic initially withholds his support from his church’s decision to sponsor a foreigner who he believes would vie for jobs in the neighborhood. The Methodist minister, however, advocates on behalf of resettling refugees and appeals to the principles of the brotherhood of man and fatherhood of God. The mechanic eventually warms up to the idea of the local church sponsoring a DP after a traveling reporter from Europe ends up stranded in the town for a couple of days. Through personal interaction with a foreigner, the

¹Roland Elliott, “Article on Refugees,” January 6, 1953, 5, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America (hereafter NCC) Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, Presbyterian Historical Society (hereafter PHS), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

mechanic changes his perspective.² This film reflects the confluence of many themes within American culture and midcentury Protestantism, including continuing social gospel sentiments, a developing religious media culture, and the postwar refugee crisis. By the 1950s, Americans were no longer witnessing multitudes of new immigrants coming to their towns, but due to refugee resettlement and the vitality of ethnic communities that were products of earlier immigration, native Protestant attention to the foreign-born continued into postwar America as white Christians worked to define the mission of a Protestant America and the merits and drawbacks of pluralism.

Following World War II, the white Protestant establishment reaffirmed its commitment to the far-reaching mission of the United States in light of foreign and domestic conditions. During the 1950s especially, American Protestants continued to stress home missions to immigrant and ethnic groups. These programs reflected progressive social gospel ideals, notions of what it meant to be American, and a continued evangelistic mission. Alongside their home mission work among ethnic groups, many mainline Protestant groups sponsored refugees during the years immediately following World War II as large numbers of Europeans were displaced and as the Cold War ensued. Together, Protestant responses to immigrants and refugees demonstrate efforts to sustain a level of pluralism while maintaining a Christian nation with global, providential responsibilities.

²*The Tourist* (1993-126), UMC 6027-3-4:10, United Methodist Church (hereafter UMC) Archives-GCAH, Madison, New Jersey. Demonstrating the inroads Protestant denominations were making into the film industry, this episode included other prominent midcentury actors and was directed by William F. Claxton, who later helped direct the TV series *Bonanza* and *Little House on the Prairie*, and was produced by Wilbur T. Blume, who won an Academy Award the following year.

Christian Nation through Home Missions

By midcentury, Protestant denominations continued to seek out foreigners in order to share the Gospel message and provide social services to those in need. Earlier sentiments that formed the basis of home missions to immigrants continued within most mainline programs. Through extensive settlement house programs and ministries appealing to specific national or language groups, many native Protestant churches, especially in urban centers, came into contact with ethnic minorities and worked to practice the social gospel tenant of the brotherhood of man. Most mainline denominations, contrary to fundamentalist claims, also continued to cultivate evangelistic efforts as a part of their mission to reach the immigrant, and by which help ensure America remained a Christian nation. A 1952 article in *Christian Century* titled “Evangelizing a Procession” demonstrates the persistence of these ideals. In defining home missions, the author, longtime home mission leader Hermann Morse, acknowledged, “Its over-all purpose—to extend the redemptive ministry of the gospel to all people throughout our land so as to make America truly Christian—relates it in some significant way to every aspect of contemporary life.”³

In addition to older European immigrant communities, Protestant home missionaries paid considerable attention to other groups, particularly Spanish-speakers and Asian immigrants. Despite deportations during the 1930s, Mexican immigration increased during the 1940s, due in part to the Bracero Program that encouraged Mexican laborers to come work in America during the labor shortages World War II created. The National Council of Churches (NCC) maintained a Committee on Spanish American Work, and all major Protestant denominations sponsored robust missions work in the

³Hermann N. Morse, “Evangelizing a Procession,” *Christian Century*, November 21, 1951, 1337.

Southwest among the Hispanic population either through denominational programs or regional associations and conferences. Missions work often came in the form of radio programs, religious educational institutes, programs for children, settlement house work, and college scholarships.⁴ As of 1960, the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC), Methodist Church, and Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. [PC(USA)] were each contributing over \$600,000 annually to missions work among Spanish-speaking people.⁵ Similar work was done among Asian populations, work given further precedence when the U.S. government recognized Chinese immigration once more in 1943 and Japanese immigration in 1952. Upon establishing communism in China in 1949, Mao Zedong only gave further impetus to some Chinese to immigrate to America.⁶ Moreover, following a concerted effort to minister to relocated Japanese during the war, Protestant

⁴Bertha Blair, Anne O. Lively, and Glen W. Trimble, *Spanish-speaking Americans: Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in the United States* (Home Missions Division, NCC, 1959); Committees: Spanish American Work, Records of the National Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2540-3-5:7, UMC Archives-GCAH; United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 19, folder 36, RG 301.7.19.36, box 24, folder 5, RG 301.7.24.5, PHS. For general historical overviews of Southern Baptist Mexican missions, see Leon McBeth, *The Baptist Heritage* (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1987), 735-44; Leon McBeth, *Texas Baptists: A Sesquicentennial History* (Dallas, TX: Baptistway Press, 1998); Joshua Grijalva, "The Story of Hispanic Southern Baptists," *Baptist History and Heritage* 18, no. 3 (July 1983): 40-47; Joshua Grijalva, *A History of Mexican Baptists in Texas, 1881-1981* (Dallas, TX: Baptist General Convention of Texas, 1982); Moisés Rodríguez, "The Cultural Context of Southern Baptist Work Among Mexican Americans in Texas" (PhD diss., Baylor University, 1997). For Southern Baptist work among *braceros* in Texas, see Jack E. Taylor, *God's Messengers to Mexico's Masses: A Study of the Religious Significance of the Braceros* (Eugene, OR: Institute of Church Growth, 1962).

⁵Glen W. Trimble, comp., "Responses to the Brief Survey of Church Related Spanish American Work in the Continental United States," January 10, 1961, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 24, folder 6, RG 301.7.24.6, PHS.

⁶Ellen M. Studley, "Stranded Intellectuals: The Case of the Chinese Student in America," *motive* 13 (January 1953), 20-26. Some Protestant leaders were also members of the Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals, Inc. See *Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals* pamphlet, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS.

denominations continued their work among Japanese communities and proudly noted, what they believed to be, their progressive stance taken during the war-time furor.⁷

Midcentury Protestant home missions drew upon the theological tradition of the social gospel. Multiple midcentury historians, such as Henry May, Paul Carter, and Robert Moats Miller, recognized in their own time that social gospel principles from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries endured.⁸ Theological propositions that underpinned the movement, particularly the brotherhood of man and fatherhood of God, were regularly cited into the 1950s, and Protestant groups continued to minister to immigrants in ways established at the turn of the century during the peak of the social gospel movement. The New York Episcopal Diocese funded denominational work on Ellis Island into the 1950s; an Episcopal Woman's Auxiliary report covering ministry conducted on Ellis Island in 1949 noted that the "year has been crowded with many G. I. brides and Displaced Persons in addition to the usual quota of stranded people."⁹ On the other side of the country, Methodists sponsored the same worker, Katharine R. Maurer,

⁷Roswell P. Barnes to Roy G. Ross, October 21, 1958; R. H. Edwin Espy to Wilbur C. Parry, February 19, 1959, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 2, folder 17, NCC RG 6.2.17; Fern M. Colborn to John Sherman Cooper, May 19, 1948, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. [hereafter PC(USA)] Board of Christian Education, Council on Church and Society Records, box 12, folder 23, RG 78.12.23, PHS.

⁸Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (1949; repr., New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1967); Paul A. Carter, *The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel: Social and Political Liberalism in American Protestant Churches, 1920-1940* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1956); Robert Moats Miller, *American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958).

⁹Diocese of New York, *Journal of the One Hundred and Sixty-Seventh Convention of the Diocese of New York, New York: Synod Hall, May 10, 1949*, 151; *Journal of the One Hundred and Seventy-Third Convention of the Diocese of New York, Held on May 11, 1954*, 139, Archives of the Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas.

from 1912 to 1951 who ministered to the needs of immigrants coming to the San Francisco Bay area through Angel Island.¹⁰

The continuity of earlier social gospel programs is also demonstrated through the continued settlement house work that several Protestant denominations maintained. A compelling example is the legacy of Maryal Knox, a member of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church. For fifty years, Knox worked among Italian, Puerto Rican, African American, and “gypsy” families in East Harlem through settlement work, aiming to “show different groups how to get along.” She helped run a neighborhood club for children, provided entertainment for mothers, and advocated for public housing projects in the area. For the children, sewing and art lessons were provided, and the club even took children on outings to Madison Square Garden to watch the circus and a “wild-west show.” On account of later postwar developments, Knox also welcomed displaced persons into her community. Having worked fifty years in her neighborhood, Knox’s career began during the early years of the social gospel movement and continued into the midcentury.¹¹ But Presbyterians were not the exception when it came to operating settlement houses later in the century. Into the 1950s, the Episcopal Church and Methodists continued to sponsor settlement houses and community centers. In their settlement house work, Methodist women defined the gravity of the need: “Too often our Christian leaders locally are ignorant of existing conditions in our cities which defy Christian principles of the brotherhood of man and respect of the rights and dignity of

¹⁰Woman’s Division of Christian Service, Methodist Church, *Patterns for Peace; Thirteenth Annual Report of the Woman’s Division of Christian Service of the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church*, 1951-1952, 116.

¹¹Carl G. Karsch, “The Lady Who Adopted a Neighborhood,” *Presbyterian Life*, April 26, 1952, 10-12.

each individual regardless of race or economic condition.” Even Southern Baptists practiced a similar form of work called Good Will Centers. Southern Baptists acknowledged that these centers followed in the vein of prior settlement efforts, such as London’s Toynbee Hall and Chicago’s Hull House, though Southern Baptists made the qualification that their Good Will Centers were “[s]ocial settlements with an evangelistic approach.”¹²

American Baptist women through their Department of Christian Friendliness also promoted a home mission program directed towards immigrants that was both socially progressive and evangelistic. In a leaflet titled “Objectives in Christian Social Relations” for 1954 and 1955, among many recommendations, it encouraged American Baptists to write their congressmen on matters of immigration and refugee policy, “[s]eek to win at least one person of another racial or national ground to Jesus Christ,” “[t]each English,” “[a]ssist in study of citizenship requirements,” and help with the “[i]nterpretation of each other’s culture and customs.”¹³ Christian Friendliness leaders depended largely on local women to implement denominational programs, noting that

it is as individuals that we show personal concern for that newcomer, helping the refugee mother learn the intricacies of shopping at the supermarket, welcoming the Negro moving in the house next door, hiring the Puerto Rican who applies for a job, looking upon each individual not as being of different color or culture, but as a child of God and therefore our brother or sister in Christ.¹⁴

¹²“Settlements and Community Centers,” *Episcopal Church Annual, 1960* (New York: Morehouse-Barlow, 1960), 103-104; “Community Centers,” *Twenty-First Annual Report of the Woman’s Division of Christian Service, Board of Missions, The Methodist Church, 1959-1960*, 81-82; first quote from Woman’s Division of Christian Service, Methodist Church, *Patterns for Peace*, 128; Loyd Carter, “Good Will Center Work”; Sara Taylor, “Good Will Centers in Missions,” in *Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists*, Vol. 1 (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1958), 569-70; second quote from 570.

¹³“Signposts in Christian Social Relations, Objectives in Christian Social Relations, 1954-1955,” 224-22, Christian Friendliness Lit Resources, 1954-55, American Baptist Historical Society, Atlanta, Georgia.

¹⁴“Mission: Stranger in the Midst,” 1962, American Baptist Historical Society (box and folder numbers unavailable; copy in author’s possession).

American Baptist women also sponsored what they called “Camp Friendly,” a program that took disadvantaged children from New York and Connecticut to homes in the countryside. The hallmark of the program was the diversity it inspired. During one summer, program organizers reported that they sponsored three Arabians, eleven Chinese, five Germans, three Japanese, twelve African Americans, two Norwegians, nineteen Puerto Ricans and Hispanics, and ten whites.¹⁵ By midcentury, a diffusion of social gospel ideals and evangelistic aspirations largely defined home missions to immigrant and ethnic communities.

In their attempts to spread the gospel message among the various nationalities represented in America, Protestant home missionaries tacitly accepted forms of cultural pluralism while working to build a Christian community that would transcend language and racial barriers. Reflecting on their work with Hispanics, a Presbyterian report recognized that the denomination needed to set aside hopes for Americanization and instead “adjust our program of approach and service to the culture and mores of the people.”¹⁶ One Southern Baptist even acknowledged that “there is a spiritual oneness that can be deeper and more significant than language, race, or culture.”¹⁷ While describing Methodist community center work, one report proclaimed that “cultural identities are fine, but to discriminate on account of color, nationality, or religion is

¹⁵“Happenings Along the Highways,” American Baptist Historical Society (box and folder numbers unavailable; copy in author’s possession).

¹⁶Paul L. Warnshois, “A Presbyterian Look at the Puerto Rican Situation,” United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 19, folder 31, RG 301.7.19.31, PHS. See also Lyle Saunders, “Anglos and Spanish-Speaking: Contrasts and Similarities,” July 16, 1959, Committees: Spanish American Work, Records of the National Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2540-3-5:7, UMC Archives-GCAH, Madison, New Jersey.

¹⁷Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1956), 196.

false.”¹⁸ Finally, a NCC book on missions to Spanish-speaking populations published in 1959 echoed similar sentiments. The text cited multiple contemporary social scientists and historians, such as Gunnar Myrdal and Oscar Handlin, and implored, on the basis of Christian missions, “majority” white, Protestant Americans to no longer marginalize “minority” groups on account of race, religion, language, class, and education, including Spanish-speaking groups in the Southwest. In an essay titled “Cultural Democracy” included as an appendix, Anne O. Lively criticized earlier Americanization efforts premised on the melting-pot theory. Instead, she called for cultural democracy, acknowledged in a footnote as cultural pluralism. While such a theory welcomed cultural differences and was suspicious of an assimilation agenda, it still acknowledged, “Cultural diversity—if adequately understood and practiced—does not negate the central unity that each society must have to function as a whole.”¹⁹ But what that “central unity” was remained unclear.

Sensitivity to cultural pluralism was evident in the area of language. Protestant home missionaries often incorporated foreign languages into their mission work, just as missionaries overseas accommodated local cultures linguistically. Presbyterians aired a radio program for Spanish speakers in New York City called “Cantares de Mi Tierra,” and Texas Baptists did something similar. Donato Ruiz, a minister in central Texas, noted the potential use of the airwaves: “Radio has been the best means to overcome obstacles no other instrument could. . . . The master and secret key to open the doors of

¹⁸Woman’s Division of Christian Service, Methodist Church, *Patterns for Peace*, 129

¹⁹Blair, Lively, and Trimble, *Spanish-speaking Americans*, quote from 222.

every home and family in all the San Angelo area is surely the use of radio.”²⁰ One SBC report reprimanded Baptists who allowed language to be a barrier. “We deal with these people in all the other realms of life in spite of the handicaps of differences of language and customs. It is unbelievable that we should continue to put these forward as excuses for neglect in the realm of religion when two million souls are involved.”²¹ An NCC study even advocated a bilingual approach: “Among Anglos, cultural reciprocity is limited without bilingual exchange and the old pattern of cultural influence (i.e., a one-directional flow toward Anglo ways) rather than cultural interflow continues to predominate.”²² In the end, evangelization and ministry often trumped any aversion to using Spanish, rather than English. When English was stressed, it was usually for more pragmatic purposes, such as equipping immigrants to attain jobs; nevertheless, underlying this position was still a latent understanding that English was the unofficial language of America.²³

Home mission programs also interpreted race in a fluid manner. The 1959 NCC study of missions to Spanish speakers consulted the work of current social theorists who acknowledged the social construction of racial prejudice and that racial categories

²⁰“Committee on Spanish American Work,” June 15, 1959; “Cantares de mi Tierra,” Committees: Spanish American Work, Records of the National Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2540-3-5:7, UMC Archives-GCAH; Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1942), quote from 284; for more information on radio broadcasts, see Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1941), 298; McBeth, *Texas Baptists*, 298; Grijalva, *A History of Mexican Baptists in Texas*, 80.

²¹Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1948), 179. See also John Caylor, *Our Neighbors of Many Tongues: Resource Book on 1954 Home Mission Series* (Atlanta, GA: Home Mission Board, SBC, 1954).

²²Blair, Lively, and Trimble, *Spanish-speaking Americans*, 114.

²³For example, see Woman’s Division of Christian Service, Methodist Church, *Patterns for Peace*, 8.

changed over time.²⁴ In many cases Protestant home missionaries conflated race, ethnicity, and nationality. A meeting of the NCC's Committee on Spanish American Work demonstrated this. Referring to a recent study of churches and race relations, Paul Warnshuis "indicated he was concerned because the proposed research program seemed to be thinking exclusively in terms of Negroes, whereas there are the very same problems involving cultural groups. The hope was expressed that if such a project were carried out it might be on a broader basis, to include racial, cultural and ethnic groups."²⁵ Such a loose interpretation of race is also evident in a Southern Baptist pamphlet describing mission center work in New Orleans. Titled "Is It Jus' For Whites?," the pamphlet recounted the ruminations of a missionary who led work in the area. The missionary described various scenarios where a lack of ministry to the local African American community stood in stark contrast to the work being done for "eighteen nationalities, ranging from very white to almost black, yet none were Negro."²⁶

Out of this very broad and inconsistent treatment of race was a progressive bent. As the civil rights movement progressed, denominational leaders began to push for integration and justice for ethnic and national groups, alongside African Americans, as a way to combat America's racial sins. A midcentury Methodist program establishing work projects for young adults along the Rio Grande noted, "Among the campers were Latin Americans, Anglo-Americans, and Negroes." Such an endeavor was reported as an

²⁴Blair, Lively, and Trimble, *Spanish-speaking Americans*, 4, 6-8, 10, 32-33, 123-28.

²⁵"Committee on Spanish American Work," June 15, 1959, 3, Committees: Spanish American Work, Records of the National Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2540-3-5:7, UMC Archives-GCAH.

²⁶Gladys Keith, "Is It Jus' For Whites?," Home Mission Board Communication Division Collection, box 2, folder 10, AR 631-7, Southern Baptist Historical Library and Archives, Nashville, Tennessee.

interracial success.²⁷ Mainline Protestant concern over racial prejudice also reinforced increasing acceptance of Catholics and Jews. In her 1952 booklet of worship programs for Protestant women that promoted the theme of “Righteousness Exalts a Nation,” Georgia Harkness listed multiple examples from history and several ideals that help define “What is America?” For one of her answers to that question, Harkness referenced a 1939 concert in Washington, D.C., that now serves as a milestone in the civil rights movement. America, according to Harkness, “is Marian Anderson, a great Negro Protestant artist, singing the Roman Catholic aria ‘Ave Maria’ in praise of Jesus’ Jewish mother beside the Lincoln Memorial in the nation’s capitol.”²⁸

Protestant home missionaries promoted a moderate form of cultural pluralism in their work among immigrant communities, and consequently separated themselves from the hard-lined Americanization program that had defined earlier efforts. This did not mean, however, that immigrant ministries were divorced from national causes. As the Cold War heightened American fears during the 1950s of a godless Soviet Russia, many Americans believed it was important to maintain America as a Christian nation. The phrase “one nation under God” was inserted into the Pledge of Allegiance in 1954, and “In God We Trust” was made the national motto in 1956. Some Protestants reached the conclusion that the nation’s destiny was closely tied to evangelization and domestic ministry. For white Protestants, the stakes were high; immigrants and ethnic Americans must be given the gospel.

²⁷Methodist Church, *Mid-Century Report, Division of Home Missions and Church Extension of the Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church*, December 10-13, 1950, 234-36; quote from 235.

²⁸Georgia Harkness, *O Worship the Lord* (New York: NCC, 1952), 5, UCW Resources, 1948-1955, Church Women United Records, 1222-4-2:7, UMC Archives-GCAH.

A 1952 article describing Presbyterian work reinforced this perspective in its title, “Because We Are . . . ‘A City Set on a Hill’: National Missions Seeks to Make America a Light to the World,” a clear nod to the nation’s supposed religious destiny inherited from the Puritans. The article sounded a clarion call for Presbyterians to save America through home missions. For the writer of this article, America’s ethnic diversity reflected “thousands upon thousands from every corner of our land, speaking many dialects, unable to understand each other, puzzled, baffled, and often outraged by their neighbors, being brought together in brotherhood as children of one loving Father.”²⁹ For many Protestants, home mission programs were the key to maintaining a Christian nation; once people converted to Protestant Christianity, the nation would affirm its religious identity.

Protestants’ desire to make America a stronghold for Christianity encouraged them in part to consider the close proximity between evangelism and religious nationalism. White Christians took up the task of evangelization and hoped that redeemed souls, regardless of ethnicity, would make America Christian. A 1949 Southern Baptist report on work among Hispanics concluded, “If we are ever to have a Christian America from the political standpoint, in the Southwest at least, it is imperative that the Spanish-speaking voting populace be evangelized.”³⁰ In his foreword to a report on the prospects of ministry among *braceros*, Dallas P. Lee, head of the Baptist General Convention of Texas’s Language Missions Department, commented, “God has brought a

²⁹“Because We Are . . . ‘A City Set on a Hill’: National Missions Seeks to Make America a Light to the World,” *Presbyterian Life*, October 18, 1952, 11-13. For a more nuanced position, see “National Purpose and Christian Mission,” *Christian Century*, January 6, 1960, 3-5.

³⁰Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1949), 178.

mission field to Christian America.”³¹ Even ethnic Protestants sometimes affirmed this logic. A 1950 Methodist report for the California Oriental Provisional Conference noted, “The Methodist Church is in a strategic position to serve these Oriental people in the United States and preach Christ to them that our racial communities may not be pagan groups in the midst of Christian America.”³² Ministering to minority groups was contributing to America’s progress, in the minds of many Protestants.

By the 1950s, American society was beginning to expand upon the notion of the United States being a Christian nation, coming to the conclusion that America was instead a Judeo-Christian country in which Protestants, Catholics, and Jews were learning to live peaceably together. The most famous interpretation of this phenomenon was sociologist Will Herberg’s 1955 study describing a triple melting pot whereby each religion incorporated the “American Way of Life”; accordingly, Protestants found it necessary to extend democracy and tolerance to Jewish and Catholic foreigners.³³ By all appearances, the 1960 election of John F. Kennedy suggested this was true, and during his campaign, Kennedy reassured Protestants that his Catholic faith posed no threat to America religious freedom.³⁴ Historian Kevin Schultz traces these interpretations of a “Tri-Faith” America during the twentieth century and suggests Jewish and Catholic

³¹Dallas P. Lee, “Foreword,” in Taylor, *God’s Messengers*.

³²Methodist Church, *Mid-Century Report*, 146.

³³Will Herberg, *Protestant, Catholic, Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology* (1955; repr., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

³⁴Concerning the theological implications of this speech, see Mark S. Massa, S.J., “A Catholic for President?: John F. Kennedy and the ‘Secular’ Theology of the Houston Speech, 1960,” *Journal of Church and State* 39, no. 2 (Spring 1997): 297-317.

interests, with the help of liberal Protestant luminaries, worked to usher in a form of pluralism that granted equal treatment to all three religions in American society.³⁵

Despite these gains in pluralism among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, native Protestants at the denominational level still worked to maintain a Christian nation with a more Protestant coloring. While progressive leaders within the NCC worked comfortably with their Catholic and Jewish counterparts, at the lower reaches of the church, religious pluralism was not as celebrated. Most notably anti-Catholicism persisted within home mission programs directed towards immigrants. A 1962 report sponsored by Texas Baptists assessing ministry opportunities among Mexican *bracero* workers suggested, “God has given Evangelicals an opportunity to strike at the very heart of Roman Catholic power in Mexico! It has been almost impossible for missionaries to penetrate this citadel, but now its men in great numbers have come to our very doors.” In a sense, Baptists believed they were fighting a veritable war with Catholicism. The report also echoed timeless Protestant interpretations of Roman Catholic faith. The study claimed that *braceros*’ “faith and reliance is in the forms, ceremonies, rites and idols of a Cristo-pagan Roman Catholicism.” In addition, “The Roman Catholic Church in Mexico and the United States has launched a campaign to bring politicians and legislature, and the United States government to their aid.”³⁶ The report on *bracero* ministries, though coming two years after Kennedy’s election, reveals Southern Baptists were still holding on to deep reservations concerning Catholicism. Speaking before the Southern Baptist Convention

³⁵Kevin M. Schultz, *Tri-Faith America: How Catholics and Jews Held Postwar America to Its Protestant Promise* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

³⁶Taylor, *God’s Messengers*, 22, 71. See also John D. Gearing, “Cotton-Picking Braceros in Arkansas,” *Home Missions* 31 (March 1960), 26.

in 1961, E. S. James, the editor of the *Baptist Standard*, even suggested that Catholicism threatened the separation of church and state through “controlled immigration and uncontrolled multiplication.”³⁷ Concern for building structures also reflected Baptist competition with Catholics. One request for a hospital in San Antonio compared Catholic and Baptist structures in the city. “There is no Baptist institution in San Antonio except a recently-organized Mexican Orphanage which is caring for fewer than 25 children. Catholics have two orphanages, one seminary, one university, two colleges for women, and 51 kindergartens, grammar and high schools; and the largest hospital in the city.”³⁸ While Baptists ultimately labored for the spiritual transformation of souls, even the condition of buildings did not go unnoticed in their efforts to best Catholics.

Concerns over Catholicism’s religious and political influence, however, were not limited to more conservative groups like Southern Baptists. Besides public intellectuals who still occasionally criticized the Catholic Church, some mainline Protestants were also wary.³⁹ An article in *Presbyterian Life* in 1952 criticized Catholicism’s legacy in New Mexico and suggested that Protestants were helping improve the region. The following month, the periodical published the response of a concerned priest from

³⁷E. S. James, “Separation of Church and State,” in Southern Baptist Convention, *News Copy, For Release: 3:40 P.M., Friday, May 26, 1961*, Baptist Press Archives from 1948 to 1996, http://www.sbhla.org/bp_archive/index.asp (accessed May 1, 2016), Southern Baptist Historical Library and Archives.

³⁸Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1946), 36.

³⁹For an assessment of anti-Catholicism among midcentury public intellectuals, see John T. McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom: A History* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2003), 166-88, 213.

Wisconsin, before printing a rebuttal to the priest's comments a month and a half later.⁴⁰ Moreover, the 1950s witnessed significant Puerto Rican migration to the U.S. mainland, and a Presbyterian report questioned the influence of Roman Catholicism among Puerto Ricans.⁴¹ For some Protestants, old habits died hard, and religious pluralism was not a certainty among many white Protestants, despite the advances of Judeo-Christian ideals at midcentury.

As Protestants worked to maintain a religious identity for the nation, they also were aware of America's global position following World War II. Often Protestants stressed the symbiotic relationship between home and foreign missions. The Episcopal Diocese of California noted in 1953 its ability to train foreign missionaries before they are sent to China, Japan, and the Philippines on account of the local Asian population and opportunities at the University of California and regional missionary centers.⁴² Sometimes Protestants hoped that Mexican immigrants, particularly *bracero* migrants, would take the seeds of their faith and plant them back in Mexico if ever they returned.⁴³ Many Protestants were convinced that racism and prejudice were hurting America's global image and that their treatment of minorities would hinder or help their work overseas. American Protestants also believed they were contributing to America's role in the Cold War. When describing the need for further Methodist work among migrant

⁴⁰"Our Mission in New Mexico," *Presbyterian Life* 5 (February 2, 1952), 20-25; Christopher Fullman, "I Think We Can Agree," *Presbyterian Life* 5 (March 29, 1952), 5; William N. Wysham, "Disagrees with Father Fullman," *Presbyterian Life* 5 (May 10, 1952), 3.

⁴¹Paul L. Warnshois, "A Presbyterian Look at the Puerto Rican Situation," United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 19, folder 31, RG 301.7.19.31, PHS.

⁴²Diocese of California, *Journal of the One Hundred Third Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of California, Grace Cathedral, San Francisco, February 3-4, 1953*, 62, Archives of the Episcopal Church.

⁴³T. A. Patterson, "The Bracero and Texas Baptists," *Baptist Standard*, July 1, 1964, 8.

Mexican families often without food, one home mission superintendent noted, “Yet there are some who are thinking that agitation for relief of the condition is communism.

Actually this is the type of situation where communism has a chance to get its roots down. When our Mexican neighbors find the spirit of Christ in our hearts, as we labor to alleviate their suffering, then communism will have no appeal.”⁴⁴ The crusade against communism for many Protestants was won both on foreign and domestic battlegrounds.

The World Council of Churches demonstrated this confluence of domestic and global initiatives in 1954 as it met on the campus of Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois. Speaking before those in attendance, President Dwight D. Eisenhower touched on numerous themes pertaining to America’s position in the world, noting that the “conference, representing forty-eight nations and 163 groups, spiritually brings the world to the center of the North American Continent.” Stressing the international import of the gathering, Eisenhower recited John Wesley’s famous quip, “The world is my parish.” Eisenhower also explicated America’s global responsibilities following the devastation of WWII and the challenges of the Cold War: “To preserve the individual freedoms we prize so highly, we must not only protect ourselves as a nation, but we must make certain that others with like devotion to liberty may also survive and prosper.”⁴⁵

Eisenhower also alluded to America’s immigrant and pluralist heritage. He assured the crowd, “Moreover, we are a nation of many people out of many lands. . . . With our diversity, if you could look at us from afar, we would be theoretically impossible. But we do exist, and in reasonable harmony.” Eisenhower later in his speech

⁴⁴Methodist Church, *Mid-Century Report*, 75.

⁴⁵Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Text of the President’s Appeal to the World Council of Churches,” *New York Times*, August 20, 1954.

then recognized the growing phenomenon of religious pluralism in America: “A score of religious faiths, large and small, are represented in the membership of our present Congress.”⁴⁶ A month earlier the *Saturday Evening Post* featured an article on the approaching meeting and briefly addressed the Council’s relationship to religious pluralism. The *Post* suggested the postwar refugee crisis would be an important topic at the meeting in Evanston, and it optimistically concluded, “Whether the refugees were Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Moslem or Buddhist, white, black or bronze, enemy or friend, made no difference.”⁴⁷ For many observers, mainline Protestants had achieved a level of liberal ecumenism that was extended to other faiths, an orientation that resonated with the current Cold War context, international cooperation, and humanitarian relief.

Refugees

Protestant work conducted domestically among immigrants often reflected more global concerns. This was made manifest following World War II and during the Cold War when people displaced by warfare and revolution looked to come to America. With increasing support for the United Nations and human rights, alongside racial concerns reinforced by the horrors of Nazi Germany and the burgeoning civil rights movement, mainline Protestants during the 1950s were eager to welcome refugees, otherwise known as DPs, with humanitarian aid and opportunities to resettle elsewhere. Church World Service (CWS), an organizational branch of the NCC, coordinated most mainline Protestant work, helping refugees through humanitarian relief overseas and assisting

⁴⁶Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Text of the President’s Appeal to the World Council of Churches,” *New York Times*, August 20, 1954.

⁴⁷Hartzell Spence, “They Put Christianity to Work,” *Saturday Evening Post*, July 24, 1954, 25, 96-98.

some refugees, mostly Europeans, to resettle in America. Between 1945 and 1960, CWS sponsored 112,703 refugees and facilitated their resettlement in the United States.⁴⁸

The U.S. government passed refugee legislation in 1948 and 1953 and measures to aid Hungarian refugees starting in 1956.⁴⁹ Many Protestant groups closely watched what went on in the halls of Congress, and issued statements supporting measures to resettle refugees in America. Starting in 1946 the Federal Council of Churches indicated at its biennial meeting that it would back efforts by the Truman administration to resettle refugees, and the American Christian Committee for Refugees also turned its attention that same year to German refugees who identified as Protestant or with no particular faith looking to resettle in America.⁵⁰ In 1952, the NCC articulated the context for needed immigration and refugee relief. “The plight of the world’s uprooted peoples creates for the United States, as for other liberty-loving nations, a moral as well as an economic and political problem of vast proportions.” The statement went on to outline the causes for the recent refugee crisis: “Among these peoples are those displaced by war, and its aftermath; the refugees made homeless by reason of Nazi, Fascist, and Communist tyranny and more recently, by military hostilities in Korea, the Middle East, and

⁴⁸Sonia Grodka and Gerhard Hennes, *Homeless No More: A Discussion on Integration Between Sponsor and Refugee* (New York: NCC, 1960), vi.

⁴⁹Carl J. Bon Tempo, *Americans at the Gate: The United States and Refugees During the Cold War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).

⁵⁰“Federal Council Urges Amendment of Immigration Laws,” Religious News Service, December 9, 1946; American Christian Committee for Refugees, Inc., “Joint Meeting of the Executive Committee and the Committee on Overseas Program,” February 15, 1946; American Christian Committee for Refugees, Inc., “Meeting of the Board of Directors,” February 20, 1946, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America (hereafter FCC) Records, box 33, folder 18, NCC RG 18.33.18, PHS.

elsewhere; . . . and the escapees who every day break through the Iron Curtain in search of freedom.”⁵¹

In addition to the NCC, other national and local Protestant groups committed themselves to refugee resettlement following World War II. Many Protestant denominations backed the Displaced Persons Act passed in 1948, which was designed to resettle 250,000 DPs in the United States by 1950.⁵² The Methodist General Conference supported this legislation and “[called] upon our churches in local communities to welcome displaced persons and to aid in their adjustment to life in the United States.”⁵³ The PC(USA) pledged to resettle three thousand refugees under the 1948 Displaced Persons Act, and its more southern counterpart, the Presbyterian Church in the United States, also backed the government’s decision to move DPs to America as long as they were “carefully screened.”⁵⁴ The New York Episcopal Diocese resolved, after some debate, to support refugee relief for the “flight of hundreds of thousands of freedom-loving people from Communist oppression.”⁵⁵ Even the SBC, though outside the ecumenical National Council, passed a resolution in 1947 supporting government policy to admit refugees, noting the “persecution or fear of persecution by reason of their race,

⁵¹NCC, “United States Immigration and Naturalization Policy,” March 21, 1952, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 19, NCC RG 6.20.19, PHS.

⁵²Roger Daniels, *Coming to America: A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper Perennial, 2002), 331.

⁵³Methodist Church, *Journal of the 1948 General Conference of the Methodist Church*, 741.

⁵⁴“The Refugees: Free Nations Make Plans,” *Presbyterian Life*, January 5, 1952, 24-26; quote from John H. Marion to Ethel Hamilton, October 1, 1948, FCC Records, box 33, folder 19, NCC RG 18.33.19, PHS.

⁵⁵Diocese of New York, *Journal of the One Hundred and Seventy-Second Convention of the Diocese of New York, New York: Synod Hall, May 12, 1953*, 75-76, 84, Archives of the Episcopal Church.

religion, or political beliefs, and desire above all else to start a new life in a nation where there is freedom of speech, freedom of worship, and freedom of movement.”⁵⁶

The Protestant Council of Church Women in New York City established the Protestant Hospitality Center near a dock where refugees entered. As of 1949, one report noted that recent refugees being ministered to came speaking German, Latvian, Estonian, Polish, Ukrainian, and Russian. These refugees had fled unspeakable horrors in Europe during the war, and they left a lasting impression on Protestant aid workers. One Estonian woman shared her experiences as a forced laborer under Nazi rule who helped saw lumber in German forests. The huge disparity of recent refugees to New York City struck Protestant workers. After an innocent bus trip down Fifth Avenue, volunteers noted, “The most vivid of the many new impressions were the abundance of chocolates on display in candy stores, the supply of soap to be seen in the 5¢ and 10¢ store windows, and the numbers of dogs on leashes wearing sweaters, a thing almost unbelievable to one young Latvian lass who had been lamenting the loss of her only well-worn sweater!”⁵⁷

Protestant commitment to refugee relief was put to the test, however, by the end of 1952 with the termination of the Displaced Persons Act nearing. Protestant leaders soon began to appeal for further refugee resettlement.⁵⁸ As Director of Immigration Services for CWS, Roland Elliot at the start of 1953 commented on the urgency of the

⁵⁶Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1947), 51. See also Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1949, 55. In 1946 the Southern Baptist Convention funded CWS \$275,300 and the American Christian Committee on Refugees \$5,000, though these funds were disbursed by the Foreign Mission Board and were probably seen as helping refugees overseas. Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*, 1947, 138.

⁵⁷“News of Christian Friendliness Coast to Coast,” March 1949, 3, American Baptist Historical Society Archives (box and folder numbers unavailable; copy in author’s possession).

⁵⁸General Board, NCC, “Resolution on Refugee Legislation,” May 20, 1953, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS.

moment and the opportunity to rectify past restriction, which he believed was “dangerously akin to the theories of a superior race.” Elliot cautioned, “The Church’s voice – or its silence – may well be determinative in deciding the destiny of the refugees, and of America.”⁵⁹ Thereafter, Protestants were at the forefront of an effort in 1953 to call for further refugee resettlement. The NCC repeatedly sent memos to its constituents keeping them abreast of policy developments. Besides writing to the president and congressmen, attempts were also made to meet with such policymakers. In March 1953, delegates representing the Jewish National Community Relations Council, Catholic Welfare Conference, and National Council of Churches scheduled time with Senator Robert A. Taft, and National Council leaders, alongside representatives of the National Lutheran Council, even met with President Dwight Eisenhower at the beginning of May.⁶⁰ By that time, Eisenhower was already pushing for further refugee relief. The General Secretary of the NCC telegrammed Eisenhower the NCC’s support, concluding, “Your action in this matter is in accord with the American tradition of concern for the oppressed and will be welcomed by many of our churches for humanitarian reasons.”⁶¹ In the weeks that followed as Congress considered refugee policy, Walter Van Kirk, a NCC departmental executive director, spoke before the Senate Sub-Committee on Immigration concerning refugee relief. He declared, “By admitting its fair share of these homeless and destitute persons the United States would stand before the world as the deliverer of the oppressed and the defender of those who, at the risk of their lives, have

⁵⁹Elliott, “Article on Refugees.”

⁶⁰Roland Elliott to Robert A. Taft, March 4, 1953; NCC, “Information Memorandum #3-Emergency Legislation,” May 5, 1953, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS.

⁶¹Walter W. Van Kirk to Social Action Secretaries, April 27, 1953, *ibid.*

sought release from the bondage of Communist oppression.” Van Kirk reminded the Sub-Committee, “Accordingly, by helping the refugees we help ourselves. By defending the right of the refugees to life and liberty we earn for ourselves the respect of the freedom loving nations of the earth.”⁶² By the end of 1953, Protestant leaders got their wish in the form of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. In a statement in September 1953, the NCC declared, “Therefore, we express our gratitude to God, for this new occasion to demonstrate the reality of Christian brotherhood in the world.”⁶³

New refugee crises soon developed after Congress passed the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, only heightening the need for refugee resettlement in the United States. The 1956 Hungarian revolution against Soviet intrusion produced more refugees displaced by political upheaval, and mainline Protestants responded by supporting Eisenhower’s decision to provide special relief and by calling for more sponsors. In December 1956, following Eisenhower’s decision to admit several thousand Hungarian refugees into the United States, the National Council applauded his efforts, and took the opportunity to declare additional legislation was needed. The statement noted the benefits of further refugee assistance: “performance of Christian service,” “national interest,” and “better international relations.”⁶⁴ Though they applauded government efforts to resettle displaced Hungarian refugees in 1956 and 1957, the NCC criticized the parole system the

⁶²Walter W. Van Kirk, “Statement on Behalf of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. and the National Lutheran Council Respecting the Emergency Migration Act of 1953,” May 27, 1953, 1-6, first quote from 3; second quote from 4; Walter W. Van Kirk to Social Action Secretaries, June 3, 1953, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS.

⁶³General Board, NCC, “Resolution on Refugee Act of 1953,” September 16, 1953, *ibid.*

⁶⁴General Board, NCC, “The Need for New Legislation for Refugee Immigration to the U.S.A.,” December 4-5, 1956, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 23, NCC RG 6.20.23, PHS; “Churches Move Fast in Hungarian Crisis,” *Presbyterian Life*, December 8, 1956, 17-18; *Bon Tempo*, 66-71.

government used to admit many people fleeing Hungary, a policy they believed put Hungarian refugees at a disadvantage once in America since it was a temporary status that did not guarantee permanent residency.⁶⁵

Then in 1959, another refugee crisis presented itself, this time in the Western Hemisphere as Fidel Castro's communist revolution triumphed in Cuba. With just over a decade of experience in refugee work, CWS and most of the major Protestant denominations worked to help. Just between 1961 and 1962, CWS helped resettle over eight thousand Cuban refugees. In Miami, Protestant denominations even organized a Protestant Latin American Emergency Committee, a group that included not only relief centers of mainline denominations, but also those of Southern Baptists, Assemblies of God, Plymouth Brethren, and Seventh Day Adventists. According to one estimate, five to seven thousand Cuban refugees were receiving aid in any given month within the Protestant centers. Reflecting its concern for both spiritual and material needs, the PC(USA) assisted Cuban refugees in Miami through the work of the First Spanish Church and the United Presbyterian Center.⁶⁶ In 1963 Southern Baptists allocated \$50,000 for Latin American refugee resettlement, and the denomination helped relocate 270 Cubans in 1964.⁶⁷

⁶⁵General Assembly, NCC, "Concerning Refugees," December 1-6, 1957, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 2, folder 6, NCC RG 6.2.6, PHS; *Bon Tempo*, 70-75.

⁶⁶Cuba—Correspondence and Report on Refugee Work, 1960-64, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 24, folder 7, RG 301.7.24.7, PHS; Donald Harris, Alfonso Rodriguez, and Russell Stevens, "The Ministry of the United Presbyterian Church to the Spanish Speaking Community of Miami, with Special Reference to the Cuban Refugee," June 1962, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 24, folder 8, RG 301.7.24.8, PHS.

⁶⁷Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1963), 160; Southern Baptist Convention, *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention* (n.p.: The Convention, 1965), 170.

Protestant denominations orchestrated a veritable media blitz in promoting the cause of refugee resettlement. *Christian Century* ran numerous articles, and denominations and agencies produced pamphlets and memoranda in mass. One CWS pamphlet appealed to its Protestant constituents: “A hundred thousand of these people look to our Protestant and Eastern Orthodox Churches in America as their only hope. Roman Catholics, Jews, care for their own. But *our people* may come only when we say, ‘*here is an assurance.*’” The pamphlet continued, “Today they are Refugees – uprooted – homeless – despairing. Tomorrow they may be your friends, your neighbors, bringing new life and resources to America – even as our ancestors did before us.”⁶⁸ Another pamphlet, aptly titled *The Fence*, criticized the McCarran-Walter Act and pointed out shortcomings in U.S. refugee policy. Promoted by multiple Protestant, Jewish, and even labor organizations, *The Fence* sold 85,000 copies by 1959.⁶⁹ In a pamphlet published in 1950, the Christian Friendliness program announced its agenda. For displaced persons, the pamphlet noted that Northern Baptist workers must provide “assistance with English and citizenship requirements, aid in social adjustments, guidance in spiritual matters and church relationships, and sympathetic understanding when the New Americans encounter problems.” The pamphlet continued, “Successful resettlement is a long range process which has full integration into American life as its ultimate objective,” and it furthermore directed workers to help refugees without visas. Included with these more social objectives were also evangelical aspirations. Christian Friendliness leadership reminded

⁶⁸“New Life for Them If We Help!,” American Baptist Historical Society (box and folder numbers unavailable; copy in author’s possession).

⁶⁹*The Fence*, revised edition, November 1959, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Board of Christian Education, Council on Church and Society Records, box 12, folder 1, RG 78.12.1, PHS; American Jewish Committee to Clifford Earle, October 6, 1959, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Board of Christian Education, Council on Church and Society Records, box 12, folder 2, RG 78.12.2, PHS.

fellow Baptists, “Our churches must be prepared not only to win converts from these groups, but also to hold them for the Kingdom’s enterprise.”⁷⁰ Much like their work with immigrants, Protestants during the 1950s aimed to include spiritual ministry alongside humanitarian aid.

Outside of pamphlets, denominations also produced book-length studies and other forms of media. American Baptists published in 1962 a book on their refugee efforts around the world, including resettlement work in the United States.⁷¹ The Methodist Church devoted a radio segment to “What Can I Do to Help Cuban Refugees?” on its Night Call show. During the program, the announcer interviewed the CWS worker in Miami, who then fielded questions from listeners who called into the station.⁷² The United Council of Church Women even produced a drama for local churches titled *This Citadel of Faith*.⁷³ Finally, to help equip sponsors to consider the social significance of their work, CWS printed in 1960 a manual on the “integration” of refugees. In its treatment of integration, as opposed to assimilation, the book embraced a form of cultural pluralism whereby the “newcomer needs to learn the validity and value of American ways without giving up his own identity.” The book concluded, “It is with the realization of the Brotherhood of Man that differences are accepted; and with the realization of the

⁷⁰“What is Happening in Christian Friendliness,” WABHMS, Margaret Wenger Research Files, 90-12, American Baptist Historical Society.

⁷¹Dana M. Albaugh, *Who Shall Separate Us?: A New Dimension in Christian Witness; Relief, Resettlement, Rehabilitation, Reconstruction* (Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1962).

⁷²“What Can I Do to Help Cuban Refugees?,” December 3, 1965, DA-1424, Historical UMC Media, <http://catalog.gcah.org/DigitalArchives/NightCall/DA-1424.mp3> (accessed September 4, 2015), UMC Archives-GCAH.

⁷³James Breetveld, *This Citadel of Faith* (New York: United Council of Church Women, 1949), UCW Resources, 1948-1955, Church Women United Records, 1222-4-2:7, UMC Archives-GCAH.

Fatherhood of God that they are creatively resolved.”⁷⁴ Through their refugee work, U.S. Protestants were formulating a subtle interpretation of pluralism that drew from earlier social gospel ideals. Protestants eager to help refugees welcomed immigrant cultures, while also remaining confident that the nation’s Protestant identity remained intact.

The sponsorship of DPs even became a theme for film. In the movie *More for Peace* released in 1952 and backed by the PC(USA) and several other denominations, a soldier named Bill Grayson, played by Peter Graves (most famous for his later roles in the *Mission Impossible* television series and movie *Airplane*), returns to his Midwestern hometown after serving in the Korean War. Upon his arrival, he notices the community has sponsored a DP family. With limited employment opportunities, the DP family pursues a job that Bill had hoped to procure. Eventually, Bill assists a local carpenter in crafting a cross from wood taken from Hiroshima after the atomic bomb. The carpenter explains his desire to “take a part of a tree killed by man’s hatred and make it into a living symbol of God’s love.” While helping with the project, Bill comes to recognize his prejudice and then tries to help the DP family, eventually allowing the DP family to have the job he earlier desired. Overall, the film emphasized the themes of global military conflict and individual Christian responsibility and aimed to highlight the “role of the church on the community level.” The PC(USA) intended for the film to be shown in Presbyterian churches and saw this as an opportunity to cooperate with Hollywood.⁷⁵

⁷⁴Grodka and Hennes, *Homeless No More*, 114, 116. For other books on the refugee crisis published at this time, see K. C. Cirtautas, *The Refugee: A Psychological Study* (Boston: Meador Publishing, 1957); Edgar H. S. Chandler, *The High Tower of Refuge: The Inspiring Story of Refugee Relief Throughout the World* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1959).

⁷⁵S. Franklin Mack, “More for Peace,” *Presbyterian Life*, May 24, 1952, 29-31.

In addition to this film, the Methodist Church produced a short episode, mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, titled *The Tourist*. In it a curmudgeonly mechanic resorts to hackneyed arguments against refugees and immigrants and is reluctant to support the church's decision to resettle a refugee. He suggests DPs will simply take jobs they did not earn and that it was "our money that is being displaced." For the mechanic, giving work to a refugee was a crude form of "Lend Lease." A European correspondent reporting on a recent United Nations session, however, leaves a positive impression on the mechanic. Moreover, the local Methodist minister stresses to the townspeople that this was an opportunity to demonstrate Christian brotherhood. The mechanic eventually comes to respect the German-accented journalist and grows more amenable to the idea of his town sponsoring refugees. The episode concludes with a promotional segment for the United Nations.⁷⁶

Multiple accounts survive of positive resettlement experiences in local communities beyond the fictional ones just described, often through the sponsorship of individual church congregations. A report from Fairmount Presbyterian Church in Cleveland Heights, Ohio, described its work in resettling sixty DPs coming from Ukraine, Bulgaria, Poland, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, and Hungary. The glowing report stressed the work ethic of the refugees and their ability to attain housing and employment, and gradually other modern conveniences. The report concluded, "To see the friendships develop between the New and the Old Americans, to see the feeling of goodwill and understanding evolve from this project, is to see Democracy at its best and

⁷⁶*The Tourist* (1993-126), UMC 6027-3-4:10, UMC Archives-GCAH.

Christianity at its most meaningful.”⁷⁷ The First Presbyterian Church of Berkeley, California, sponsored at least eleven families during the 1950s, and concluded, “We consider this an important way to express our Christian and humanitarian concern for all freedom-seeking people.” The Berkeley church also supported the government admitting more refugees.⁷⁸ Langdale Methodist Church in Alabama sponsored a family in 1960. Apparently it was a local sensation; television, newspaper, and radio journalists joined the church members as the family arrived. Church members bought the husband a suit and the wife dresses, and a school teacher taught English to the family in the evenings. The church reported, “The whole community has responded most graciously to them. . . . Our problem right now is how to keep our people from smothering them with too much attention.”⁷⁹ A 1960 *New York Times* article featured the success of a Methodist church in Cranford, New Jersey, that aided the resettlement of twenty-nine refugees during the 1950s.⁸⁰ The president of Kansas State Teachers College, John E. King, who also served on the Presbyterian Board of National Missions, helped enroll twenty-five Cubans in his school.⁸¹ And refugee resettlement was not limited to the continental United States; St.

⁷⁷Dept. of Inter-Church Aid and Service to Refugees, World Council of Churches, “Inter-Church Aid Newsletter,” January 3, 1952, 13-14, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 18, NCC RG 6.20.18, PHS.

⁷⁸Robson E. Taylor, First Presbyterian Church of Berkeley, Calif. to Dept. of International Affairs, NCC, May 10, 1957, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 23, NCC RG 6.20.23, PHS.

⁷⁹Travis A. Warlick to Joanna Podberezka, January 28, 1960, Refugee Resettlement Program, 1957-1960, Records of the United Methodist Committee on Relief, 2041-4-2:1, UMC Archives-GCAH.

⁸⁰Geoffrey Pond, “Ex-D.P.’s Salute Success in Jersey,” *New York Times*, February 22, 1960.

⁸¹Flora Wester to Dr. Neigh, et al., March 12, 1963, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 24, folder 7, RG 301.7.24.7, PHS.

Mark's Episcopal Church in Hawaii sponsored a Cuban lawyer.⁸² American Baptists even appointed former Latvian refugees Tabea Korjus and Adolph Klaupiks to assist resettlement work for the denomination.⁸³

Mainline Protestant leaders, however, did encounter some concerns among their constituencies when it came to refugee resettlement. A listener from Denver called into the Methodist radio show asking about the utility of accepting Cuban refugees in 1965, and another caller was adamant that communist refugees would not be tolerated, since Americans were in the middle of “fighting for the security of our country.”⁸⁴ In 1953, the Episcopal Diocese of New York voted to pass a resolution calling for immigration reform and refugee resettlement, but not before “much discussion, pro and con.”⁸⁵ One Methodist minister from Pennsylvania wrote Gaither P. Warfield, General Secretary of the Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief, asking about qualifications for people wanting to seek refuge in America. He pointed out that his church sponsored a family he believed was already economically self-sufficient back in West Germany. Warfield responded by noting that some refugees' needs, rather than being primarily economic, were psychological. Warfield assured the minister that the denomination was not “in the immigration business,” but rather facilitated the resettlement of refugees who had not “integrated” within their former society. Warfield recounted a refugee family he knew

⁸²“Refugee Lawyer Here,” *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, January 26, 1962, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 24, folder 8, RG 301.7.24.8, PHS.

⁸³“Tabea Korjus,” Woman's American Baptist Home Mission Society; “Tabea Korjus,” September 11, 1951, WABHMS, Mary Kinney, 31-9, American Baptist Historical Society; Albaugh, *Who Shall Separate Us?*, 39.

⁸⁴“What Can I Do to Help Cuban Refugees?,” UMC Archives-GCAH.

⁸⁵Diocese of New York, *Journal of the One Hundred and Seventy-Second Convention of the Diocese of New York, New York: Synod Hall, May 12, 1953*, 84, Archives of the Episcopal Church.

who was financially secure in West Germany, but who could not find peace living so close to Soviet power.⁸⁶ Denominational leaders also had to deal with the racial limitations of 1950s America. Methodist leaders believed resettling Dutch Indonesian refugees, often racially mixed, should be done in the Southwest and Northwest, on account of “climate and certain racial limitations” elsewhere in the country.⁸⁷ Evident in *The Tourist and More for Peace*, Protestants also had to respond to economic concerns and Congressional demands that refugees have job assurances. Protestant leaders understood the economic and cultural concerns of policymakers, but were also working from a vantage point that infused spiritual, humanitarian ideals. One NCC memo in 1954 concluded that instead of advocating for further changes to the Refugee Relief Act, Protestants could instead “use the very difficulties of this program as a challenge to prove that we are more interested in helping people than simply in filling jobs.”⁸⁸

In the decade and a half following World War II, Protestants in America were forced to come to terms with pluralism as they worked with refugees. Their work highlighted the aspirations and limitations of Protestant interpretations of pluralism. National Council leadership often worked alongside their counterparts in the Jewish National Community Relations Council and Catholic Welfare Conference. Some

⁸⁶Paul M. Corson to Gaither P. Warfield, September 25, 1957; Gaither P. Warfield to Paul M. Corson, October 1, 1957, Refugee Resettlement Program, 1957-1960, Records of the United Methodist Committee on Relief, 2041-4-2:1, UMC Archives-GCAH.

⁸⁷Gaither P. Warfield to A. Raymond Grant, September 28, 1959; “Why Refugee Committee is Needed at This Point,” *ibid.*

⁸⁸Roland Elliott to Church Leaders Interested in Immigration, January 28, 1954, NCC Information Memorandum #7, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 22, NCC RG 6.20.22, PHS.

Protestant leaders were even concerned over the sectarian divisions in refugee relief.⁸⁹ During the Cuban refugee crisis, after CWS fulfilled most Protestant Cuban needs, it gave a helping hand to Catholic Relief Services. CWS leadership guaranteed that its Protestant assistance would respect refugees' Catholic faith.⁹⁰ In a Cuban Refugee Center newsletter, produced under the auspices of the federal government, an anecdote demonstrates the popular hope for tri-faith cooperation: "A protestant family is helping a Cuban family of the Catholic faith buy a house. Members of a Methodist church are furnishing it. A man of the Hebrew faith, handling the sale, joined the spirit of cooperation by buying the refugees a lawn mower."⁹¹

While some mainline Protestant figures intended to promote refugee relief programs that were nonsectarian, other Protestants were more conscious of religious differences in resettlement work. Occasionally comparisons were made with Jewish and Catholic agencies in order to spur Protestants to sponsor more refugees. The New York Episcopal Diocese recognized in 1949, "The Roman Catholic and Jewish groups are making valiant and effective efforts for their people. So far the non-Roman churches have been slow to accept their responsibility, in spite of the fact that 20% of all Displaced Persons are non-Roman Christians – of them Eastern Orthodox, who look naturally to the

⁸⁹Roland Elliott to Walter W. Van Kirk, November 23, 1951, box 20, folder 18, NCC RG 6.20.18; Roland Elliott to John W. Gibson, January 14, 1952, box 2, folder 6, NCC RG 6.2.6, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, PHS.

⁹⁰"Protestants—Catholics Cooperate," Diocesan Press Service, June 5, 1963, XI-4, http://www.episcopalarchives.org/cgi-bin/ENS/ENSpress_release.pl?pr_number=XI-4 (accessed January 26, 2015), Archives of the Episcopal Church.

⁹¹*Resettlement Re-Cap*, January 1963, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 24, folder 7, RG 301.7.24.7, PHS.

Episcopal Church for aid.”⁹² In 1952 some Protestants criticized Congressional legislation, known as the Celler Bill, that aimed to link refugee relief to the needs of overpopulated regions, especially in Italy; Protestant leaders considered this proposal a Catholic initiative. As one article in the *Christian Century* surmised, “Without doubt, Roman Catholics see in it an opportunity to increase their religious and political power in the United States.”⁹³

While Protestant interpretations of Catholic and Jewish refugee relief were varied at best, Protestant groups still sponsored refugees of multiple faiths. CWS denied that “the religious affiliation of refugees was a criterion used to foster or prevent resettlement assistance.” During the four-year tenure of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, the statistics of the Episcopal, Methodist, Congregational, and Disciples denominations show that they resettled 382 Muslims, 19 Buddhists, a Sikh, along with 1,222 Roman Catholics and 13 Jews. Overall, these numbers pale in comparison to the 7,476 Protestant refugees these denominations sponsored, but it also suggests that small measures of religious pluralism did not concern Protestants.⁹⁴ *Christian Century* even noted an instance where Buddhist

⁹²Diocese of New York, *Journal of the One Hundred and Sixty-Seventh Convention of the Diocese of New York, New York: Synod Hall, May 10, 1949*, 144, Archives of the Episcopal Church.

⁹³ Ralph E. Smeltzer, “For Justice in Immigration,” *Christian Century*, June 4, 1952, 666. See also “C.W.S.-N.L.C. Proposals Re Special Emergency Refugee Legislation,” NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS.

⁹⁴Grodka and Hennes, *Homeless No More*, 53. A brief perusal of the United Methodist records of refugee resettlement reveal that Methodists sponsored not only Methodist refugees, but also Muslim, Lutheran, Catholic, Orthodox, Georgian Orthodox, Dutch Reformed, Mennonite, and “none.” Refugee Arrivals by Refugee Concluded (V-Z), 1950-1970, 2041-6-4.1; Refugee Arrivals by Public Law 316, 1950-1960, 2041-6-4.2; Refugee Arrivals by Public Law 648, 1950-1960, 2041-6-4.3; Refugee Arrivals by Public Law 892, 1959-1961, 2041-6-4.4; Refugee Arrivals by Quota, 1955-1974, 2041-6-4.6, Records of the United Methodist Committee on Relief, UMC Archives-GCAH.

refugees in New Jersey donated money to CWS to assist refugees in Tibet, supposedly out of gratitude for the assistance they had previously received from Protestants.⁹⁵

This apparent comfort with religious pluralism can be explained in part by the more universal, humanitarian ethic of Protestant relief efforts during the twentieth century. The tidal wave of support among mainline Protestant leaders for the United Nations, human rights, and international brotherhood encouraged this openness to pluralism. One Methodist booklet observed, “Many American boys and girls have had wonderful firsthand experiences in thinking in terms of world citizenship as they have had the chance to know the displaced persons who have come to their towns.”⁹⁶ The perception that America stood as a safe “haven” amidst global turmoil only encouraged these international perspectives. One NCC leader remarked that “the tradition of America as the haven of the oppressed is a matter of deep concern to American Protestantism.”⁹⁷ A 1957 NCC resolution even concluded by recognizing “our nation’s character and its sense of world responsibility.”⁹⁸ This confluence of internationalism and pluralism among liberal Protestants earlier in the century, traced by historian David Mislin, helped establish an amenable context for refugee resettlement.⁹⁹

⁹⁵“Good News on the Interfaith Front,” *Christian Century*, August 19, 1959, 942.

⁹⁶*The Gates Swing Wide, for a World Friendship Group of Girls, in the Commission on Missions and World Friendship to Study the Work of the Woman’s Society of Christian Service, September 1951 through August 1952*, 24, *The Gates Swing Wide, 1951-1952*, Records of the Women's Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2601-4-4:29, UMC Archives-GCAH.

⁹⁷Roland Elliott to Walter W. Van Kirk, November 23, 1951, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 18, NCC RG 6.20.18, PHS.

⁹⁸General Assembly, NCC, “Concerning Refugees,” December 1-6, 1957, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 2, folder 6, NCC RG 6.2.6, PHS.

⁹⁹David Mislin, *Saving Faith: Making Religious Pluralism an American Value at the Dawn of the Secular Age* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015).

But it also reflects a particular interpretation of pluralism. Protestant efforts to work among refugees and immigrants during the twentieth century anticipated cultural pluralism, but not widespread religious pluralism. Mainline Protestant leaders by the 1950s generally praised the diverse cultural heritage of America. Historian Robert L. Fleegler traces the development of the concept he calls “contributionism” in American culture during the twentieth century. For Fleeger contributionism reflected the increasingly popular interpretation that America’s national identity was largely tied to past immigrants, especially European immigration from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.¹⁰⁰ Such thinking is evident in a CWS piece: “Distinctive contributions would primarily stem from the preservation of the newcomer’s identity. Such preservation of identity, elastically applied, builds up a creative tension between the old and the new, which makes the newcomer’s contribution all the more significant.”¹⁰¹ This attention to cultural pluralism and the contributions of immigrants, however, led to a more ambivalent concern for religious pluralism.

This ambivalence is evident in a Methodist pamphlet on refugee work. The booklet stressed the importance of cultural pluralism, stating that the “American concept of integration is not that of assimilation – remoulding the newcomer in everything from clothes to ideology.” Yet later the pamphlet noted that some refugees, “without changing their original religion or church affiliations, are attending Methodist services Orthodox, Moslem, Roman Catholics, and people without religion – many hundreds of

¹⁰⁰Robert L. Fleegler, *Ellis Island Nation: Immigration Policy and American Identity in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

¹⁰¹Grodka and Hennes, *Homeless No More*, 17-18.

them have been given an opportunity to see how we worship and live.”¹⁰² While refugees outside of Protestantism were welcome, it is implicit that their attendance at Methodist services was a denominational success. This ambivalence is further illustrated in a Presbyterian booklet published in 1957 on “social progress.” The program acknowledged America’s “melting pot” tradition, with the aside that “[t]his cultural pluralism is not without its problems.” The text then briefly assented to a limited view of religious pluralism by pointing out the prominence of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. It then suggested, “Yet one of our greatest assets is this very cultural and religious diversity. As the United States continues to consolidate its national life, one of the basic issues will be the proper relation of the whole to its parts and the parts to the whole.”¹⁰³ Maintaining the “whole” while welcoming diversity would continue to puzzle Protestants for years to come, especially as more immigrants entered America practicing religions other than Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism.

The apogee of postwar refugee concern came between July 1959 and June 1960 during what the UN recognized as World Refugee Year. The event, and its American organizer the U.S. Committee for Refugees, received glowing support from mainline Protestant groups. The NCC and denominations used the occasion to call for legislation that would admit more refugees and reform immigration policy. The work of Francis B. Sayre, Jr. is telling. As Dean of the National Cathedral and grandson of Woodrow Wilson, he served from a platform of white Protestant stature, and as chairman of the

¹⁰²Elizabeth M. Lee and John S. Kulisz, *The Methodist Program under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953* (New York: Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief, 1957) 1, 13, UMC Archives-GCAH.

¹⁰³“Changing America: A Social Perspective for the Churches in Their Christian Life and Work,” *Social Progress: Changing America* 47 (April 1957), 7, Rapid Social Change-Folder 2, 1955-1963, Records of the Women's Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2597-3-5:5, UMC Archives-GCAH.

board of directors for the U.S. Committee for Refugees, Sayre was active in the work of World Refugee Year, even penning “A Litany for Refugees.” By 1960 native Protestants were convinced that the United States stood for freedom in a world threatened by communism, and as cultural gatekeepers, they had become more accommodating to immigrants and refugees bringing their cultural differences. With their support for World Refugee Year and diligence to refugee resettlement during the 1950s, it comes as no surprise that mainline Protestants would actively respond to the further refugee needs as the twentieth century continued.¹⁰⁴

Conclusion

During the decade and a half following World War II, native, white Protestants representing the religious establishment in American culture grappled with an increasingly diverse nation. This is evident in their home mission programs fostering understanding and comity between white Protestants and immigrant communities, while also maintaining a Protestant Christian vision for the nation’s future. Protestant agencies demonstrated a similar outlook in their efforts to resettle refugees. The American Way of Life, for many Protestants, remained a strong indicator of what separated the United

¹⁰⁴United States Committee for Refugees, *News*, September 28, 1959, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Board of Christian Education, Council on Church and Society Records, box 12, folder 2, RG 78.12.2, PHS; *Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Original Minutes, Meeting of the National Council, Apr. 26, 27, 28, 1960*, 81; *Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, Original Minutes, Meeting of the National Council, Oct. 13, 14, 15, 1959*, 119, Archives of the Episcopal Church; General Board, NCC, “Resolution on Refugees and Immigration,” December 3, 1959, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 23, NCC RG 6.20.23, PHS; Francis B. Sayre, Jr., “A Litany for Refugees,” and other material, World Refugee Year, 1959-1960, Records of the United Methodist Committee on Relief, 2041-4-7:7, UMC Archives-GCAH; Francis B. Sayre, Jr., “The World Refugee Year,” *Christian Century*, June 10, 1959, 695-97; Dillon Wesley Throckmorton, “From the Minister’s Study: World Refugee Year,” *Methodist Messenger*, November 6, 1959, Refugee Resettlement Program, 1957-1960, Records of the United Methodist Committee on Relief, 2041-4-2:1, UMC Archives-GCAH; “Refugee Relief Goal Unreached,” *Christian Century*, August 24, 1960, 965; See also Elfan Rees, *We Strangers and Afraid: The Refugee Story Today* (New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1959).

States from a world caught up in revolution, disorder, and terror. Often unwittingly, Protestants expected foreigners to assimilate to a national culture, while also promoting cultural pluralism and diversity.¹⁰⁵ Meanwhile, Protestants were certain that the Judeo-Christian identity of the nation would remain intact.

One of the more lasting results of postwar Protestant home missions and refugee relief is the impetus they gave to reforming U.S. immigration policy. Mainline Protestant criticism of the 1952 McCarran-Walter Act, believed to perpetuate a discriminatory immigration policy, was closely tied to concerns for refugees and the welfare of immigrants. A 1957 NCC statement declared that “the manifold problem of ministering to refugees is so integrally related to our basic Immigration Law.”¹⁰⁶ Concerns for immigration reform would be met later in 1965 when Congress finally replaced the discriminatory system of quotas based on national origins that had been in place since 1924. An unintended consequence was that religious pluralism increased at a rapid pace in the years following 1965, and the social prominence of mainline Protestants soon began to erode.

¹⁰⁵For more on this incongruity, see Philip Gleason, “American Identity and Americanization,” in *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, edited by Stephan Thernstrom (Cambridge: Belknap Press, Harvard University Press, 1980), 50; Fleegler, *Ellis Island Nation*.

¹⁰⁶General Assembly, NCC, “Concerning Refugees,” December 1-6, 1957, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 2, folder 6, NCC RG 6.2.6, PHS.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Paving the Way for Pluralism

“The Statue of Liberty, standing at one of our important gateways, symbolizes what immigration to America has meant to the families of many of us and to the moral, spiritual, economic and cultural growth of this nation, under God.”

—Bishop Gerald H. Kennedy, “Statement Presented to the Committee on Platform and Resolutions of the Democratic Party”¹

By 1960 mainline Protestant leaders and, to a limited extent, their constituents demonstrated a growing tolerance for ethnic diversity and concern for immigration reform. This increasingly benevolent attitude towards the foreigner was largely the product of earlier home mission work premised upon a combination of social gospel ideals, evangelistic goals, and cultural superiority. As the twentieth century progressed, World War II, the civil rights movement, the Second Red Scare, and other midcentury developments reinforced growing Protestant support for pluralism in response to fascism, communism, racism, and bigotry. The civil rights movement in particular gave Protestants who had been advocating immigration reform for many years the extra push needed to get legislation passed. In short, a gradual diffusion of earlier social gospel sentiments among church members and increasing openness to ethnic, racial, and religious equality led mainline Protestants unwittingly to help cultivate conditions for the acceleration of pluralism by the 1960s. At the same time, these Protestants held firmly to

¹Bishop Gerald H. Kennedy, “Statement Presented to the Committee on Platform and Resolutions of the Democratic Party,” July 5, 1960, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America (hereafter NCC) Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 23, NCC RG 6.20.23, Presbyterian Historical Society (hereafter PHS), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

the notion of an American way of life. In no other area was this more apparent than in their drive for legislative reform.

Legislating Pluralism

As the Cold War emerged during the late 1940s, home missions and racial tolerance quickly became tools Protestants used to set apart American democracy from foreign communism. This concern for foreign affairs, united with social gospel aspirations and missions work, led to a robust political activism and commentary. As mainline Protestants traversed the road of liberalism, they began to contemplate further the discrimination inherent in the quotas enforced in the 1924 immigration legislation. Since that time the U.S. immigration policy was one of restriction based upon discriminatory quotas assigned to various nations, with the exception of Asian immigrants, who were excluded entirely. Many Protestant denominations affiliated with the National Council of Churches (NCC) gradually recognized that the 1924 laws racially discriminated against not only Asians, but also southern and eastern Europeans and people from other regions of the world. For most Protestant denominational and ecumenical leaders, legislative reform was the answer.

Protestants had to be careful, however, when entering the legislative fray. Not only did liberal Protestant leaders have to account for their more conservative constituents who were less willing to promote a progressive political agenda, but they also had to acknowledge the American tradition of the separation of church and state. While their actions often contradicted this notion of separation between the two spheres, mainline Protestants were convinced they could address political issues that they believed had broad significance, just as long as they avoided lobbying specific legislation. By

1957 mainline Protestants acknowledged churches could employ government funds to assist social work, as long as the funds were “not used for religious ministrations.” Further, “they should take steps to prevent the promulgation of a particular faith or doctrine at public expense. Spiritual care for all must be made available and special arrangements for persons of other faiths should be made.” As for government regulation of church social work: “The setting of such standards does not violate the principle of church-state separation as long as the standards apply equitably to all agencies,” a principle that echoed the Supreme Court’s position of neutrality in matters involving religion and First Amendment jurisprudence.² In many respects, maintaining this logic of the separation of church and state reinforced pluralism because aiming for impartiality in social work fostered a respect for diversity.

Other Protestants made a more humanitarian argument for legislative reform, claiming that they were not succumbing to partisan politics and legislative meddling when they were simply trying to help people in need. For Margaret Bender, a leader in the Methodist Women’s Division, immigration was not a political issue, but rather a social problem affecting the wellbeing of individuals. Bender responded in 1961 to an angry church member in Louisiana who was concerned that the Methodist women’s program was too political. Bender wrote back and employed a different interpretation of “political.” She wrote, “To me, political matters are those in which political parties take sides. The need for the reform of the present immigration laws does not fall in this class. It has appeared on both party platforms in almost the same terms for the last two political

²Benson Y. Landis and Constant H. Jacquet, Jr., “Immigration Programs and Policies of Churches of the United States,” December, 1957, 58, NCC Office of Planning and Program Records, box 17, folder 26, NCC RG 14.17.26, PHS. On Supreme Court jurisprudence and “neutrality,” see John Witte, Jr., *Religion and the American Constitutional Experiment*, 2nd ed. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2005), 193-96.

elections It seems to me that this becomes more of [a] human matter than a political one.”³ For Bender, and others, they were only being political if they entered partisan debates over specific legislation.

Reflecting the principle of impartiality and growing acceptance of pluralism, Protestant leaders often joined other organizations outside the framework of Protestantism to promote immigration reform. As with refugee work, they often worked alongside Catholics and Jews through various cooperative endeavors.⁴ Protestants also cooperated with nonreligious groups. For instance, Detroit Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic entities worked alongside civic organizations to sign a joint letter to their congressmen addressing immigration policy.⁵ In Buffalo, a Committee for Immigration Legislation Policies was organized by the Buffalo Council of Churches, International Institute, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Jewish Community Service, Board of Community Relations, Labor Committee to Combat Intolerance, Anti-Defamation League, and Buffalo Council of Social Agencies.⁶ NCC leaders even participated in the

³Mrs. C. A. Bender to Mrs. W. F. Hartwig, October 30, 1961, Immigration – Folder One, 1960-1965, Records of the Women's Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2599-5-3:6, United Methodist Church (hereafter UMC) Archives-GCAH, Madison, New Jersey. See also F.S.S., “Updating Immigration Policy,” *Christianity and Crisis*, February 22, 1965, 16.

⁴Roswell P. Barnes to Walter Van Kirk, March 27, 1952; “Statement on Immigration Policy”; “Proposed Joint Statement on Immigration;” Roland Elliott to Walter W. Van Kirk and Wynn C. Fairfield, March 19, 1952; “A Joint Statement on Immigration Refugees Surplus Populations,” March 19, 1952, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 19, NCC RG 6.20.19, PHS; Walter W. Van Kirk, April 18, 1952; Walter W. Van Kirk, Simon G. Kramer, and Paul C. Empie, “A Joint Statement on Immigration Refugees Surplus Populations,” NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 20, NCC RG 6.20.20, PHS; Committee to Improve U.S. Immigration Law, *U.S. Immigration Policy, Statements of Position by Major Religious, Labor, Civic and Nationality Organization* (New York: Committee to Improve U.S. Immigration Law, 1952), 24-25, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS.

⁵Committee to Improve U.S. Immigration Law, *U.S. Immigration Policy*, 37-38.

⁶Mildred H. Taylor to Walter Van Kirk, March 13, 1953, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS.

American Immigration and Citizenship Conference and spoke at the National Conference of Social Work in 1953 and 1954 on immigration matters.⁷

Moreover, many individual Protestants signed their names to various statements promoting immigration reform, safely bypassing any church-state concerns. The Committee for Equality in Naturalization was one such example. In 1951 it advocated reform that would overturn Asian exclusion and provide citizenship to Japanese. The roster for the Committee as of 1951 not only included a plethora of civic leaders, diplomats, college presidents, and civil rights leaders such as A. Philip Randolph and Eleanor Roosevelt, but also Christian public figures such as Harry Emerson Fosdick, Reinhold Niebuhr, and others affiliated with various regional and national Protestant groups, along with Jewish and Catholic leaders.⁸ In 1952 the *New York Times* published a statement criticizing immigration legislation that was signed by individuals affiliated with the Young Women's Christian Association, American Jewish Committee, Massachusetts Congregational Conference, Negro Labor Committee, labor and ethnic groups, American Veterans Committee, Cleveland Baptist Association, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society. Notable midcentury scholars such as Oscar Handlin, Arthur Schlesinger, Sr.,

⁷Roland Elliott to Wynn C. Fairfield, et al., May 7, 1953, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS; Walter W. Van Kirk, *The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (McCarran-Walter Act): What It Means in Terms of Our Foreign Policy and What It Means to Social Work* (New York: Community Relations Service, 1954), United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. [hereafter PC(USA)] Board of Christian Education, Council on Church and Society Records, box 12, folder 1, RG 78.12.1, PHS; American Immigration and Citizenship Conference, "*We Must Open Opportunity . . .*" (New York: American Immigration and Citizenship Conference, 1965); Committee on Integration, American Immigration and Citizenship Conference, "The Integration of Immigrants: A Digest of Source Material," February 1963 (see list of committee members at the back of the booklet), Immigration – Folder One, 1960-1965, Records of the Women's Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2599-5-3:6, UMC Archives-GCAH.

⁸Committee for Equality in Naturalization, March 21, 1951, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 18, NCC RG 6.20.18, PHS.

and the theorist of cultural pluralism, Horace Kallen, also signed the document.⁹ Some Protestants even ventured into more hostile waters. A. D. Willis boldly requested information from the NCC before he served on the Resolutions Committee at the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution Convention in 1953. Referring to recently passed legislation that continued a restrictive immigration policy, he tersely noted, “Undoubtedly, the McCarran-Walter Act will be ‘resolved’ upon—or maybe ‘pronounced’ is a better word.”¹⁰ He did not have high hopes that the SAR would critique the law as many NCC leaders were doing.

To reinforce their protest, Protestants repeatedly wrote legislators and courted various statesmen. By the early 1950s, Congress began to work to revise U.S. immigration policy, and at the center of this policymaking was a congressman from Pennsylvania named Francis E. Walter. Walter had served as representative of his state since 1933, and eventually established strong cold warrior credentials while serving on the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC). Though he was a moderate, if not conservative, voice in Congress at this time, Walter was still willing to listen to liberal, mainline Protestants. Over the next decade, Protestants developed an ambivalent relationship with Walter; they appreciated Walter’s attention to immigration policy, but were concerned over his restrictionist proclivities.

⁹Advertisement: “Nations, like men, sometimes find a rare opportunity . . .,” *New York Times*, April 24, 1952.

¹⁰A. D. Willis to R. P. Barnes, March 4, 1953; Walter Van Kirk to A. D. Willis, March 6, 1953, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS.

Confronting the McCarran-Walter Act

A window of opportunity was opened in 1951 and 1952 as Congress began to reconsider U.S. immigration law, and Protestants saw this as their chance to promote a more progressive immigration policy and thus remedy earlier restriction. Amidst the flurry of legislative proposals, two rival camps formed within Congress. Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada and Congressman Walter proposed legislation that while reintroducing Asian immigration, would maintain the national origins basis of immigration quotas and implement safeguards for deterring and deporting communists who entered the country. Immigrants with an Asian family heritage, even if born outside of an Asian nation, were forced to fall within an Asian national quota, thus making race a continued factor in restricting Asian immigration. Senators Herbert H. Lehman and Hubert Humphrey and Representative Emmanuel Celler, however, promoted a more liberal bill that would base the quota system on the 1950 U.S. population, rather than 1920, and would identify Asian immigrants on the basis of where they were born.¹¹

Beginning in 1951, while they were also busy working for refugee relief, Protestants recognized the legislative stirrings and believed an opportunity was at hand to advocate for immigration reform. Mainline Protestants began courting Walter and initially felt that his proposals would help alleviate previously burdensome immigration laws and overturn Asian exclusion.¹² One NCC information leaflet published in February 1952 even noted that Walter's recent position "appears to be preferred by the advocates

¹¹Aristide R. Zolberg, *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008), 311-15.

¹²Francis E. Walter to Walter W. Van Kirk, January 11, 1951; Van Kirk to Walter, January 19, 1951, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 18, NCC RG 6.20.18, PHS.

of a more liberal immigration policy.”¹³ Soon thereafter, however, Protestants began to reconsider the bill Walter was co-sponsoring and recognized the more liberal option that Lehman, Humphrey, and Celler were working towards. NCC official Walter Van Kirk sent telegraphs to several congressmen in March 1952, declaring that the “adoption of restrictive measures embodied in pending omnibus immigration bill would gravely imperil moral stature of United States and adversely affect America’s leadership among free nations.” Van Kirk suggested instead that the “quota system should be made more flexible for reasons of self-interest and for furtherance of international goodwill.”¹⁴ That same month Van Kirk even scheduled a lunch with Lehman, indicating his decision to support the work of Lehman, rather than the bill McCarran and Walter sponsored.¹⁵

As mainline Protestant leadership began to criticize the McCarran-Walter bill, they also began throwing their support behind the proposals of Senator Lehman. The Women’s Division of Christian Service of the Methodist Church advocated Lehman’s bill during the early spring of 1952, concluding that it was “an effort to remove sex and racial discrimination, and to improve the quota system without doing a major job on revision of immigration laws.”¹⁶ After corresponding with Lehman, J. Henry Carpenter, Executive Secretary of the Protestant Council in Brooklyn, reported to Van Kirk, “This is one bill which I feel we can back in every way possible. It eliminates the Oriental

¹³Central Department of Research and Survey, National Council of Churches (hereafter NCC), “Fourth Report on Activities of the 82nd Congress, Revision of Immigration Statutes,” *Information Service*, February 23, 1952, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 19, NCC RG 6.20.19, PHS.

¹⁴Walter W. Van Kirk to Herbert H. Lehman, et al., March 12, 1952, *ibid.*

¹⁵Walter W. Van Kirk to Herbert H. Lehman, April 1, 1952, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 20, NCC RG 6.20.20, PHS.

¹⁶Thelma Stevens to Walter W. Van Kirk, April 10, 1952, *ibid.*

Exclusion Act and any other provisions in the immigration act, that would keep people out on the basis of race, color, creed or national origin.” Caught up in his excitement over the bill, Carpenter conceded, “It is one of those almost too good items to really go through, but still I am sure we should back it in every way.”¹⁷ The coming months would prove that such a proposal was in fact “too good” to be true.

While the legislative particulars were being drawn up that spring, the NCC began to work on its own position on immigration and refugees. The final statement was approved through the National Council’s General Assembly in March 1952. The policy statement made three recommendations to Congress. First, the NCC called for Congress to “make the quota system more flexible.” Second, the statement requested that “all discriminatory provisions based upon considerations of color, race, or sex would be removed.” Finally, the NCC asked Congress to reexamine U.S. visa and deportation policies, which many people at the time interpreted as abuses of power as they were used to combat supposed communist subversives.¹⁸

In the 1952 statement, the National Council appealed to the principles of mercy, justice, and national morality in calling for legal reform, while also acknowledging Cold War concerns and internationalist perspectives. Cold War rhetoric is subtle, but present throughout. The resolution referred to the United States and “other liberty-loving nations,” and speaking to the refugee crisis, it noted those “who every day break through the Iron Curtain in search of freedom.” Addressing the U.S. government in what was

¹⁷Herbert H. Lehman to J. Henry Carpenter, July 17, 1951; J. Henry Carpenter to Walter Van Kirk, November 1, 1951, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 18, NCC RG 6.20.18, PHS.

¹⁸NCC, “A Pronouncement: A Policy Statement of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America; United States Immigration and Naturalization Policy, Adopted by the General Board March 21, 1952,” 18.1-1-2, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 19, NCC RG 6.20.19, PHS.

then the early years of the Cold War, the document declared that “enlightened immigration and naturalization laws would add immeasurably to the moral stature of the United States.” In keeping with its ecumenical foundations and attention to internationalism and universal brotherhood, the report also affirmed America’s global role. The NCC applauded U.S. involvement in UN initiatives and declared, “The National Council of Churches rejoices in the knowledge that the United States, as a member of the family of nations, is a party to these humanitarian endeavors.” The report unapologetically supported both U.S. global leadership and participation in the United Nations during the turbulent post-war period.

NCC leaders quickly mailed out copies to fellow combatants, including the Jewish leader Jules Cohen tied to the National Community Relations Advisory Council, the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith, and congressmen, including Walter and Lehman.¹⁹ Lehman commented that he “read the statement with interest and was very favorably impressed with it.” Lehman assured Van Kirk that such sentiments were in line with his proposed Humphrey-Lehman bill. Lehman then identified their “common objectives” of “humanization of our present immigration laws” and refugee relief that would assist “our own welfare” and the “advancement of the struggle against Communist imperialism.”²⁰ Arthur Greenleigh, of the United Service for New Americans, wrote that “it is one of the finest statements on general principles which I have yet seen. It is an excellent frame of reference in the common struggle for immigration legislation in

¹⁹Walter W. Van Kirk to Jules Cohen, March 21, 1952; Paul Hartmann to Van Kirk, March 26, 1952; Van Kirk to Francis E. Walter, March 27, 1952, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 19, NCC RG 6.20.19, PHS; Van Kirk to Herbert H. Lehman, April 1, 1952, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 20, NCC RG 6.20.20, PHS.

²⁰Herbert H. Lehman to Walter W. Van Kirk, April 4, 1952, *ibid.*

keeping with our American tradition.”²¹ Owen E. Pence, of the World Alliance of YMCAs, wrote Van Kirk that “the positions taken by your General Board are sound.”²² Congressman Charles R. Howell of New Jersey acknowledged that the statement’s positions “represent substantially my own feelings about the immigration revision legislation” and that Van Kirk could “count on my strong efforts to help adopt a liberal bill.”²³ Congressman Walter simply assured Van Kirk that through a resolution he was currently promoting, the NCC’s concerns over refugees were being addressed, though he sidestepped the larger topic of immigration policy.²⁴

While the NCC produced its statement, other Protestants continued to decry the McCarran-Walter bill Congress was considering. Samuel McCrea Cavert, as General Secretary of the NCC, criticized McCarran’s half of the legislation, Senate Bill 2550, and wrote congressmen declaring that the National Council was “officially committed to the principle that immigration and naturalization laws in keeping with our democratic tradition and our concern for human rights should provide for . . . fair hearings and appeals respecting the issuance of visas and deportation proceedings.”²⁵ William F. Hasting, Director of the Congregational Christian Service Committee, Inc., wrote the *Christian Century* demanding it reconsider its soft position on the bill as of May 1952. Hasting believed a *Christian Century* article he had read suggested “half a loaf seems

²¹Arthur Greenleigh to Walter W. Van Kirk, April 3, 1952, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 20, NCC RG 6.20.20, PHS.

²²Owen E. Pence to Walter Van Kirk, New York City, April 5, 1952, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 20, NCC RG 6.20.20, PHS. See also Eugene J. McCarthy to Van Kirk, April 21, 1952, *ibid*.

²³Charles R. Howell to Walter W. Van Kirk, April 22, 1952, *ibid*.

²⁴Francis E. Walter to Walter W. Van Kirk, April 3, 1952, *ibid*.

²⁵Samuel McCrea Caver to Senators Ives, et al., May 7, 1952, *ibid*.

better than no bread.” But Hasting then asked, “What if the bread be adulterated or poisoned?” Hasting instead promoted the Humphrey-Lehman bill.²⁶

Despite the staunch protest of numerous liberal Protestants and other public figures, Congress eventually passed what became known as the McCarran-Walter Act in the summer of 1952. To the dismay of advocates for reform, the act basically ensured national origins would continue to define quota restriction, and it also instituted a platform that favored immigrants on the basis of labor skills. Overall, it only nominally acknowledged liberal concerns. It did end Asian exclusion, but gave only token quotas to Japan, China, and other parts of the Asian Pacific. The act also wedded African American concerns with the issue of immigration in that it limited West Indian immigration through its own quota separate from the quota established for Britain.²⁷

The passage of the McCarran-Walter Act did not silence the protest of Protestants, especially in the Protestant press. The popular mainline serial *Christian Century* chimed in on the debate. Its perspective was initially more ambivalent, praising the end of an immigration policy excluding Asian immigrants, but disagreeing with the national origins quota system that remained intact.²⁸ The next year, however, the

²⁶William F. Hastings to Paul Hutchinson, May 17, 1952, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 20, NCC RG 6.20.20, PHS.

²⁷Zolberg, 311-17. See also Walter W. Van Kirk to M. Moran Weston, April 23, 1952, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 20, NCC RG 6.20.20, PHS.

²⁸“Immigration Laws to Be Revised?,” *Christian Century*, August 15, 1951, 932; “What Should Be Done About Immigration?,” *Christian Century*, May 14, 1952, 580; “Church Forces Continue to Fight McCarran Bill,” *Christian Century*, May 28, 1952, 635-36; “The Senate Passes the McCarran Bill,” *Christian Century*, June 4, 1952, 661; “McCarran Immigration Bill Become Law,” *Christian Century*, July 16, 1952, 820-21; “Churches and the McCarran Law,” *Christian Century*, November 12, 1952, 1308-9. See also Ralph E. Smeltzer, “For Justice in Immigration,” *Christian Century*, June 4, 1952, 666-68.

Christian Century increased its criticism of the law.²⁹ The progressive Methodist periodical *motive* simply referred to the law as “a bipartisan bit of racial bigotry.”³⁰

After Congress passed the McCarran-Walter Act, but before President Harry Truman decided whether to veto or sign the bill, Protestants continued to work diligently in the political arena. Roland Elliott of Church World Service wrote people asking them to encourage Truman to veto, and Van Kirk also wired President Truman describing the NCC’s hope that he would veto.³¹ Senator Lehman sent Van Kirk a letter in June, what was probably a form letter to the senator’s supporters, acknowledging, “I know we could not have made as good a fight as we did without the support and enthusiasm shown by the National Council of Churches of Christ in USA.” Lehman confirmed that he would back Truman if he vetoed the bill.³² Another letter from a congressman assured Van Kirk he voted against McCarran-Walter and that he would “continue my efforts to eliminate any semblance of racial or religious discrimination from our laws.”³³

As promised, Truman vetoed the bill. In his veto message, Truman lambasted the discrimination that the 1924 quota established and that the McCarran-Walter Act continued. In his message before Congress, Truman appealed to the social gospel

²⁹“McCarran Act Revision a Church Priority,” *Christian Century*, March 11, 1953, 275-76; Pat McCarran, “From Senator McCarran,” *Christian Century*, April 8, 1953, 419; Harry N. Rosenfield, “The Prospects for Immigration Amendments,” *Law and Contemporary Problems* 21, no. 2 (Spring 1956): 412-16. The *Christian Century* reported in 1956, “Our foreign relations have suffered enough from this act, but our self-respect as a free and humane people has suffered more.” “Creaking McCarran Act Should Be Amended,” *Christian Century*, February 22, 1956, 227.

³⁰Herbert Hackett, “These are the Platforms,” Supplement to *motive* 13 (October 1952), 3-S.

³¹Roland Elliott to Colleague, June 20, 1952; Walter W. Van Kirk to Harry S. Truman, June 6, 1952, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS.

³²Herbert H. Lehman to Walter W. Van Kirk, June 12, 1952, *ibid.*

³³Abraham J. Multer to Walter Van Kirk, May 12, 1952, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 20, NCC RG 6.20.20, PHS.

rhetoric still in vogue by the midcentury among his Protestant constituents. “It repudiates our basic religious concepts, our belief in the brotherhood of man, and in the words of St. Paul that ‘there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free * * * for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.’” The social gospel ideal of the brotherhood of man had clearly made its way to the White House by 1952 and infused the debate over immigration. For Truman, there was no excuse for the McCarran-Walter Act to continue to restrict immigrants on account of race and ethnicity. “It is incredible to me that, in this year of 1952, we should again be enacting into law such a slur on the patriotism, the capacity and the decency of a large part of our citizenry.”³⁴ Like other contemporary critics, Truman did not believe challenging the law contradicted a commitment to the nation; rather, such positions reinforced each other.

After Congress overturned his veto in the summer of 1952, Truman organized a Commission on Immigration and Naturalization to investigate public reception of the law, on which served, among others, the Jewish Philip B. Perlman, Catholic Monsignor John O’Grady, Lutheran Thaddeus F. Gullixson, and Clarence E. Picket with the American Friends Service Committee. As the committee listened to the testimony of civic and religious figures in eleven cities during the fall of 1952, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish representatives voiced their criticisms of the McCarran-Walter Act. Van Kirk wrote to various Protestant leaders to prepare them should they be asked to testify before the committee, and he referred them to the NCC’s statement from March.³⁵

³⁴Harry S. Truman, “Text of Truman’s Message to House on Veto of Immigration Bill,” *New York Times*, June 26, 1952.

³⁵Walter W. Van Kirk to “those to be invited to testify. . .,” September 26, 1952, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS; “Churchmen Question New Immigration Law,” *Presbyterian Life*, November 29, 1952, 16.

Congregational minister Myron W. Fowell wrote to Van Kirk: “We fought this legislation hard over a long period of time through our state Social Action Committee and through the Legislative Committee of the Massachusetts Council of Churches of which I am chairman. I plan to go to the hearing tomorrow and register the sentiments of these two committees along with a resolution passed by the delegates of our last Annual Meeting.”³⁶ Other Protestants rallied to the cause and spoke before the commission, including NCC official Earl F. Adams, Washington National Cathedral Dean Francis B. Sayre, Jr., Presbyterians Edward D. Auchard and Harold H. Henderson, Methodist Charles B. Boss, Jr., and Southern Baptist Joseph M. Dawson, representing the Baptist World Alliance.³⁷ Van Kirk himself went before the commission, declaring, “The Immigration and Naturalization Law of 1952, as approved by Congress, is at some points not compatible with the spirit and intent of the principles set forth by the National Council of Churches, principles which are dictated alike by consideration of Christian justice and love of country.” Van Kirk made it clear that the National Council was not calling for unfettered immigration, but simply a quota system “without discriminations predicated upon national origin or racial heritage.”³⁸

³⁶Myron W. Fowell to Walter Van Kirk, October 1, 1952, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS.

³⁷Photocopy of Mitchell, “McCarran Smears Religious Leaders,” *S.D. Daily Republic*, January 10, 1953, United PC(USA) Board of Christian Education, Council on Church and Society Records, box 12, folder 1, RG 78.12.1, PHS; Edward D. Auchard, “A Statement Presented to the President’s Commission on Immigration and Naturalization,” October 11, 1952, United PC(USA) Board of Christian Education, Council on Church and Society Records, box 12, folder 3, RG 78.12.3, PHS.

³⁸“Statement to be Submitted by Dr. Walter W. Van Kirk, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., To the President’s Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, Washington, D.C., October 28, 1952,” NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS; Appendix I: The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; Statement by Walter W. Van Kirk, before the President’s Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, Washington, Oct. 28, 1952, in “As We Do Unto Others: Immigrants, Alien Residents, Naturalized Citizens,” April 20, 1954, 31-32, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 22, NCC RG 6.20.22, PHS.

Following the commission's hearings, it published a report titled *Whom We Shall Welcome*. In the introduction the authors of the report acknowledged the broad basis of support for such an endeavor: "It is noteworthy that all the major religious faiths of America urged the President to appoint a commission for this general purpose." They went on to note the recent pronouncements of the NCC, Church World Service, and Protestant Episcopal Church. Later in the introduction, the report drew heavily upon America's immigrant heritage, essentially Robert L. Fleegler's "contributionism," and clearly favored cultural pluralism, in line with many mainline Protestant figures. "The Commission believes that an outstanding characteristic of the United States is its great cultural diversity within an overriding national unity."³⁹ Van Kirk commented on the commission's report, assuring critics of McCarran-Walter that "[s]trong support will be forthcoming from the Christian leaders of many denominations."⁴⁰ Protestants may have lost a legislative battle, but they were far from giving up on the war for immigration reform.

In the years that followed, numerous Protestant figures and agencies continued to speak out against McCarran-Walter.⁴¹ Before 1952 was over, a group of Minnesota Protestants suggested the legislation be amended to assist more displaced persons, base quotas on the 1950 population instead of 1920 (a nod to the previously proposed

³⁹President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, *Whom We Shall Welcome: Report of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953), xi, xiv-xv; first quote from xi; second quote from xiv; Robert L. Fleegler, *Ellis Island Nation: Immigration Policy and American Identity in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

⁴⁰NCC, "Information Memorandum," February 3, 1953, 1, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS.

⁴¹The NCC educated its constituents through periodic memoranda and informational bulletins. See multiple examples in NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS.

Humphrey-Lehman bill), extend unmet quotas to additional groups, no longer attribute quotas according to “color, race, or sex,” and reform visa and deportation practices.⁴² In 1953 the American Baptist Convention and Methodist Church both passed resolutions demanding changes to the McCarran-Walter Act, and that same year the indomitable Methodist Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam went on record announcing that the law included “bad philosophy, archaic provisions and un-American procedures.”⁴³ The Episcopal Diocese of Michigan passed a resolution in February 1953 “requesting the Congress . . . to replace immediately the McCarran-Walter Act with another piece of legislation which would be more in accord with our American spirit.”⁴⁴ And the New York Episcopal Diocese voted against McCarran in 1953, declaring it “perpetuates a quota system based upon the now out-moded census of 1920 and upon racial theories that are scientifically unsound and contrary to the clear implications of the Christian doctrine of man.”⁴⁵ The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. [PC(USA)] Foreign Mission Board, reflecting the close relationship between home and foreign missions, also went on record in March 1953 calling for revision.⁴⁶

⁴²“Churchmen Question New Immigration Law,” *Presbyterian Life*, November 29, 1952, 16.

⁴³Rosenfield, “The Prospects for Immigration Amendments,” 414; “Immigration Law,” 1953, *CQ Almanac*, Online ed., <https://library.cqpress.com/cqalmanac> (accessed 9/14/2016). See also Thelma Stevens to Maurice Gross, December 29, 1961, Immigration – Folder One, 1960-1965, Records of the Women's Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2599-5-3:6, UMC Archives-GCAH.

⁴⁴Episcopal Diocese of Michigan, “Resolution at 120th Convention, February 5, 1953,” in *American Immigration Policy: Selected Statements*, ed. American Immigration Conference (New York: American Immigration Conference, 1957), 20.

⁴⁵Diocese of New York, *Journal of the One Hundred and Seventy-Second Convention of the Diocese of New York, New York: Synod Hall, May 12, 1953*, 75, Archives of the Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas.

⁴⁶Peter K. Emmons, March 30, 1953, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS.

Just like his Democratic predecessor, the Republican Dwight Eisenhower upon being elected in 1952 did not let the issue die, instead mentioning it in his State of the Union address in February 1953. Eisenhower remarked that “we are—one and all—immigrants or the sons and daughters of immigrants,” and he admitted that “[e]xisting legislation contains injustices. It does, in fact, discriminate.” Despite Eisenhower’s overtures, Protestants gradually began to realize by spring of 1953 that Congress was not going to budge. Because nothing could be done to revise McCarran-Walter, Protestants instead focused on refugee relief through emergency legislation in 1953.⁴⁷ The Jewish social reformer Jules Cohen believed Protestants were choosing “to capitulate much too early in the game” when it came to immigration policy.⁴⁸ But by the fall, Protestants had conceded to political pragmatism. PC(USA) official Clifford J. Earle noted in a letter Congress’ decision to set aside revision of the McCarran-Walter Act in order to pass refugee legislation. He counseled his colleague, William N. Wysham, on pursuing immigration reform, “Your only possible action, of course, would be a letter to the White House, and the Washington Office suggests that this would be a waste of influence which might better be held until the next session of Congress when it is possible that something may break.”⁴⁹ Earle and other Protestants decided to bide their time.

⁴⁷Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Text of Eisenhower’s State of the Union Message on New Domestic and Foreign Policies,” *New York Times*, February 3, 1953; Walter W. Van Kirk to Clark P. Garman, February 27, 1953; “Joint Position (June 17, 1953) of the National Lutheran Council and the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.”; Roland Elliott to Agencies Interested in Emergency Legislation for Refugees, June 23, 1953; Joseph B. Mow to Don Bolles, July 27, 1953, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 21, NCC RG 6.20.21, PHS.

⁴⁸Jules Cohen to Roland Elliott, March 24, 1953, *ibid.*

⁴⁹Clifford Earle to William N. Wysham, October 28, 1953, United PC(USA) Board of Christian Education, Council on Church and Society Records, box 12, folder 3, RG 78.12.3, PHS.

The Consequences of Protest

Mainline Protestant concerns over the McCarran-Walter Act coincided with a tense moment in U.S. cultural and political history. Americans' earlier fears of nonwhite racial groups immigrating to the United States waned in the face of potential communist subversion. Historian David H. Bennett notes that, following a prolonged war fighting fascist powers only to witness the rise of communism, the threats the American public perceived by midcentury came "from the head and not the blood."⁵⁰ Such hysteria over the communist threat evolved into another full-fledged Red Scare in which one's views on the McCarran-Walter Act served as a litmus test for their commitment to counter communist infiltration. "It should be unnecessary to comment on Mr. McCarran's implication that opponents of the act must be Communists or Communist sympathizers," asserted the *New York Times*. "Opponents of the McCarran Act include men and women of every religion, of every national strain, including his own, of every political party, of every occupation and every walk of life."⁵¹ Despite the views of the *Times*, opposition to the new immigration law continued to elicit accusations of communist sympathy. But the Second Red Scare was not the only source of resistance liberal Protestants faced while advocating immigration reform. The positions they took occasionally undermined their relationship with fellow believers. There was a price to pay for protest during the 1950s, and Protestant critics of the McCarran-Walter Act soon encountered it.

One pocket of dissent came from within Protestant denominations. In 1961 Church World Service commissioned a study by Benson Y. Landis titled *Protestant*

⁵⁰David H. Bennett, *The Party of Fear: From Nativist Movements to the New Right in American History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 3.

⁵¹"Revision of M'Carraan Act," *New York Times*, January 20, 1953.

Experience with United States Immigration, outlining the history of immigration, ethnic churches, and white, mainline efforts to assist immigrants and refugees over the last fifty years. Benson recognized what he called a “paradox.” Benson noted, “There are clear and definite national policies – but constituencies appear indifferent, or uninformed. Indeed, probably large portions of constituencies may not be in agreement with national pronouncements – on immigration or other great issues.”⁵²

Disgruntled church members were not shy in voicing their concerns. Ivan H. Peterman from Pennsylvania wrote the PC(USA)’s Board of Christian Education, criticizing its support for the *Fence*, a pamphlet that critiqued the McCarran-Walter Act and appealed for refugee resettlement. Peterman, self-identified as a “long-time Presbyterian,” inquired concerning the denomination’s support for the pamphlet “without any consultation of the church membership.” Apparently a constituent of Congressman Walter, Peterman articulated his concern that the pamphlet, and broader criticism of the law, were simply hurting America. “‘The Fence’ is merely part of an under cover [*sic*] drive, which Representative Walter would be able to explain, to complete a latter-day influx by people with widely divergent viewpoints to those of the earlier immigrants who made America what it is today.” Peterman then warned, “We have discussed this pamphlet in our mens’ [*sic*] class [at church]; there was no sympathy or favor for it, including the pastor. If that information guides you in future, perhaps this letter is not in vain.”⁵³ Emily Keenan of Illinois wrote the Methodist Women’s Division of Christian

⁵²Benson Y. Landis, *Protestant Experience with United States Immigration, 1910-1960* (New York: Church World Service, 1961), 53.

⁵³Ivan H. Peterman to Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church of the U.S.A., February 21, 1956, United PC(USA) Board of Christian Education, Council on Church and Society Records, box 12, folder 3, RG 78.12.3, PHS.

Service in 1957 concerning a recent Methodist pamphlet and its treatment of McCarran-Walter. Keenan countered several points made in the leaflet and surmised the publication was “emotional but not logical.” Keenan concluded, “In my opinion, it is dangerous grounds for the Methodist Church to broadcast literature against the Laws of the United States.” Thelma Stevens, as executive secretary of the Women’s Division, wrote back to Keenan affirming her continued criticism of the law and noting that the McCarran-Walter Act was a “great handicap to the democratic processes” and threat to America’s global image.⁵⁴

Mainline leaders, however, could also stir vociferous supporters among the denominational faithful. Maurice Gross wrote the bishop of the Methodist Church in 1961 concerning his frustration over the recent suggestion made by the General Secretary of Laymen’s Work that those who challenged the McCarran-Walter Act were following communist “propaganda.” Gross bluntly charged, “He sounds very little like a follower of John Wesley and much more like a follower of John Birch.” He continued, “It shames me for my Church to see leadership of its lay program at the national level in such naive and reactionary hands.”⁵⁵ Among the Protestant rank and file could be found a variety of views on immigration restriction.

Not all confrontation, however, remained within the personal correspondence of the parties involved. Eventually, more liberal Protestants had to account for their positions before the American public. California journalist Franklin Hichborn published

⁵⁴Emily Keenan to Woman’s Division of Christian Service, April 24, 1957; Thelma Stevens to Emily Keenan, May 3, 1957, Immigration, 1957-1959, Records of the Women's Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2583-2-2:15, UMC Archives-GCAH.

⁵⁵Maurice Gross to Bishop; Thelma Stevens to Maurice Gross, December 29, 1961, Immigration – Folder One, 1960-1965, Records of the Women's Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2599-5-3:6, UMC Archives-GCAH.

an exchange he had with an unnamed pastor “of one of the largest Protestant churches of our country.” The minister had criticized the McCarran-Walter Act and challenged Hichborn’s earlier claim that the refugee program was being abused by the “unassimilable of immigrants.” In his published response, Hichborn touched on communist fears and referenced the “well-financed minority seek[ing] to ‘liberalize’” the McCarran-Walter Act, a minority Hichborn claimed was based in New York. He lamented that the pastor he wrote to took part in such endeavors and was “misinformed, or the victim of propaganda, or both.” Hichborn then came to the heart of his concerns: the threat critics posed to America’s Christian heritage. He suggested America was becoming more secular, resorting to an argument that would become common parlance among culture warriors several decades later. Resorting to anti-Semitic language, he believed America had accepted the “Talmudization of Christianity,” a “curious hybrid which would have enraged John Wesley and scandalized our forebears.” Hichborn recognized, but clearly did not support, the position some Protestant ministers had taken on immigration and pluralism in America.⁵⁶

Even Senator McCarran spoke out against Protestants who disapproved of his law. Early in January 1953 in response to the report of Truman’s Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, McCarran decried Protestant support of such an initiative. Likely in response to the arguments some Protestants were making, McCarran boldly declared that “the rock of truth is that the Act does not contain one iota of racial or

⁵⁶Franklin Hichborn, *Reply to Pastor’s View of Immigration Laws*, Santa Clara, California, April 1958, United PC(USA) Board of Christian Education, Council on Church and Society Records, box 12, folder 1, RG 78.12.1, PHS.

religious discrimination.”⁵⁷ Then in March and April 1953, *Christian Century* and McCarran directly challenged each other. In a March editorial, *Christian Century* voiced its concerns about the prospects for delegates entering the United States to attend the World Council of Churches meeting the following year and used it as an opportunity to encourage protest of the McCarran-Walter Act and the difficulties it created for people of other nationalities in coming to America. The periodical provocatively stated, “As now worded, this law raises an iron curtain of restrictions on even temporary entry which will make it difficult if not impossible for a world ecumenical conference to meet here.”⁵⁸ The following month, Senator McCarran responded in a rebuttal published in the *Century*. McCarran simply noted that according to U.S. immigration policy, “no one is inadmissible to the United States as a visitor unless his presence in this country would endanger the public safety.” McCarran then explained that the publication was either wrong in its earlier claim that such a law would restrict the travel of World Council members, or that *Christian Century* was suggesting those attending were actually subversives. McCarran then asserted,

I submit that in all fairness, my letter should be published in The Christian Century as a rebuttal to the editorial which is highly prejudicial of an act which was endorsed by the immigration and naturalization service, the visa division, the department of state, the department of justice, the Central Intelligence Agency, and by over 100 patriotic, civic and religious organizations as fair and sound legislation which was urgently needed for the best interests of the United States of America.

Following McCarran’s response, *Christian Century* editors included a parenthetical disclaimer that McCarran still did not answer their original concern that WCC

⁵⁷Photocopy of Mitchell, “McCarran Smears Religious Leaders”; Pat McCarran, “Statement by Senator McCarran Regarding the Report by the President’s Commission,” in *Immigration: An American Dilemma*, ed. Benjamin Munn Ziegler (Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1953), 113.

⁵⁸“McCarran Act Revision a Church Priority,” *Christian Century*, March 11, 1953, 275.

representatives from communist countries or regions with a fascist past would be able to attend the Evanston, Illinois, meeting of World Council delegates.⁵⁹

Mainline Protestants also felt the wrath of fundamentalist Protestants on their right, including Carl McIntire and Billy Hargis, who pointed out mainline Protestant criticism of immigration legislation and assumed a communist ploy was at hand. Hargis claimed that the NCC “propagandized Congress for passage of amendments which would open wide the gates of our first line of defense.”⁶⁰ Mid-century evangelicals also questioned the NCC’s positions on immigration. In a phone conversation between two NCC officials, they expressed fears in 1957 that the “National Assoc. of Evangelicals is unleashing a campaign against the Kennedy Bill S 2410 and the NCC for supporting it. Accusing NCC of conspiring with Jews and Roman Catholics to let down the bars.”⁶¹ In their crusade against the McCarran-Walter Act, mainline Protestants provided their more conservative critics the opportunity use the Cold War climate against them.

Mainline Protestant leaders who disparaged the McCarran-Walter Act eventually brought unwanted attention from the government during Senator Joseph McCarthy’s anticommunist crusade. As early as 1948, the Committee on Un-American Activities published a booklet titled *100 Things You Should Know About Communism and Religion*, in which it identified the YMCA, YWCA, and Methodist Epworth League as potential “Communist target(s)” and proclaimed that the Methodist Federation for Social Action

⁵⁹Pat McCarran, “From Senator McCarran,” *Christian Century*, April 8, 1953, 419.

⁶⁰Ralph Lord Roy, *Communism and the Churches* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1960), 228-30, 234, 264, 419-20; Landis, *Protestant Experience*, 60-61; Billy James Hargis, *Facts about Communism and Our Churches* (Tulsa, OK: Christian Crusade, 1962), 125-26.

⁶¹“Immigr.,” S. F. Mack to Kenneth L. Maxwell, July 24, 1957, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 23, NCC RG 6.20.23, PHS. See also Rafael Cepeda to Editor, *Christianity Today*, September 26, 1960, United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 24, folder 7, RG 301.7.24.7, PHS.

was a “tool of the Communist Party.”⁶² The Methodist Federation later drew the ire of McCarthyites, in part because of its criticism of the McCarran-Walter Act and support for the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.⁶³

In the case of Methodist Bishop Garfield Bromley Oxnam, his record of progressive social ideals eventually caught the attention of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Oxnam voluntarily went before the committee to defend his legacy and make clear that he did not support communism, a decision that resulted in a ten-hour hearing rife with strong personalities, rhetorical wit, and strident sparring. On the committee at this time was Congressman Walter, who had co-authored the immigration act the year prior. He appeared to take Oxnam’s previous criticism of his law personally and grilled Oxnam on the matter. Walter’s interrogation was so persistent that other committee members could barely get a word in edge wise once the two went at it. Walter questioned Oxnam, “Could you have taken the position, if you were properly quoted, that you were opposed to the immigration policy of the United States because you were not concerned with the number of Communists coming into this country?” Oxnam responded to this by reaffirming his disregard for the Communist Party and declaring, “I’m fundamentally opposed to the whole Communist movement and would do everything within my power to keep them out.” Oxnam then turned the tables on Walter, bringing up the fact that President Truman had even vetoed the act. Oxnam shot back, “Well, you wouldn’t call him interested in letting Communists in, would you?” The two

⁶²Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives, *100 Things You Should Know About Communism and Religion* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1948), 15, Communism and Religion - House on Un-American Activities Committee, 1948-1952, Records of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, 2136-2-3:12, UMC Archives-GCAH.

⁶³Roy, *Communism and the Churches*, 312-16, 319.

men continued to argue, before another committee member finally was able to step in and steer the questioning to other topics. Five years later, bad blood was not lost between Oxnam and Walter. Oxnam surmised in a speech that if Walter was tasked with writing the inscription used on the Statue of Liberty, rather than the famous words of Emma Lazarus, Walter would have written: “Keep them, the tempest tos’t from me. / Turn the key, and lock the unfriendly door.”⁶⁴

Arriving at the Hart-Celler Act of 1965

Despite the challenges of the Second Red Scare, Protestant leaders continued to work towards immigration reform and revision of the McCarran-Walter Act. In so doing they highlighted the international ramifications of the law and the racial discrimination embedded in the immigration quotas. In 1954 Charles H. Seaver published the booklet *As We Do Unto Others* for the NCC’s Department of International Justice and Goodwill. The pamphlet reflected a growing recognition that the 1924 law limited others beyond just Asian immigrants. “It is based on the assumption that Americans of British or Irish or German birth or ancestry are better citizens than Americans of Italian, Greek, or Polish birth or ancestry.”⁶⁵ This increasing concern for racial injustice was certainly a product of the much larger drive for civil rights at that time.

Progressive immigration views capitalized on the burgeoning civil rights movement during the 1950s and the historically fluid understanding of race among white

⁶⁴“Bishop Oxnam—Committee Hearing,” *U.S. News and World Report*, August 7, 1953, 116-17; Roy, *Communism and the Churches*, 254-60; G. Bromley Oxnam, “The Impact of the American City Upon the World Scene,” Urban Pamphlet No. 8, in *Convocation: Urban Life in America, Washington, D.C., February 18-20, 1958* (Philadelphia: Department of City Work, Division of National Missions, Methodist Church, 1958), Urban Church, 1956-1962, Records of the Women's Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2597-3-6:2, UMC Archives-GCAH.

⁶⁵Charles H. Seaver, *As We Do unto Others* (New York: Department of International Justice and Goodwill, NCC, [1954]), quote from 9.

Protestants during the first half of the twentieth century. Oftentimes, when confronting racial discrimination, mainline Protestants were addressing not only African American civil rights protest, but also the plight of Hispanics and Asians. As one NCC official noted, “Certainly, in this period when the Churches’ concerns have been made manifest in the area of civil rights, the Churches should not fail to seek the removal of the racist characteristics of the present immigration law.”⁶⁶ Protestant social workers had come to identify the racial foundation of an immigration policy based on national origins. A NCC statement in June 1952 titled “The Churches and Segregation” called upon churches to “renounce the pattern of segregation based on race, color or national origin as unnecessary and undesirable and a violation of the Gospel of love and human brotherhood.”⁶⁷ In 1959 the Episcopal Church formed the Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity in an effort to encourage “greater implementation of the inclusive nature of the Church and the elimination of all barriers in the Church based upon race, class, or national origin.”⁶⁸ Such sentiment was also evident in a statement by the Methodist Church’s Council of Bishops in 1963 that called on pastors to accept visitors “without regard to race, color, or national origin.” It concluded with an appeal “to

⁶⁶Quote from John W. Schauer to Kenneth Maxwell, January 19, 1965; “Background Information on the Proposed Resolution on the Churches and United States Immigration Policy,” NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 24, NCC RG 6.20.24, PHS.

⁶⁷“The Churches and Race: Report from Department of Racial and Cultural Relations and Division of Christian Life and Work,” NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 2, folder 17, NCC RG 6.2.17, PHS.

⁶⁸*Episcopal Church Annual, 1963* (New York: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1963), 124.

deepen by word and deed the brotherhood of man and make this a reality instead of a hope.”⁶⁹

A fluid interpretation of race by Protestants encouraged more concerted attention to immigration. This is evident in the position some Southern Baptist women took in 1950 that conflated race, ethnicity, and nationality. In a piece titled “How Christian is America?,” the writer outlined a program for Southern Baptist women and selected several social issues, including the status of minorities. “One of the most difficult problems is the treatment of minority groups. This includes Negroes, Jews, Mexicans, Indians, Japanese, Chinese, Puerto Ricans and other foreign born living among us.” The author then confessed, “If we face the issue, we realize that the problem is ours—with us—not the minority group. Our attitude towards people who are different creates the problem. We do not want to share equally with them the fruits of freedom which are ours in America.” Referencing the 1947 Southern Baptist Charter on Race Relations, the author noted, “Written primarily to help us in our relations with Negroes, it will apply just as well to people of other groups.”⁷⁰ Most Protestant home missionaries conflated race, ethnicity, and nationality in a way that drew attention to immigration during the civil rights movement.

Energized by the concurrent civil rights movement, Protestants entered the latter half of the 1950s determined to seek change in immigration policy. In 1956 continuing Cold War developments such as the Suez Canal crisis and revolutions in Hungary and Czechoslovakia kept refugees and immigration before the public eye. Eisenhower’s State

⁶⁹“Statement of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church; Adopted November 13, 1963, Detroit, Michigan,” Racial Questionnaire (Prelude to Charters), 1948-1969, Records of the Women's Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2594-2-3:10, UMC Archives-GCAH.

⁷⁰Kate Bullock Helms, “How Christian is America?” *Royal Service* 44 (February 1950), 23, 29.

of the Union for that year called for immigration reform and a quota system based on the 1950 census, while also acknowledging America's immigrant history.⁷¹ The following year, Senator John F. Kennedy began working for further immigration reform in Congress. Protestants soon entered into the fray.⁷²

In January 1957, the Methodist Board of Missions passed a resolution melding the continuing refugee crisis with the need for immigration reform and pointing out that the Board was "concerned about the world-wide effect of restrictions contained in the present law, which seems to have racial implications."⁷³ Kenneth Maxwell, executive director of the NCC's Department of International Affairs, wrote in 1957 to Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson, advocating "an improved non-discriminatory immigration and naturalization policy." Maxwell noted, "We are concerned because of moral and human values and also because we believe these issues are important in our international relations."⁷⁴ The United Church Women also passed a resolution that year addressing immigration and refugees, and one of their spokeswomen appealed to Johnson for refugee relief.⁷⁵

⁷¹Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Text of President Eisenhower's Annual Message to Congress on the State of the Union," *New York Times*, January 6, 1956.

⁷²Kenneth L. Maxwell to Denominational Executives in Christian Social Education and Action, July 16, 1957, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 23, NCC RG 6.20.23, PHS; Zolberg, 325.

⁷³Methodist Board of Missions, "Resolution at Annual Meeting, January 18, 1957," in *American Immigration Policy: Selected Statements*, ed. American Immigration Conference (New York: American Immigration Conference, 1957), 20-21.

⁷⁴Kenneth L. Maxwell to Lyndon B. Johnson, June 17, 1957; Johnson to Maxwell, June 20, 1957, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 23, NCC RG 6.20.23, PHS.

⁷⁵"United Church Women Action Taken on Immigration and Refugees"; Esther W. Hymer to Lyndon Johnson, June 24, 1957, *ibid.*

Protestants also maneuvered politically beyond just letter writing by continuing to testify before Senate subcommittees. In October 1955, the NCC encouraged people to provide testimony in line with the NCC's March 1952 statement.⁷⁶ Eugene Carson Blake, as President of the NCC, prepared a statement for the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration in 1955. Blake reaffirmed the NCC's principle not to "address itself to lengthy detailed consideration of the specifics of the legislation," but rather promote "principles which it believes are dictated by considerations of Christian justice and love of country." Blake affirmed that the NCC was not calling for "unlimited immigration" and recognized the importance of safeguards against subversives, but he wanted the law not to consider "national origin or racial heritage." Blake also appealed to international cooperation. He believed his proposals "would be in accord with the spirit of the United Nations Charter, to which our country is a party, and with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which we are a signatory" and would reflect "comradeship with the freedom loving peoples of the earth." Clearly, Blake had imbibed the international impulse of his era as he spoke for immigration reform.⁷⁷

Aside from testifying before congressional subcommittees, mainline Protestant leaders demonstrated their political savvy in other ways. In 1957 representatives of the NCC, National Lutheran Council, and Common Council for American Unity were able to secure time to meet with Congressman Walter, Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn,

⁷⁶"Authorization from General Board NCCUSA," October 5-6, 1955; To Denominational Executives with Responsibilities for Christian Social Education and Action, November 4, 1955, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 23, NCC RG 6.20.23, PHS.

⁷⁷"Statement to be Made by President Eugene Carson Blake for the National Council of Churches of Christ at the Projected Hearings Before the Senate Judiciary Committee on Immigration, Washington, D.C., November 21, 1955," *ibid.* See also Eugene Carson Blake, "National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, President, November 21, 1955," in *American Immigration Policy: Selected Statements*, ed. American Immigration Conference (New York: American Immigration Conference, 1957), 21-22.

Lyndon B. Johnson's assistant George Reedy, Joseph M. Swing with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Senator Arthur Watkins, and White House staffer Max Raab.⁷⁸ NCC leaders were also aware of shifting political alliances. In a phone call between Kenneth Maxwell and Charles M. Smith, they considered the current legislative climate and believed Walter was "a man under pressures." They then speculated the opportunity other congressmen, more favorable to immigration reform, had: "[Walter's] anxiety may be the leverage by which some action may be possible."⁷⁹ Bishop Gerald H. Kennedy even gave an impassioned speech at the Democratic convention in Los Angeles during the summer of 1960 before its Committee on Platform and Resolutions, where he reaffirmed the NCC's traditional position on immigration reform. He concluded with an appeal for an immigration law that would be "commensurate with our national ideals and international long term interests."⁸⁰

Protestants put their political networking skills to use in 1961 when the National Council organized one of its more impressive attempts to call for immigration reform through a conference referred to as the Consultation on Immigration Policy in the United States. The event was held for two days in April in Washington, D.C., with 200 people in attendance. The conference program included speeches given by many mainline Protestant divines, women and men, along with such political figures as New York Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, United Nations

⁷⁸"Conversation Between K. L. Maxwell and Roland Elliot – Jan 24, 1957," NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 23, NCC RG 6.20.23, PHS.

⁷⁹Quote from Kenneth L. Maxwell to Paul C. Empie, July 19, 1957; see also "Immigr.," phone conversation with Jules Cohen, May 31, 1957, *ibid.*

⁸⁰Gerald H. Kennedy, "Statement Presented to the Committee on Platform and Resolutions of the Democratic Party," July 5, 1960, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 23, NCC RG 6.20.23, PHS.

High Commissioner for Refugees Felix Schnyder, and California Congressman D. S. Saund. In addition to these speakers, the conference also included a panel of respondents, including Former Administrator of the Bureau of Consular and Secretary Affairs John W. Hanes, Jr., New York Congressman John V. Lindsay, and none other than Congressman Walter himself, who evidently had not entirely burned his bridges with all mainline Protestants following his interrogation of Bishop Oxnam eight years prior.⁸¹ Though not in attendance, President John F. Kennedy did send his regards, commenting on his hopes for immigration reform. Kennedy noted that immigration was tied to both “international standing” and “national self-respect.” He wrote, “You who assume the daily burden of guiding the oppressed and the orphaned people of the world to productive and satisfying lives under the banner of freedom deserve our thanks. . . . I will be interested in the results of your discussions.”⁸²

In many respects, one could argue that this conference represented one of the final demonstrations of mainline Protestant influence in America in its ability to marshal such prominent political and religious figures. It was definitely a high-water mark for Protestant efforts to usher in immigration reform. The Christian and internationalist tenor of the consultation was reinforced in its “Summary of Concerns,” approved by the attendees. The first two sentences read: “Under God, men and nations are responsible to

⁸¹Several mainline Protestant leaders considered Walter an ally. Roland Elliott wrote a ringing endorsement in 1953 of Walter’s work in the House Immigration Committee “expressing the true heart of America with high statesmanship,” particularly with refugees. “In personal terms, I have never come to you with a difficult immigration problem but I felt your friendly concern in helping to find a proper and constructive solution.” Roland Elliot to Francis E. Walter, January 26, 1953, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 19, NCC RG 6.20.19, PHS. Kenneth L. Maxwell wrote Walter in 1962 also thanking him. Kenneth L. Maxwell to Francis E. Walter, May 2, 1962, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 24, NCC RG 6.20.24, PHS.

⁸²NCC, *Witness for Immigration: Report of the Consultation on Immigration Policy in the United States, Washington, D.C., April 13 and 14, 1961*, quote from xi.

each other and for the welfare of all mankind. The implications of God’s sovereign claim upon all men have been proclaimed by the advent and example of His Son, Jesus Christ, in human society.” In the summary statement, those in attendance also agreed that the 1924 quota law was a disgrace on account of its racial preferences and that equal justice for the naturalized and native-born was necessary. Overall, the consultation’s platform was a call for immigration reform that balanced both “national interest” and “moral values,” twin foci of much of Protestant social work in America.⁸³

Within a year of the consultation, the NCC produced another policy statement on immigration reform. Once the NCC approved the statement, copies were sent to President Kennedy, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, the Commissioner for Immigration, and leading congressmen.⁸⁴ Even Francis Walter received a copy in the mail, though he made it clear he was not fully in agreement with the statement.⁸⁵ The document directly confronted the quota laws and provided several policy suggestions, including basing immigration quotas on the 1960 census. The 1962 NCC statement also reinforced both the moral and national emphases stressed during the Consultation the year before. It asserted, “In a world of dynamic change, our nation’s immigration policy must be shaped by the requirements of moral principles and human values, as well as considerations of national welfare.” It recognized the need for “(a)dmision of persons with occupational skills generally employable in the United

⁸³NCC, *Witness for Immigration, April 13 and 14, 1961*, 93-94. See also NCC, “Resolution, Study of Immigration Policy, Approved by the General Board, June 8-9, 1961,” NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 24, NCC RG 6.20.24, PHS.

⁸⁴Kenneth L. Maxwell to Robert F. Kennedy, April 17, 1962, *ibid.*

⁸⁵Francis E. Walter to Kenneth L. Maxwell, May 8, 1962, *ibid.*

States” and “persons whose coming will tend to stimulate rather than jeopardize economic health and growth in the United States.”⁸⁶

In keeping with the ubiquitous notion of the brotherhood of man found within mainline Protestant social positions, the statement assumed a strikingly global focus. It acknowledged America’s leading global position and also noted that repressive sociopolitical circumstances in different parts of the world contributed to increasing migration. The NCC report declared its hope that the “immigration policy and practices of our Government will move further toward . . . the fulfillment of the responsibilities of the international position of the United States in its crucial role in helping to develop world community.” Rather than just fixing immigration laws in the United States, the NCC recognized that when framing immigration policy the Congress must take into account the rest of the world.⁸⁷

In a political climate increasingly more receptive to immigration reform, John F. Kennedy hoped to revamp immigration policy. He became publically linked to the immigration issue after the positions he took during the late 1950s while serving in the Senate and in a pamphlet, *A Nation of Immigrants*, he wrote for the Anti-Defamation League on immigration. Segments of this booklet were later printed in the *New York Times* in August 1963, when at the same time, he called for immigration reform as President.⁸⁸ Indicative of Kennedy’s support for the 1961 Consultation, his public image

⁸⁶NCC, “A Pronouncement: A Policy Statement of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America; The Churches and Immigration, Adopted by the General Board, February 27, 1962,” 18.2-1-3, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 24, NCC RG 6.20.24, PHS.

⁸⁷Ibid.

⁸⁸This booklet later culminated in the book *A Nation of Immigrants* published posthumously. Concerning its usage among immigration reform efforts, see the American Immigration and Citizenship

linked to immigration reform resonated with many mainline Protestant figures. In 1963 they backed an open letter to Kennedy that declared, “We are greatly encouraged and wish to express our appreciation for the outstanding leadership you are giving in this major field of human rights.” It was signed by various groups and societies representing American Baptists, Church World Service, the Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief, National Board of the YWCA, Protestant Episcopal Church, United Presbyterian Church, along with various civic and labor organizations.⁸⁹ Following Kennedy’s assassination, Lyndon Johnson and others would see to it that Kennedy’s proposals were not discontinued.⁹⁰

By 1964, the political climate had shifted since the McCarran-Walter Act passed twelve years earlier, and immigration reform that would rectify the national origins quota system was back on the table. In May 1963, Congressman Walter, the principle opponent to major revision to the national origins system, died. McCarran had passed away nine years earlier. Without their opposition, the pendulum swung towards immigration reform.⁹¹ In his State of the Union address in January 1964, Lyndon Johnson, after commenting on his vision for racial equality, addressed immigration. “We must also lift by legislation the bars of discrimination against those who seek entry into our country,

Conference pamphlet “We must open opportunity . . .,” Immigration – Folder One, 1960-1965, Records of the Women’s Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2599-5-3:6, UMC Archives-GCAH; John F. Kennedy, “A Nation of Immigrants,” *New York Times*, August 4, 1963; Zolberg, 318-19, 324-29.

⁸⁹“Statement by Congressman Herman Toll at Hearings of Subcommittee No. 1 on Immigration and Nationality, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, June 25, 1964,” 3-4, United PC(USA) Board of Christian Education, Council on Church and Society Records, box 12, folder 3, RG 78.12.3, PHS.

⁹⁰Zolberg, 329-333; “Administration’s Immigration Proposals Not Enacted,” 1964, *CQ Almanac*, Online ed., <https://library.cqpress.com/cqalmanac> (accessed 9/17/2016); “National Quotas for Immigration to End,” 1965, *CQ Almanac*, Online ed., <https://library.cqpress.com/cqalmanac> (accessed 9/17/2016).

⁹¹Zolberg, 323, 328-30.

particularly those with much needed skills and those joining their families. In establishing preferences, a nation that was built by the immigrants of all lands can ask those who now seek admission: What can you do for our country? But we should not be asking: In what country were you born?" He then outlined his foreign policy, whose basis echoed a pluralist ideal. Johnson aspired for a "world made safe for diversity, in which all men, goods and ideas can freely move across every border and every boundary."⁹²

Continuing its work on immigration reform, in 1964 the NCC prepared another statement for the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the House Judiciary Committee, in which it confirmed Protestant support for Emmanuel Celler's work in Congress where he advocated HR 7700, the bill Kennedy had promoted the year prior that aimed to eliminate the national origins system.⁹³ That same year the Methodist Church published yet another pamphlet deconstructing the McCarran-Walter Act. It frequently cited the Truman commission's report *Whom We Shall Welcome* and the 1961 Consultation. Using a series of tabs, it took the reader through the challenges facing immigration policies, critiquing the McCarran-Walter Act but also recognizing immigration still needed some federal regulation, just as long as it was not discriminatory.⁹⁴

⁹²Lyndon B. Johnson, "Texts of Johnson's State of the Union Message and His Earlier Press Briefing," *New York Times*, January 9, 1964.

⁹³"John W. Schauer to R. H. Edwin Espy, Memorandum, "Statement to be Presented before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the House Judiciary Committee," June 11, 1964, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 24, NCC RG 6.20.24, PHS; "Administration's Immigration Proposals Not Enacted," 1964, *CQ Almanac*.

⁹⁴*I Lift My Lamp* (Cincinnati, OH: Board of Missions, Methodist Church, 1964), Immigration - Folder Two, 1960-1965, Records of the Women's Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2599-5-3:7, UMC Archives-GCAH.

Despite President Johnson's acknowledgement of immigration reform in 1964, he did not begin in earnest to address it until 1965, with the aid of Congressmen Philip Hart and Emanuel Celler who carried the mantle of Kennedy's earlier bill.⁹⁵ Early that year, sensing the shifting political climate, the NCC passed a final resolution on immigration reform. At the February 1965 meeting of the NCC held in Portland, Oregon, the body voted on a resolution backing President Johnson's recent appeals for revising U.S. immigration policy. The ecumenical meeting and the passage of the resolution reflected two themes closely tied to the evolving Protestant position on immigration over the last forty years: the leadership women provided and the prominence of racial concerns. Thelma Stevens of the Methodist Women's Division presented the resolution to the gathering, and the opening address by Martin Niemoller stood as a stark reminder of the Nazi oppression and racial theories that many postwar Americans worked to distance themselves from. The actual resolution criticized the "inequitable racial and national barriers" previous legislation enacted and called for an end to quotas based upon national origin, while also echoing many of the reforms outlined in the NCC's statement from 1962.⁹⁶

Later that spring and into early summer, mainline Protestants contributed to the gaining momentum of immigration reform. In March, Robert D. Bulkley, as Secretary of

⁹⁵Zolberg, 329-333; "Administration's Immigration Proposals Not Enacted," 1964, *CQ Almanac*; "National Quotas for Immigration to End," 1965, *CQ Almanac*. See also Stephen Thomas Wagner, "The Lingering Death of the National Origins Quota System: A Political History of United States Immigration Policy, 1952-1965" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1986); Betty K. Koed, "The Politics of Reform: Policymakers and the Immigration Act of 1965" (PhD diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 1999).

⁹⁶"Resolution on the Churches and United States Immigration Policy, Adopted by the General Board on February 24, 1965"; Kenneth L. Maxwell to Jon L. Regier and Norman Baugher, February 19, 1965; Ken to Thelma Stevens, February 20, 1965, NCC Division of Christian Life and Mission Records, box 20, folder 24, NCC RG 6.20.24, PHS; "Portland, Ore., Feb. 26," NCC General Board Roundup, 4-5, NCC Broadcasting and Film Commission Records, box 12, folder 32, NCC RG 16.12.32, PHS.

the Office of Church and Society of the PC(USA), wrote to Presbyterians active in local programs. Commenting on the “unfair and unfortunate discrimination against people in eastern and Southern Europe, Asia, and Africa,” Bulkley declared that “it is also just another not too subtle way of saying to the peoples of the world that we judge some of them to be of inferior stock and therefore hardly suitable to admission to our land.”⁹⁷ Bulkley’s comment represented how far some Protestants had come since 1924 in their understanding of racial discrimination in immigration quotas. Protestants also turned their attention to the airwaves. In May 1965, the ABC Radio Network aired a program on “The Churches and United States Immigration Policy” that included talks by NCC, Church World Service, and American Friends Service Committee representatives.⁹⁸ Mainline Protestant leaders used all means at their disposal in this final push to overturn immigration restriction.

Later that fall, President Johnson signed the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, often referred to as the Hart-Celler Act, ending four decades of immigration restriction based upon race and national origins. In a speech before the Statue of Liberty, Johnson conceded “that for over four decades the immigration policy of the United States has been twisted and has been distorted by the harsh injustice of the national origins quota system.” Johnson went on to echo the pluralist, internationalist vision that many of his mainline Protestant supporters believed: “Our beautiful America was built by a nation of strangers. From a hundred different places or more they have poured forth into an

⁹⁷Robert D. Bulkley to Church and Society Chairmen, “Proposed Amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act,” March 17, 1965, United PC(USA) Board of Christian Education, Council on Church and Society Records, box 12, folder 3, RG 78.12.3, PHS.

⁹⁸Only an outline of that program has survived; thus, it is assumed that the program was aired. “Pilgrimage, May 9, 1965,” NCC Broadcasting and Film Commission Records, box 12, folder 32, NCC RG 16.12.32, PHS.

empty land, joining and blending in one mighty and irresistible tide. The land flourished because it was fed from so many sources—because it was nourished by so many cultures and traditions and peoples.”⁹⁹ As Johnson demonstrated, many Americans had come to embrace their immigrant heritage and, to a certain extent, the nation’s cultural diversity.

The demographic changes that the reform would usher in over the next several decades were not evident in 1965, to politicians and Protestants alike. At the beginning of his speech, Johnson acknowledged, “This bill that we will sign today is not a revolutionary bill.” Immigration scholar Aristide Zolberg even claimed that at the time, congressmen believed they were passing only moderate immigration reform. The law itself would not be implemented until 1968, and immediately following the bill’s passage, many contemporaries were oblivious to the changes in immigration to come, due in part to greater public attention to the continuing civil rights movement.¹⁰⁰ In a similar vein, the 1965 reform went largely unnoticed in the Christian press after the law passed. *Christian Century* did not provide comment in 1965, and in 1966 the publication only gave brief mention to the law in the context of increased Japanese immigration. Overall, this speaks to the lacuna in the perspective of many Americans concerning the coming changes. Protestants were largely unaware of the significance this legislation had for religious pluralism. As the law allowed greater opportunity for non-European immigrants, the bill would indeed introduce “revolutionary” cultural and social changes in the coming years. Immigration increased by 4.4 million between 1960 and 1980, and while Europeans and Canadians were the majority of immigrants during the 1950s,

⁹⁹Lyndon B. Johnson, “Remarks at the Signing of the Immigration Bill, Liberty Island, New York,” October 3, 1965, LBJ Presidential Library, <http://www.lbjlib.utexas.edu/johnson/archives.hom/speeches.hom/651003.asp> (accessed 9/17/2016).

¹⁰⁰Zolberg, 329-38.

during the 1970s, Mexico, the Philippines, Korea, Cuba, and India provided the most immigrants to the United States.¹⁰¹

Conclusion

In his 1964 book *The Protestant Establishment*, University of Pennsylvania sociologist E. Digby Baltzell announced that the social hegemony of white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestants was coming to an end. In this dirge, Baltzell believed that white Protestants were experiencing a “crisis in moral authority” due to their inability to extend power and opportunity to minorities in society. For Baltzell, it had become an exclusive caste and was dying on account of not adapting. The social gospel had challenged its position during the early twentieth century, and World War II helped undermine the racial consensus upon which it was built. Drawing from the current civil rights movement at the time that he wrote, Baltzell concluded that Christianity was needed to stem the tide of racism and chip away at the ensconced position of white Protestant America. In order for a civilizing upper class to survive, according to Baltzell, it must adapt to the pluralistic conditions at that time.¹⁰²

Baltzell’s observations proved to be both prescient and misplaced. The Protestant establishment was indeed in decline. While Baltzell was correct that its authority was historically the result of racial and ethnic discrimination, the religious preeminence of white Protestant Americans was on the verge of dissipating, not because of a lack of toleration, but due to an increasing religious pluralism ushered in by recent immigrants and refugees and the continuance of ethnic communities outside the Protestant fold.

¹⁰¹Zolberg, 337-39.

¹⁰²E. Digby Baltzell, *The Protestant Establishment: Aristocracy and Caste in America* (New York: Random House, 1964).

Mainline Protestants were largely ignorant to these coming changes. When it came to pluralism, they often supported a form of cultural pluralism, but largely overlooked the coming religious pluralism. When they did discuss religious pluralism, it was often an acknowledgement of America's "Tri-Faith" tradition of Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism. In a 1957 report promoted by the NCC, one section asked the question: "Would a More Liberal Immigration Policy Encourage More Roman Catholic Immigrants and Change the Relationships Among the Faiths in the United States?" In a rather dry response, the report concluded that increased immigration would "be only a minor factor in interfaith relationships," and that Catholic and Protestant numbers would remain stable. But by interfaith, they were still looking through the lens of pluralist overtures to Catholics and Jews. They did not anticipate the broader religious pluralism to come.¹⁰³

While they did not see it coming, they nevertheless contributed to it. Earlier social gospel sentiments and current events largely shaped Protestant approaches to immigration during this time, and underlying their positions was a developing progressive critique of the racial components of restrictive legislation. Moreover, their continued attention to "national" and "moral" concerns encouraged a robust interest in immigration reform. But in their support for immigration reform lay unintended consequences. The increasing pluralism that immigration fostered took a toll on Protestants' own position in American culture. The 1965 immigration reform propelled an extensive religious pluralism that countered white, Protestant claims on America. By the end of the twentieth century, Buddhist monasteries, Muslim mosques, and Hindu temples joined Protestant chapels, Jewish synagogues, and Catholic cathedrals in

¹⁰³Landis and Jacquet, Jr., "Immigration Programs and Policies," 59.

characterizing the religious landscape of the United States.¹⁰⁴ Often overlooked is that native Protestants themselves, through their increasingly progressive positions on immigration, helped advance a hallmark of the American political and social tradition, religious pluralism.

¹⁰⁴For late twentieth-century religious pluralism in America, see Diana L. Eck, *A New Religious America: How a "Christian Country" Has Become the World's Most Religiously Diverse Nation* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2001).

CHAPTER EIGHT

Conclusion: The Pluralistic Bargain

“Open-mindedness opens closed doors, not all of them, but all those which hold culture’s universal treasures. Beside the open mind there needs to be the open heart, open to all sorts and kinds of people, and the lowliest often enter with the most precious gifts.”

—Edward A. Steiner, *The Making of a Great Race*¹

Beginning in the colonial era, Protestants in America served as gatekeepers of culture. Ever since the Puritans formed the Massachusetts Bay Colony as a “city upon a hill,” Protestantism and American identity have been woven inextricably together. This aspiration proved elusive during the colonial period as the religious practice of dissident Protestant sects, Catholics, and native Americans challenged Puritan claims, and the task has remained ever since just beyond the grasp of Protestants desiring a Christian nation conforming to their beliefs. But this has not stopped white Christians in the United States from attempting to maintain social, cultural, and religious boundaries that define who is and is not American. As the twentieth century unfolded, a host of developments began chipping away at their role as national gatekeepers, none more so than the immigration of people practicing different cultures and religions.

This confrontation between Protestant religion and immigration is nothing new. Throughout colonial and nineteenth-century American history, Protestants have been at the forefront of fierce nativist movements. Many Protestants during the twentieth century continued to draw from this legacy as they defended a white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant

¹Edward A. Steiner, *The Making of a Great Race: Racial and Religious Cross-Currents in the United States* (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1929), 190.

identity for America, but they did so with much less militancy. An increasing number of them, often steering the course of denominations and ecumenical organizations, began challenging racist visions of the nation that promoted one hundred percent cultural assimilation. Moreover, efforts to evangelize and minister to immigrants through home missions checked nativist tendencies as they instead fostered a more compassionate spirit. Many home missionaries drew inspiration from the earlier social gospel movement and its emphasis on brotherhood and fraternity. As their nativism became less strident, some Protestants began to acknowledge a spiritual and national purpose that transcended race and culture. They were more inclined to welcome immigrants and refugees into the nation—while at the same time hoping that these foreigners would join Protestant churches. For while many leading Protestants of the early to mid-twentieth century grew more comfortable with cultural pluralism, they were unwilling to let go of their vision of a Protestant Christian nation. And so, they came to a pluralistic bargain with immigrant America.

Protestant home missionaries demonstrated a largely ambivalent approach to pluralism. Much of their thinking was akin to the work of philosopher Horace Kallen and his definition of cultural pluralism. The United States was at its best, according to cultural pluralists, when its ethnic communities maintained their own distinctive cultures, while still giving allegiance to the nation and the American Way of Life. Multiple scholars have noted the incongruity in this expectation. Progressives touting the notion of an American melting pot desired both a multifaceted American culture and a singular, or “homogenous,” national identity.² This concept is largely enshrined in the American

²Philip Gleason, “American Identity and Americanization,” in *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*, edited by Stephan Thernstrom (Cambridge: Belknap Press, Harvard University Press,

ideal of *E Pluribus Unum* (“out of many, one”).³ A Presbyterian booklet published in 1957 illustrates this ambivalence within Protestant responses to immigration. “Yet one of our greatest assets is this very cultural and religious diversity,” acknowledged the writer of the pamphlet. “As the United States continues to consolidate its national life, one of the basic issues will be the proper relation of the whole to its parts and the parts to the whole.”⁴ Consolidation and diversity were held in seemingly unresolved tension.

The pluralistic bargain Protestants came to accept helps clarify this conundrum. Protestants believed a shared Judeo-Christian faith would assure common American ideals, outlined in Will Herberg’s monumental midcentury work.⁵ Such principles included tolerance and social accord based on acceptance of other cultures. A shared Christian faith encouraged Protestants to give less attention to cultural differences that existed, as they elevated religious identity over culture. This became even more important as the Cold War ensued, and a “godless” Russia threatened America. The popular revivalism of Billy Graham and other evangelicals by the 1960s began to stress

1980), 50; Robert L. Fleegler, *Ellis Island Nation: Immigration Policy and American Identity in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013).

³A 1922 Episcopal manual pointed out, “Our country’s task is to create one harmonious nation out of many—to live up to our motto—E Pluribus Unum.” Thomas Burgess, *Foreign-Born Americans and Their Children: Our Duty and Opportunity for God and Country from the Standpoint of the Episcopal Church* (New York: Department of Missions and Church Extension of the Episcopal Church, 1922), 1. Discussion of “E Pluribus Unum” was also included on the back of a community center pamphlet from the 1920s. “What the Caspian Community Center Stands For,” United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. [hereafter PC(USA)] Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development Records, box 11, folder 54, RG 301.7.11.54, Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

⁴“Changing America: A Social Perspective for the Churches in Their Christian Life and Work,” *Social Progress: Changing America* 47 (April 1957), 7, Rapid Social Change-Folder 2, 1955-1963, Records of the Women's Division of the General Board of Global Ministries, 2597-3-5:5, United Methodist Church Archives-GCAH, Madison, New Jersey.

⁵Will Herberg, *Protestant, Catholic, Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology* (1955; repr., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983). See also Gunnar Myrdal, “American Dilemma Still Remains in Our Intentions of Democracy and What We Do About Our Serious Race Problem,” *motive* 9 (January 1949), 15-16, 44.

what mainline Protestants had been arguing for some time, that religion was the foundation for national stability, while cultural differences were ancillary. In the process, native Protestants worked to promote a form of pluralism that was more cultural than religious. When they did acknowledge religious pluralism, it was nearly always limited to Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism.⁶ Many mainline Protestant leaders turned to a more liberal immigration policy that welcomed cultural differences, with the understanding that America's religious identity would remain largely intact. What they did not realize was that they unwittingly helped pave the way for a broader religious pluralism in the future.

Not all white Protestants, however, supported such an agenda. A clear gap remained between denominational leadership and the laity, as occasional letters penned by disgruntled parishioners attest.⁷ A Presbyterian writer even confessed in 1957, "In personal terms, we are likely to extol the virtues of our many-faceted cultural heritage, and at the same time make life difficult for the various minorities upon whom much of the pluralism depends."⁸ As gatekeepers, they often mirrored the prejudice and fears of society at large. Their tacit approval of the quota system and its discrimination against eastern and southern Europeans demonstrates that they remained steeped in broader American cultural views. Even their response to the 1965 immigration reform is telling since they did not challenge the government's decision to place a quota on the Western Hemisphere, which would for the first time officially limit Latin American immigration.

⁶One still sees this in 1962 in Franklin H. Littell, *From State Church to Pluralism: A Protestant Interpretation of Religion in American History* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1962).

⁷Elesha J. Coffman makes this argument in *The Christian Century and the Rise of the Protestant Mainline* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

⁸"Changing America," 22.

A combination of home missions, Christian convictions, diffusion of earlier social gospel tenets, and the American Way of Life, along with a determination to confront racism and encourage toleration, inspired many ecumenical leaders within the Federal/National Council of Churches to pursue an active political agenda. Before the ink dried on the Immigration Act of 1924, liberal minded Protestants began calling for immigration reform. They at first only challenged Japanese exclusion, which threatened foreign missions and international diplomacy, but by the midcentury Protestants began to realize the discrimination embedded in a system that favored some nations' immigrants over others. Even the most progressive leaders agreed, however, that a quota system was desirable that would limit the rising immigration they had witnessed at the turn of the twentieth century. While their progressive leanings were certainly not shared by all American Protestants, their ideas gradually filtered down to temper the views of local congregations. City and state church councils began to follow ecumenical leaders in calling for immigration reform, and town churches began to sponsor refugees following the Second World War. Archival sources detailing local home mission programs suggest certain social sensibilities on race and immigration reform were being diffused at the lower reaches of the Protestant church in the United States.

Another central component of this history is the role of women and the immigrants themselves. While the notion of "brotherhood" was ubiquitous among home mission work and was meant to be inclusive, it deemphasized the work of Protestant women. This study is largely an account of men with access to denominational leadership and publishing opportunities, but while men were at the forefront, women were on the battlefield. Protestant women often were the ones visiting immigrant

families and putting progressive ideals into action, while also inculcating American culture in immigrant communities. Many female home missionaries carried earlier social gospel programs into the midcentury. One must also give credit to the vitality of immigrants themselves. Some of them worked within native Protestant denominations, supplying much needed counsel for home mission programs. Though white Protestant leaders helped mediate between immigrants and American society, this task must also be attributed to the immigrant workers within Protestant denominations. Whether they joined Protestant churches or not, most immigrants retained ethnic cultural practices in the face of strong Americanization programs. By holding on to diverse cultures, they forced white Americans to accommodate diversity. It is likely that native Protestants would have been less interested in cultural pluralism had immigrant groups not actively maintained diverse cultures.

In sum, this is a history of unintended consequences. Historian Stephen T. Wagner argues that policymakers in 1965 were “looking backwards more than forwards” when they overturned the national origins system.⁹ The same can be said for Protestants invested in the debate. Protestants and politicians alike did not realize that immigration demographics would drastically change following passage of the Hart-Celler Act. Rising numbers of Asians and Latinos and a broader array of world religions made their way into the United States after 1965. Ten years later, Susan Jacoby wrote in the *New York Times* that immigration had reached its “highest point in half a century.”¹⁰ What resulted was far from the “new and compact national consciousness” that Henry Goddard Leach

⁹Stephen Thomas Wagner, “The Lingering Death of the National Origins Quota System: A Political History of United States Immigration Policy, 1952-1965” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1986), 478.

¹⁰Susan Jacoby, “The Law Changed in 1965,” *New York Times*, June 8, 1975.

hoped for in his *Forum* article from 1924. By the end of the twentieth century, most mainline Protestants could not, and would not, refer to America as a Christian nation. This was left to their distant relatives in the Religious Right.

Despite the religious pluralism that challenged Protestant hegemony, increasing immigration during the twentieth century also helped revitalize American Protestantism. Numerous immigrant and refugee believers contributed to the nation's churches. While still predominantly white, by 2014 7 percent of mainline Protestants and 13 percent of evangelicals identified as either Asian or Latino. By that same year, 14 percent of mainliners and 16 percent of evangelicals were either first or second generation immigrants.¹¹ Moreover, many immigrant and refugee theologians who came to America during the twentieth century, Paul Tillich being the foremost example, fortified Protestantism. As a part of the pluralistic bargain, Protestants began to come to terms with their complicity in racist policies and ascribe to forms of justice that drew them to aid the dispossessed. In grappling with pluralism, they realized the prophetic admonition declared in a Presbyterian periodical in 1957. "The danger in a pluralistic society that is prevailingly 'Christian' is that we represent to our fellow citizens not our Lord but our culture, or particular parts of it. In the political realm, we tend to identify democracy with Christianity, and our nation with God." The Presbyterian writer then asserted, "It is not our task to proclaim our culture in the name of the gospel, but to witness to the gospel. This we must do in terms both personal and social."¹² The pluralistic bargain

¹¹Racial and Ethnic Composition, Immigrant Status, Religious Landscape Study, 2014, Pew Research Center, <http://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/racial-and-ethnic-composition/> (accessed April 22, 2017).

¹²"Changing America," 23.

and ensuing religious pluralism loosened Protestants' grip on American society, but in so doing allowed them to reassess and renew the mission of their churches.

After 1965 white American Protestants encountered multiple opportunities to practice a more welcoming attitude to immigrants. During the 1980s, several Protestant churches took part in the Sanctuary Movement that aided Latin Americans fleeing political oppression. Following terrorist attacks at the outset of the twenty-first century, American nativists began channeling former fears of Catholicism or communism towards Islam instead. Many Protestant groups, however, have chosen to resist the recent spate of anti-immigrant sentiments and policy.

In 2010, the American Baptist Churches USA issued a letter calling for immigration reform. The statement recognizes concerns over “national security, appropriate means of border control, and the impact on our economic and social welfare systems,” but still concludes that “immigration reform in our country must reflect mercy and justice rooted in God’s love.” The document also reflects various historical precedents. It notes cooperation with Catholics and Eastern Orthodox Christians and even recognizes the earlier work that American Baptist women conducted within Christian Friendliness programs, what the document refers to as the denomination’s “missional DNA.” Finally, the signers welcomed the revitalization that immigration brought to American Baptist churches. “God has woven us into a coat of many colors.”¹³

As the political parties began sifting through presidential candidates in the fall of 2015, the Stated Clerk of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) wrote an open letter to then Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump. Pointing to Trump’s Presbyterian past,

¹³American Baptist Churches USA, “Immigration Letter,” May 14, 2010, http://www.abc-usa.org/what_we_believe/mission/immigration-letter/ (accessed April 22, 2017).

Gradye Parsons noted that the purpose of his letter was “to share with you [Trump] the Presbyterian policies on refugees and immigrants.” Parsons declared, “Knowing our Lord was once a refugee, faithful Presbyterians have been writing church policy urging the welcome of refugees and demanding higher annual admissions into the United States since the refugee crisis of World War II.” Parsons commented on the denomination’s ties to foreign missions and how this fostered concern for refugees. In his letter, Parsons drew from the experience Presbyterians, and many other mainline denominations, had in refugee and immigrant work over the latter half of the twentieth century. Clearly his letter was left unread by the later president.¹⁴

Today, it is not just progressive mainline figures who participate in this discussion. Evangelical groups also enter the fray and find spiritual solidarity with immigrants and refugees. The Church of the Nazarene, for example, sponsors multiple immigration resource centers licensed by the U.S. Board of Immigration Appeals that assist immigrants through the legal process.¹⁵ In January 2017, various evangelical leaders signed a statement questioning Trump’s ban on refugees. They appealed to the Bible, which “teaches us that each person—including each refugee, regardless of their country of origin, religious background, or any other qualifier—is made in the Image of God, with inherent dignity and potential.” They also stressed the importance of keeping refugee families together and drew from the Christian missional impulse “to love our neighbors, to make disciples of all nations, and to practice hospitality.” They balanced

¹⁴Gradye Parsons, “Stated Clerk Issues Letter to Trump on refugees, immigrants,” October 2, 2015, <https://www.pcusa.org/news/2015/10/2/clerk-issues-letter-trump-refugees-immigrants/> (accessed April 22, 2017).

¹⁵Callie Stevens, “Welcome to the Table,” *NCM Magazine* (Winter 2016), 21-23, https://issuu.com/ncm.magazine/docs/ncm_magazine_winter_2016/21?e=10810763/39967973 (accessed April 22, 2017). See also Nazarene Compassionate Ministries, “Refugee and Immigrant Support,” <http://www.ncm.org/refugee-and-immigrant-support.html> (accessed April 22, 2017).

these appeals, however, with the understanding that national security remains important, appealing to the government “to be both compassionate *and* secure.”¹⁶

That same month the *Washington Post* published a letter Russell Moore, head of the Southern Baptist Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission, wrote to Trump. In many respects, his letter serves as a testimony to Protestant efforts during the twentieth century to assist immigrants and come to terms with pluralism. Moore highlighted the “church’s commitment to welcoming the stranger.” He cited Emma Lazarus’s words on the Statue of Liberty and acknowledged the nation’s failure to aid Jewish refugees during the 1930s. Moore, like other Protestant leaders, called for both “compassion for the sojourner and the security of our citizens,” while also noting his concern for the safety of foreign missionaries in the Middle East. Reminiscent of arguments made by many Protestants after World War II, Moore noted the role of the United States as a “model for freedom around the world.” In his concluding remarks, Moore identified a concern that lay at the heart of most Protestant responses to immigrants over the last century. He concluded that “assimilation into American life is crucial for both the security of our existing citizens and the well-being of refugee families. Christian churches and other faith communities have proven their unique ability to facilitate such adjustments.”¹⁷

As Moore’s statement suggests, certain Protestant responses to foreigners continue into the twenty-first century. Native Protestants still grapple with what is the proper relationship between national identity and pluralism, between religion and culture.

¹⁶Chad Hayward, et al. to President Trump and Vice President Pence, January 29, 2017, <http://static.politico.com/ac/e4/b93a2d7041bc8243fed19f149fd0/evangelical-letter.pdf> (accessed April 22, 2017).

¹⁷Russell Moore, “Exclusive: The Letter Russell Moore will Send Trump about the Refugee Order,” *Washington Post*, January 30, 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2017/01/30/exclusive-the-letter-russell-moore-will-send-trump-about-the-refugee-order/?utm_term=.59be6b707bae (accessed April 22, 2017).

If Moore's comments are any indicator, Protestants will over the coming years continue to work through their spiritual and national commitments in light of immigration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Collections

American Baptist Historical Society Archives, Atlanta, Georgia
American Baptist Home Mission Society
Baptist World Alliance
Christian Friendliness
Woman's American Baptist Home Mission Society

Archives of the Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas
*The Annual Report of the National Council, The Domestic and Foreign
Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United
States of America*, 1924, 1930, 1933
Diocese of California, *Journal of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese
of California, Grace Cathedral, San Francisco*, 1943, 1953
Diocese of New York, *Journal of the Convention of the Diocese of New York*,
1921, 1934, 1939, 1949, 1953, 1954
*Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in
the United States of America, Original Minutes, Meeting of the National
Council*, 1930, 1938, 1939, 1944, 1945, 1959, 1960
“Protestants—Catholics Cooperate.” Diocesan Press Service. June 5, 1963. XI-4.
[http://www.episcopalarchives.org/cgi-bin/ENS/ENSpress_release.pl?pr_](http://www.episcopalarchives.org/cgi-bin/ENS/ENSpress_release.pl?pr_number=XI-4)
[number=XI-4](http://www.episcopalarchives.org/cgi-bin/ENS/ENSpress_release.pl?pr_number=XI-4) (accessed January 26, 2015)

Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library and Museum, Hyde Park, New York
American Christian Committee for Refugees, Inc., Records of the War Refugee
Board, 1944-1945. [http://www.fdrlibrary.marist.edu/_resources/images](http://www.fdrlibrary.marist.edu/_resources/images/wrb/wrb0010.pdf)
[/wrb/wrb0010.pdf](http://www.fdrlibrary.marist.edu/_resources/images/wrb/wrb0010.pdf) (accessed March 21, 2016)

Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America Records
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America
Broadcasting and Film Commission Records
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America
Division of Christian Life and Mission Records
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America Office
of Planning and Program Records
United PC(USA) Board of Christian Education, Council on Church and Society
Records
United PC(USA) Board of National Missions Dept. of Mission Development
Records

South Asian American Digital Archive

“Memorandum on Proposed Legislation.” <http://www.saada.org/sites/all/themes/saada/bookreader.php?title=TWVtb3JhbmR1bSBvbiBQcm9wb3NlZCBMZWdpc2xhdGlvbiA=&folder=MjAxMy0wMQ==&object=aXRlbS1iYWdhaS1hYmct&pages=NDM=#page/1/mode/1up> (accessed April 2, 2017)

Southern Baptist Historical Library and Archives, Nashville, Tennessee

Home Mission Board Communication Division Collection

Jacob Gartenhaus Collection

Joseph Frank Plainfield Papers

“News Copy, For Release: 3:40 P.M., Friday, May 26, 1961.” Baptist Press Archives from 1948 to 1996. http://www.sbhla.org/bp_archive/index.asp (accessed May 1, 2016)

Una Roberts Lawrence Collection

United Methodist Church Archives-General Commission on Archives and History, Madison, New Jersey

Church Women United Records

Missionary Files: Methodist Church, 1912-1949, Japan Conf., Roll No. 115

Records of the General Conference

Records of the Methodist Federation for Social Action

Records of the National Division of the General Board of Global Ministries

Records of the United Methodist Committee on Relief

Records of the United Methodist Church General Board of Higher Education and Ministry

Records of the Women's Division of the General Board of Global Ministries

The Tourist (1993-126)

“What Can I Do to Help Cuban Refugees?” December 3, 1965. DA-1424.

Historical UM Media. <http://catalog.gcah.org/DigitalArchives/NightCall/DA-1424.mp3> (accessed September 4, 2015)

Newspapers and Periodicals

American Missionary

The Baptist

Baptist Standard

Campaign Talking Points

Christian Advocate

Christian Century

The Congregationalist

Federal Council Bulletin

Forum

Herald of Gospel Liberty

Home Mission Monthly

Home Missions
Independent
Jewish Criterion
The Nation
Methodist Review
Missionary Review of the World
motive
New York Times
The Presbyterian
Presbyterian Life
Presbyterian Tribune
Reformed Church Review
Royal Service
Saturday Evening Post
Spirit of Missions
U.S. News and World Report
Vital Speeches of the Day
Woman's Home Missions

Books, Pamphlets, and Public Documents

- Abel, Theodore. *Protestant Home Missions to Catholic Immigrants*. New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1933.
- Alba, Richard, Albert J. Raboteau, and Josh DeWind, eds. *Immigration and Religion in America: Comparative and Historical Perspectives*. New York: New York University Press, 2009.
- Albaugh, Dana M. *Who Shall Separate Us?: A New Dimension in Christian Witness; Relief, Resettlement, Rehabilitation, Reconstruction*. Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1962.
- Alldredge, E. P. *Southern Baptist Handbook 1924*. Nashville, TN: Baptist Sunday School Board, 1924.
- Allen, Irving Lewis. *Unkind Words: Ethnic Labeling from Redskin to WASP*. New York: Bergin & Garvey, 1990.
- Allerfeldt, Kristofer. *Race, Radicalism, Religion, and Restriction: Immigration in the Pacific Northwest, 1890-1924*. Westport: Praeger, 2003.
- Alvis, Joel L. *Religion and Race: Southern Presbyterians, 1946-1983*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1994.

- American Baptist Churches USA. "Immigration Letter." May 14, 2010. http://www.abc-usa.org/what_we_believe/mission/immigration-letter/ (accessed April 22, 2017).
- American Immigration Conference, ed. *American Immigration Policy: Selected Statements*. New York: American Immigration Conference, 1957.
- Archdeacon, Thomas. *Becoming American: An Ethnic History*. New York: Free Press, 1983.
- Axling, William. *Japan Wonders Why?: A Challenging Chapter in American Japanese Relations*. New York: Commission on International Justice and Goodwill, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 1924.
- Badillo, David A. *Latinos and the New Immigrant Church*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.
- Baltzell, E. Digby. *The Protestant Establishment: Aristocracy and Caste in America*. New York: Random House, 1964.
- Banker, Mark T. *Presbyterian Missions and Cultural Interaction in the Far Southwest, 1850-1950*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- Banner, James M., Jr., ed. *A Century of American Historiography*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2010.
- Baptist General Convention of Texas. *Annual of the Baptist General Convention of Texas*. 1921.
- . *Annual of the Baptist General Convention of Texas*. 1924.
- Barker, John Marshall. *The Social Gospel and the New Era*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1919.
- Barton, Paul. *Hispanic Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists in Texas*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006.
- Bates, Katharine Lee. *America the Beautiful and Other Poems*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1911.
- Bendroth, Margaret. *Growing Up Protestant: Parents, Children, and Mainline Churches*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2002.
- . *The Last Puritans: Mainline Protestants and the Power of the Past*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015.

- Bennett, David H. *The Party of Fear: From Nativist Movements to the New Right in American History*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- Billington, Ray Allen. *The Protestant Crusade: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism, 1800-1860*. 1938. Reprint, Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964.
- Blair, Bertha, Anne O. Lively, and Glen W. Trimble. *Spanish-speaking Americans: Mexicans and Puerto Ricans in the United States*. Home Missions Division, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., 1959.
- Blankenship, Anne M. *Christianity, Social Justice, and the Japanese American Incarceration during World War II*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016.
- Blum, Edward J., and Paul Harvey. *The Color of Christ: The Son of God and the Saga of Race in America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012.
- Bodnar, John. *The Transplanted: A History of Immigrants in Urban America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987.
- Bon Tempo, Carl J. *Americans at the Gate: The United States and Refugees During the Cold War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Bowden, Henry W., ed. *A Century of Church History: The Legacy of Philip Schaff*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1988.
- Bowman, Matthew. *The Urban Pulpit: New York City and the Fate of Liberal Evangelicalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Brackenridge, R. Douglas, and Francisco O. García-Treto. *Iglesia Presbiteriana: A History of Presbyterians and Mexican Americans in the Southwest*. 2nd ed. San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 1987.
- Breitman, Richard, and Allan J. Lichtman. *FDR and the Jews*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Brooks, Charles Alvin, ed. *The Church and the Foreigner: A Christian Service Program for the Local Church*. New York: American Baptist Home Mission Society, n.d.
- . *Christian Americanization: A Task for the Churches*. Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1919.
- . *Through the Second Gate: Baptists in Action among New American*. New York: American Baptist Home Mission Society, 1922.

- Brown, Karen McCarthy. *Mama Lola: A Vodou Priestess in Brooklyn*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Brumberg, Stephan F. *Going to America, Going to School: The Jewish Immigrant Public School Encounter in Turn-of-the-Century New York City*. New York: Praeger, 1986.
- Burgess, Thomas, Charles Kendall Gilbert, and Charles Thorley Bridgeman. *Foreigners or Friends: The Churchman's Approach to the Foreign-Born and Their Children*. New York: Department of Missions and Church Extension, 1921.
- Burgess, Thomas. *Foreign-Born Americans and Their Children: Our Duty and Opportunity for God and Country from the Standpoint of the Episcopal Church*. New York: Department of Missions and Church Extension of the Episcopal Church, 1922.
- Burnidge, Cara Lea. *A Peaceful Conquest: Woodrow Wilson, Religion, and the New World Order*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016.
- Carpenter, Joel A. *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Carter, Heath W. *Union Made: Working People and the Rise of Social Christianity in Chicago*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Carter, Paul A. *The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel: Social and Political Liberalism in American Protestant Churches, 1920-1940*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1956.
- Casselmann, Arthur V. *Making America Christian: A Guide in the Study of the Home Mission of the Church Based on the Research and Findings of the North American Home Missions Congress, Washington, D. C., December 1-5, 1930*. New York: Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement, 1930.
- Cavert, Samuel McCrea, ed. *The Churches Allied for Common Tasks: Report of the Third Quadrennium of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 1916-1920*. New York: Federal Council of the Church of Christ in America, 1921.
- Caylor, John. *Our Neighbors of Many Tongues: Resource Book on 1954 Home Mission Series*. Atlanta, GA: Home Mission Board, SBC, 1954.
- Chan, Sucheng, ed. *Entry Denied: Exclusion and the Chinese Community in America, 1882-1943*. Asian American History and Culture, edited by Sucheng Chan. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991.

- Chandler, Edgar H. S. *The High Tower of Refuge: The Inspiring Story of Refugee Relief Throughout the World*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1959.
- Chang, Derek. *Citizens of a Christian Nation*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.
- Chappell, David L. *A Stone of Hope: Prophetic Religion and the Death of Jim Crow*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Chicago Presbytery. *Presbyterian Progress in 100 Years*. University of Chicago Library. www.lib.uchicago.edu/ead/pdf/century0389.pdf (accessed January 8, 2017).
- Cirtautas, K. C. *The Refugee: A Psychological Study*. Boston: Meador Publishing, 1957.
- Coffman, Elesha J. *The Christian Century and the Rise of the Protestant Mainline*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Cohen, Charles L., and Ronald L. Numbers, eds. *Gods in America: Religious Pluralism in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Cohen, Deborah. *Braceros: Migrant Citizens and Transnational Subjects in the Postwar United States and Mexico*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2011.
- Collins, Ace. *Songs Sung Red, White, and Blue: The Stories Behind America's Best-Loved Patriotic Songs*. New York: HarperCollins, 2003.
- Cordasco, Francesco, et al., eds. *Protestant Evangelism among Italians in America*. New York: Arno Press, 1975.
- Coser, Lewis A. *Refugee Scholars in America: Their Impact and Their Experiences*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.
- Craig, Laura Gerould. *America, God's Melting-Pot: A Parable-Study*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1913.
- Curtis, Susan. *A Consuming Faith: The Social Gospel and Modern American Culture*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991.
- Daniels, Roger. *Coming to America: A History of Immigration and Ethnicity in American Life*. 2nd ed. New York: Harper Perennial, 2002.
- Davis, Lawrence. *Immigration, Baptists, and the Protestant Mind in America*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973.
- Dawson, J. M. *The Spiritual Conquest of the Southwest*. Nashville, TN: Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, 1927.

- De León, Arnolando. *They Called Them Greasers: Anglo Attitudes Toward Mexicans in Texas, 1821-1900*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987.
- Di Donato, Pietro. *Christ in Concrete*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill, 1939.
- Dinnerstein, Leonard, Roger L. Nichols, and David M. Reimers. *Natives and Strangers: Ethnic Groups and the Building of America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Dinnerstein, Leonard, and David M. Reimers. *Ethnic Americans: A History of Immigration*. 5th ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.
- Disciples of Christ. *1925 Year Book*. St. Louis, MO: United Christian Missionary Society, 1925.
- Dolan, Jay P. *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- Dorrien, Gary. *Soul in Society: The Making and Renewal of Social Christianity*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Dupont, Carolyn Renée. *Mississippi Praying: Southern White Evangelicals and the Civil Rights Movement, 1945-1975*. New York: New York University Press, 2013.
- Eck, Diana L. *A New Religious America: How a "Christian Country" Has Become the World's Most Religiously Diverse Nation*. New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2001.
- Edwards, Mark. *The Right of the Protestant Left: God's Totalitarianism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists*. Vol. 1. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1958.
- Episcopal Church. *Episcopal Church Annual, 1960*. New York: Morehouse-Barlow, 1960.
- . *Episcopal Church Annual, 1963*. New York: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1963.
- . *Journal of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 1928*. New York: Abbott Press & Mortimer-Walling, 1929.
- . *Journal of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, 1931*. Saint Louis, MO: Frederick Printing and Stationary Co., 1932.
- . *Living Church Annual, Churchman's Year Book, and American Church Almanac, 1924*. Milwaukee, WI: Morehouse Publishing, 1923.

- . *Living Church Annual, Churchman's Year Book, and American Church Almanac, 1931*. Milwaukee, WI: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1931.
- . *Living Church Annual, Year Book of the Episcopal Church, 1935*. Milwaukee, WI: Morehouse Publishing Co., 1934.
- . *Living Church Annual, Year Book of the Episcopal Church, 1941*. New York; Milwaukee: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1940.
- . *Living Church Annual, Year Book of the Episcopal Church, 1943*. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1942.
- . *Living Church Annual, Year Book of the Episcopal Church, 1945*. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1944.
- Evans, Christopher H. *The Social Gospel in American Religion: A History*. New York: New York University Press, 2017.
- Fawcett, Edmund. *Liberalism: The Life of an Idea*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.
- Findlay, James F. *Church People in the Struggle: The National Council of Churches and the Black Freedom Movement, 1950-1970*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Fleegler, Robert L. *Ellis Island Nation: Immigration Policy and American Identity in the Twentieth Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.
- Foner, Eric, ed. *The New American History*. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997.
- Foner, Eric, and Lisa McGirr, eds. *American History Now*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011.
- Foreign-Born Americans Division, National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church. *How to Reach the Foreign-Born: A Practical Parish Program of American Fellowship*. Bulletin No. 45. New York: Department of Publicity, 1924.
- Gabaccia, Donna. *From the Other Side: Women, Gender, and Immigrant Life in the U.S., 1820-1990*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- Gardner, Martha. *The Qualities of a Citizen: Women, Immigration, and Citizenship, 1870-1965*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Garland, Libby. *After They Closed the Gates: Jewish Illegal Immigration to the United States, 1921-1965*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014.

- Geffert, Bryn. *Eastern Orthodox and Anglicans: Diplomacy, Theology, and the Politics of Interwar Ecumenism*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010.
- Gerstle, Gary. *American Crucible: Race and Nation in the Twentieth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- GhaneaBassiri, Kambiz. *A History of Islam in America: From the New World to the New World Order*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Glazer, Nathan, and Daniel Patrick Moynihan. *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Gleason, Philip. *The Conservative Reformers: German-American Catholics and the Social Order*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.
- Gordon, Linda. *The Great Arizona Orphan Abduction*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Gordon, Milton M. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Grant, Madison. *The Passing of the Great Race, or the Racial Basis of European History*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.
- Green, Steven K. *Inventing a Christian America: The Myth of the Religious Founding*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Greene, Alison Collis. *No Depression in Heaven: The Great Depression, the New Deal, and the Transformation of Religion in the Delta*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Grijalva, Joshua. *A History of Mexican Baptists in Texas, 1881-1981*. Dallas, TX: Baptist General Convention of Texas, 1982.
- Grodka, Sonia, and Gerhard Hennes. *Homeless No More: A Discussion on Integration Between Sponsor and Refugee*. New York: National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., 1960.
- Grose, Howard B. *Aliens or Americans?* Dayton, OH: Home Missionary Society of the United Brethren Church, 1906.
- Guerin-Gonzales, Camille. *Mexican Workers and American Dreams: Immigration, Repatriation, and California Farm Labor, 1900-1939*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994.

- Gulick, Sidney L. *Should Congress Enact Special Laws Affecting Japanese?* New York: National Committee on American Japanese Relations, 1922.
- . *Adventuring in Brotherhood among Orientals in America*. New York: Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1925.
- Hamburger, Philip. *Separation of Church and State*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Handlin, Oscar. *Boston's Immigrants*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1941.
- . *The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migrations that Made the American People*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1952.
- Hankins, Barry. *Jesus and Gin: Evangelicalism, the Roaring Twenties and Today's Culture Wars*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Hansen, Marcus L. *The Problem of the Third Generation Immigrant*. Rock Island, IL: Augustana Historical Society, 1938.
- Hansen, Marcus Lee, and Arthur M. Schlesinger. *The Immigrant in American History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940.
- Hargis, Billy James. *Facts about Communism and Our Churches*. Tulsa, OK: Christian Crusade, 1962.
- Harkness, Georgia E. *The Church and the Immigrant*. New York: George H. Doran, 1921.
- Harper, Keith. *The Quality of Mercy: Southern Baptists and Social Christianity, 1890-1920*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1996.
- Hawkins, J. Russell, and Philip Luke Sinitiere, eds. *Christians and the Color Line: Race and Religion after Divided by Faith*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Hayward, Chad, et al. to President Trump and Vice President Pence. January 29, 2017. <http://static.politico.com/ac/e4/b93a2d7041bc8243fed19f149fd0/evangelical-letter.pdf> (accessed April 22, 2017).
- Hedstrom, Matthew S. *The Rise of Liberal Religion: Book Culture and American Spirituality in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Herberg, Will. *Protestant, Catholic, Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology*. 1955. Reprint, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

- Higham, John. *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism 1860-1925*. Corrected ed. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981.
- . *Send These to Me: Immigrants in Urban America*. Rev. ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984.
- Hinnershitz, Stephanie. *Race, Religion, and Civil Rights: Asian Students on the West Coast, 1900-1968*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2015.
- Hinojosa, Felipe. *Latino Mennonites: Civil Rights, Faith, and Evangelical Culture*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014.
- Hirobe, Izumi. *Japanese Pride, American Prejudice: Modifying the Exclusion Clause of the 1924 Immigration Act*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- Hoffman, Abraham. *Unwanted Mexican Americans in the Great Depression: Repatriation Pressures, 1929-1939*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1974.
- Hollinger, David A. *After Cloven Tongues of Fire: Protestant Liberalism in Modern American History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.
- Home Missions Council. *Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Home Missions Council*. New York: Home Missions Council, 1920.
- Home Missions Council and Council of Women for Home Missions. *Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Home Missions Council and Council of Women for Home Missions*. New York: Home Missions Council, Council of Women for Home Missions, 1922.
- Hopkins, Charles Howard. *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.
- Horsman, Reginald. *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Hsu, Madeline Y. *The Good Immigrants: How the Yellow Peril became the Model Minority*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.
- Hutchison, William R., ed. *Between the Times: The Travail of the Protestant Establishment in America, 1900-1960*. Cambridge Studies in Religion and American Public Life, edited by Robin W. Lovin. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- . *Religious Pluralism in America: The Contentious History of a Founding Ideal*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

- Jacobson, Matthew Frye. *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- . *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2001.
- Jacobson, Robin Dale. *The New Nativism: Proposition 187 and the Debate over Immigration*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.
- Jenkins, Philip. *The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity*. Rev. ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Jones, Henry D. *The Evangelical Movement among Italians in New York City: A Study*. New York: Unit for City, Immigrant and Industrial Work Board of National Missions of the Presbyterian Church, 1935. In *Protestant Evangelism among Italians in America*, edited by Francesco Cordasco, et al. New York: Arno Press, 1975.
- Jones, Maldwyn Allen. *American Immigration*. Chicago History of American Civilization, edited by Daniel J. Boorstin. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Joselit, Jenna Weissman. *Parade of Faiths: Immigration and American Religion*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Kallen, Horace M. *Culture and Democracy in the United States*. 1924. Reprint, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1998.
- . *Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea: An Essay in Social Philosophy*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1956.
- Kinney, Mary Martin. *The World at My Door*. Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1938.
- Kinzer, Donald L. *An Episode in Anti-Catholicism: The American Protective Association*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964.
- Kittelstrom, Amy. *The Religion of Democracy: Seven Liberals and the American Moral Tradition*. New York: Penguin Press, 2015.
- Kivisto, Peter, and Dag Blanck, eds. *American Immigrants and Their Generations: Studies and Commentaries on the Hansen Thesis after Fifty Years*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990.
- Knowles, Frederic Lawrence. *Love Triumphant: A Book of Poems*. 5th and rev. ed. Boston: Dana Estes & Company, 1906.

- Kruse, Kevin M. *One Nation Under God: How Corporate America Invented Christian America*. New York: Basic Books, 2015.
- Landis, Benson Y. *Protestant Experience with United States Immigration, 1910-1960*. New York: Church World Service, 1961.
- Lantzer, Jason S. *Mainline Christianity: The Past and Future of America's Majority Faith*. New York: New York University Press, 2012.
- Lawrence, J. B. *History of the Home Mission Board*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1958.
- Lawrence, Una Roberts. *Winning the Border: Baptist Missions among the Spanish-Speaking Peoples of the Border*. Atlanta, GA: Home Mission Board, SBC, 1935.
- Lee, Elizabeth M., and John S. Kulisz. *The Methodist Program under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953*. New York: Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief, 1957.
- Leonard, Karen I., et al., eds. *Immigrant Faiths: Transforming Religious Life in America*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press, 2005.
- Lippy, Charles H. *Pluralism Comes of Age: American Religious Culture in the Twentieth Century*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2000.
- Lissak, Rivka Shpak. *Pluralism and Progressives: Hull House and the New Immigrants, 1890-1919*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Littell, Franklin H. *From State Church to Pluralism: A Protestant Interpretation of Religion in American History*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1962.
- Lowe, Kevin M. *Baptized with the Soil: Christian Agrarians and the Crusade for Rural America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Machen, J. Gresham. *Christianity and Liberalism*. New York: Macmillan, 1923.
- Marsden, George. *The Twilight of the American Enlightenment: The 1950s and the Crisis of Liberal Belief*. New York: Basic Books, 2014.
- Martin, Susan F. *A Nation of Immigrants*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Maryland Baptist Union Association. *Minutes of the One Hundred and Seventh Annual Session of the Maryland Baptist Union Association*, 1942.
- Maston, T. B. *"Of One": A Study of Christian Principles and Race Relations*. Atlanta, GA: Home Mission Board, Southern Baptist Convention, 1946.

- May, Henry F. *Protestant Churches and Industrial America*. 1949. Reprint, New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1967.
- McBeth, Leon. *The Baptist Heritage*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1987.
- . *Texas Baptists: A Sesquicentennial History*. Dallas, TX: Baptistway Press, 1998.
- McClatchy, V. S. *Japanese Immigration and Colonization*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921.
- McGreevy, John T. *Catholicism and American Freedom: A History*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2003.
- McLean, Robert. *Old Spain in New America*. New York: Association Press, 1916.
- Methodist Episcopal Church. *Composite Annual Report, Section of Home Missions, Division of Home Missions and Church Extension*, November 22-29, 1940. Philadelphia, PA: Board of Missions and Church Extension, Methodist Church, 1940.
- . *Journal of the Thirty-First Delegated General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, edited by John M. Arters. New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1932.
- . *Journal of the Thirty-Second Delegated General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, edited by John M. Arters. New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1936.
- . *Journal of the 1948 General Conference of the Methodist Church*.
- . *Mid-Century Report, Division of Home Missions and Church Extension of the Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church*, December 10-13, 1950.
- . *Reports Presented at the 1936 Annual Meeting of the Board of Home Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the year ending October 31, 1936*.
- Miller, Randall M., and Thomas D. Marzik, eds. *Immigrants and Religion in Urban America*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1977.
- Miller, Robert Moats. *American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958.
- . *Harry Emerson Fosdick: Preacher, Pastor, Prophet*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

- . *Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam: Paladin of Liberal Protestantism*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990.
- Mislin, David. *Saving Faith: Making Religious Pluralism an American Value at the Dawn of the Secular Age*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015.
- Molho, Anthony, and Gordon W. Wood, eds. *Imagined Histories: American Historians Interpret the Past*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Montejano, David. *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836-1986*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1987.
- Morris, Samuel L. *The Task That Challenges: Home Mission Text Book*. Richmond, VA: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1917.
- Morse, Hermann N., ed. *Home Missions Today and Tomorrow: A Review and Forecast*. New York: Home Missions Council, 1934.
- . *Toward a Christian America: The Contribution of Home Missions*. New York: Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement, 1935.
- National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. *Witness for Immigration: Report of the Consultation on Immigration Policy in the United States, Washington, D.C., April 13 and 14, 1961*.
- Nazarene Compassionate Ministries. "Refugee and Immigrant Support."
<http://www.ncm.org/refugee-and-immigrant-support.html> (accessed April 22, 2017).
- Newman, Mark. *Getting Right with God: Southern Baptists and Desegregation, 1945-1995*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2001.
- Nixon, Justin Wroe. *Protestantism's Hour of Decision*. Philadelphia, PA: Judson Press, 1940.
- Noll, Mark A., Nathan O. Hatch, and George M. Marsden. *The Search for Christian America*. Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1983.
- North American Home Missions Congress. *Reports of Commissions, Addresses and Findings, Washington, D.C., December 1-5, 1930*.
- Nurser, John S. *For All Peoples and All Nations: The Ecumenical Church and Human Rights*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2005.

- Orsi, Robert A. *The Madonna of 115th Street: Faith and Community in Italian Harlem, 1880-1950*. 3rd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.
- Oxx, Katie. *The Nativist Movement in America: Religious Conflict in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Parsons, Gradye. "Stated Clerk Issues Letter to Trump on refugees, immigrants." October 2, 2015. <https://www.pcusa.org/news/2015/10/2/clerk-issues-letter-trump-refugees-immigrants/> (accessed April 22, 2017).
- Pattern for Peace: Catholic, Jewish and Protestant Declaration on World Peace*. New York: Church Peace Union, World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, 1943. W. E. B. Du Bois Papers (MS 312). Special Collections and University Archives. University of Massachusetts Amherst Libraries. <http://credo.library.umass.edu/view/pageturn/mums312-b101-i493/#page/3/mode/1up> (accessed April 10, 2017).
- Petit, Jeanne D. *The Men and Women We Want: Gender, Race, and the Progressive Era Literacy Test Debate*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2010.
- Phalen, William J. *American Evangelical Protestantism and European Immigrants, 1800-1924*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2011.
- Plainfield, J. F. *The Stranger within Our Gates*. Atlanta, GA: Home Mission Board, Southern Baptist Convention, n.d.
- Pozzetta, George E., ed. *The Immigrant Religious Experience*. Vol. 19 of American Immigration and Ethnicity Series, edited by George E. Pozzetta. New York: Garland Publishing, 1991.
- Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. *One Hundred Sixteenth Annual Report, Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*. New York: Presbyterian Building, 1918.
- . *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.* Vol. 1, Part 1. Philadelphia: Office of the General Assembly, 1922.
- President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization. *Whom We Shall Welcome: Report of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953.
- Preston, Andrew. *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith: Religion in American War and Diplomacy*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012.

- Racial and Ethnic Composition. Immigrant Status. Religious Landscape Study, 2014. Pew Research Center. <http://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/racial-and-ethnic-composition/> (accessed April 22, 2017).
- Rees, Elfan. *We Strangers and Afraid: The Refugee Story Today*. New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1959.
- Reeves, Richard. *Infamy: The Shocking Story of the Japanese-American Internment in World War II*. New York: Henry Holt, 2015.
- Reeves-Ellington, Barbara, Kathryn Kish Sklar, and Connie A. Shemo, eds. *Competing Kingdoms: Women, Mission, Nation, and the American Protestant Empire, 1812-1960*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.
- Robinson, Greg. *By Order of the President: FDR and the Internment of Japanese Americans*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Roediger, David R. *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*. Rev. ed. 1991. Reprint, New York: Verso, 2003.
- Ross, Robert W. *So It Was True: The American Protestant Press and the Nazi Persecution of the Jews*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1980.
- Ross, William G. *Forging New Freedoms: Nativism, Education, and the Constitution, 1917-1927*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994.
- Roy, Ralph Lord. *Communism and the Churches*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1960.
- Saenger, Gerhart. *Today's Refugees, Tomorrow's Citizens: A Story of Americanization*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941.
- Sánchez, George J. *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900-1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Sánchez Walsh, Arlene M. *Latino Pentecostal Identity: Evangelical Faith, Self, and Society*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.
- Sandoval, Moises. *On the Move: A History of the Hispanic Church in the United States*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1990.
- Schultz, Kevin M. *Tri-Faith America: How Catholics and Jews Held Postwar America to Its Protestant Promise*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

- Seaver, Charles H. *As We Do unto Others*. New York: Department of International Justice and Goodwill, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., [1954].
- Seller, Maxine. *To Seek America: A History of Ethnic Life in the United States*. Englewood, NJ: J. S. Ozer, 1977.
- Shattuck, Gardiner H. *Episcopalians and Race: Civil War to Civil Rights*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2000.
- Shea, William M. *The Lion and the Lamb: Evangelicals and Catholics in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Shurden, Walter B., ed. *Proclaiming the Baptist Vision: Religious Liberty*. Macon, GA: Smyth and Helwys, 1997.
- Sollors, Werner. *Beyond Ethnicity: Consent and Descent in American Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- , ed. *The Invention of Ethnicity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Song, Yuwu, ed. *Encyclopedia of Chinese-American Relations*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Co., 2009.
http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/mcfcham/judd_walter_h_1898_1994/0?institutionId=720 (accessed April 12, 2017).
- Southern Baptist Convention. *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*. [S.l.]: The Convention, 1925.
- . *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*. N.p.: The Convention, 1927.
- . *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*. N.p.: The Convention, 1935.
- . *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*. N.p.: The Convention, 1941.
- . *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*. N.p.: The Convention, 1942.
- . *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*. N.p.: The Convention, 1946.
- . *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*. N.p.: The Convention, 1947.
- . *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*. N.p.: The Convention, 1948.
- . *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*. N.p.: The Convention, 1949.

- . *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*. N.p.: The Convention, 1956.
- . *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*. N.p.: The Convention, 1963.
- . *Annual of the Southern Baptist Convention*. N.p.: The Convention, 1965.
- Steiner, Edward A. *From Alien to Citizen: The Story of My Life in America*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1914.
- . *The Making of a Great Race: Racial and Religious Cross-Currents in the United States*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1929.
- Stephenson, George M. *A History of American Immigration, 1820-1924*. New York: Ginn, 1926.
- Stout, Harry S., and D. G. Hart, eds. *New Directions in American Religious History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Stowe, Walter Herbert. *Immigration and the Growth of the Episcopal Church*. Richmond, VA: Joint Commission of General Convention on Strategy and Policy, 1942.
- Strong, Josiah. *The Challenge of the City*. New York: Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1911.
- Sutton, Matthew Avery, and Darren Dochuk, eds. *Faith in the New Millennium: The Future of Religion and American Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Takaki, Ronald. *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America*. Rev. ed. New York: Back Bay Books, 2008.
- Taylor, Jack E. *God's Messengers to Mexico's Masses: A Study of the Religious Significance of the Braceros*. Eugene, OR: Institute of Church Growth, 1962.
- Taylor, Sandra C. *Advocate of Understanding: Sidney Gulick and the Search for Peace with Japan*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1984.
- Thernstrom, Stephan, ed. *Harvard Encyclopedia of American Ethnic Groups*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, Harvard University Press, 1980.
- Thompson, Michael G. *For God and Globe: Christian Internationalism in the United States between the Great War and the Cold War*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015.
- Tichenor, Daniel J. *Dividing Lines: The Politics of Immigration Control in America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

- Tindall, George Brown, and David Emory Shi. *America: A Narrative History*. Vol. 2, 8th ed. New York: W. W. Norton, 2010.
- Ueda, Reed. *Postwar Immigrant America: A Social History*. Boston: Bedford Books, 1994.
- United States Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. *Religious Bodies: 1926, Vol. I, Summary and Detailed Tables*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1930.
- . *Religious Bodies: 1936, Vol. I, Summary and Detailed Tables*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941.
- . *Historical Statistics of the United States, 1789-1945*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1949.
- U.S. House of Representatives. 79th Congress. First Session. *To Grant a Quota to Eastern Hemisphere Indians and to Make Them Racially Eligible for Naturalization; Hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1945.
- Watson, E. O., ed. *Year Book of the Churches, 1921-22*. Washington D.C.: Hayworth Publishing House, 1922.
- Wattles, Jeffrey. *The Golden Rule*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- White, Ronald C., Jr., and C. Howard Hopkins. *The Social Gospel: Religion and Reform in Changing America*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1976.
- Witte, John, Jr. *Religion and the American Constitutional Experiment*. 2nd ed. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2005.
- Woman's Division of Christian Service, Methodist Church. *First Annual Report of the Woman's Division of Christian Service, 1940-1941*. New York: Woman's Division of Christian Service, Methodist Church, n.d.
- . *Patterns for Peace; Thirteenth Annual Report of the Woman's Division of Christian Service of the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church, 1951-1952*.
- . *Twenty-First Annual Report of the Woman's Division of Christian Service, Board of Missions, The Methodist Church, 1959-1960*.
- Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, *Fifty-Fifth Annual Report, For the Year 1935-1936*. Cincinnati, OH: Woman's Home Missionary Society, Methodist Episcopal Church, n.d.

- Wuthnow, Robert. *The Restructuring of American Religion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Wuthnow, Robert, and John H. Evans, eds. *The Quiet Hand of God: Faith-Based Activism and the Public Role of Mainline Protestantism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Yans-McLaughlin, Virginia, ed. *Immigration Reconsidered: History, Sociology, and Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Yohn, Susan M. *A Contest of Faiths: Missionary Women and Pluralism in the American Southwest*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Yoo, David K. *Contentious Spirits: Religion in Korean American History, 1903-1945*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2010.
- Zeidel, Robert F. *Immigrants, Progressives, and Exclusion Politics: The Dillingham Commission, 1900-1927*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 2004.
- Ziegler, Benjamin Munn, ed. *Immigration: An American Dilemma*. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1953.
- Zolberg, Aristide R. *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Zunz, Olivier. *Why the American Century?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Articles and Essays

- Adams, Henry C. "Introduction." In *Philanthropy and Social Progress*, v-xi. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1893.
- Addams, Jane. "The Subjective Necessity for Social Settlements." In *Philanthropy and Social Progress*, 1-26. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1893.
- "Administration's Immigration Proposals Not Enacted." 1964. *CQ Almanac*. Online ed. <https://library.cqpress.com/cqalmanac> (accessed 9/17/2016).
- Alba, Richard, Albert J. Raboteau, and Josh DeWind. "Introduction: Comparisons of Migrants and Their Religions, Past and Present." In Alba, Raboteau, and DeWind, 1-24.

- Blake, Eugene Carson. "National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, President, November 21, 1955." In *American Immigration Conference*, 21-22.
- Boyer, Paul. "Piety, International Politics, and Religious Pluralism in the American Experience." In *Cohen and Numbers*, 320-46.
- Burgquist, James M. "The Concept of Nativism in Historical Study Since *Strangers in the Land*." *American Jewish History* 76, no. 2 (December 1986): 125-41.
- Butler, Jon. "God, Gotham, and Modernity." *Journal of American History* 103, no. 1 (June 2016): 19-33.
- Calkins, Laura M. "Judd, Walter H. 1898-1994." In *Song*. http://ezproxy.baylor.edu/login?url=http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/mcfcham/judd_walter_h_1898_1994/0?institutionId=720 (accessed April 12, 2017).
- Carlson, Beverly. "Chronology of the American Baptist Churches, USA." *American Baptist Quarterly* 14, no. 2 (June 1995): 106-185.
- Carter, Loyd. "Good Will Center Work." In *Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists*. Vol. 1. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1958: 569-70.
- Chang, Derek. "'Brought Together upon Our Own Continent': Race, Religion, and Evangelical Nationalism in American Baptist Home Missions, 1865-1900." In Leonard, et al., 39-66.
- . "Imperial Encounters at Home: Women, Empire, and the Home Mission Project in Late Nineteenth-Century America." In Reeves-Ellington, Sklar, and Shemo, 293-317.
- Cohen, Charles L., and Ronald L. Numbers. "Introduction." In *Cohen and Numbers*, 1-18.
- Cole, Donald B. "Book Review: *Ethnic Americans: A History of Immigration and Assimilation* and *To Seek America: A History of Ethnic Life in the United States*," *American Historical Review* 83, no. 3 (June 1978): 818-19.
- Daniels, Roger. "Changes in Immigration Law and Nativism since 1924." *American Jewish History* 76, no. 2 (December 1986): 159-80.
- Dinnerstein, Leonard, and David Reimers. "Strangers in the Land: Then and Now." *American Jewish History* 76, no. 2 (December 1986): 107-116.
- Dolan, Jay P. "The Immigrants and Their Gods: A New Perspective in American Religious History." *Church History* 57, no. 1 (March 1988): 61-72.

- . “Immigration and American Christianity: A History of Their Histories.” In Bowden, 119-47.
- Episcopal Diocese of Michigan. “Resolution at 120th Convention, February 5, 1953.” In American Immigration Conference, 20.
- Essick, John D. “The International Baptist Seminary: A Baptist Attempt at Americanization, Education, and Missions in East Orange, New Jersey.” *Baptist History and Heritage* 40, no. 1 (Winter 2005): 96-103.
- Gleason, Philip. “American Identity and Americanization.” In Thernstrom, 31-58.
- . “Hansen, Herberg, and American Religion.” In Kivisto and Blanck, 85-103.
- . “Crèvecoeur’s Question: Historical Writing on Immigration, Ethnicity, and National Identity.” In Molho and Wood, 120-43.
- Gribble, Richard. “The Immigration Restriction Debate, 1917-1929: Church and State in Conflict.” *Journal of Church and State*. February 16, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcs/csw001> (accessed February 7, 2017).
- Grijalva, Joshua. “The Story of Hispanic Southern Baptists.” *Baptist History and Heritage* 18, no. 3 (July 1983): 40-47.
- Hacker, Andrew. “Liberal Democracy and Social Control.” *American Political Science Review* 51, no. 4 (December 1957): 1009-1026.
- Hessel, Beth. “Keeping Silence: Executive Order 9066 at 75.” Presbyterian Historical Society. <http://www.history.pcusa.org/blog/2017/02/keeping-silence-executive-order-9066-75> (accessed April 1, 2017).
- Higham, John. “Ethnicity and American Protestants: Collective Identity in the Mainstream.” In Stout and Hart, 239-59.
- Hunter, Jane H. “Women’s Mission in Historical Perspective: American Identity and Christian Internationalism.” In Reeves-Ellington, Sklar, and Shemo, 19-42.
- Hutchison, William R. “The Americanness of the Social Gospel: An Inquiry in Comparative History.” *Church History* 44, no. 3 (September 1975): 367-81.
- “Immigration Law.” 1953. *CQ Almanac*. Online ed. <https://library.cqpress.com/cqalmanac> (accessed 9/14/2016).
- Johnson, Lyndon B. “Remarks at the Signing of the Immigration Bill, Liberty Island, New York.” October 3, 1965. LBJ Presidential Library. <http://www.lbjlib.utexas.edu/johnson/archives.hom/speeches.hom/651003.asp> (accessed 9/17/2016).

- Kazal, Russell A. "Revisiting Assimilation: The Rise, Fall, and Reappraisal of a Concept in American Ethnic History." *American Historical Review* 100, no. 2 (April 1995): 437-71.
- Kittelstrom, Amy. "The International Social Turn: Unity and Brotherhood at the World's Parliament of Religions, Chicago, 1893." *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation* 19, no. 2 (Summer 2009): 243-74.
- Kraut, Alan M. "A Century of Scholarship in American Immigration and Ethnic History." In Banner, Jr., 124-40.
- Lippy, Charles. "From Consensus to Struggle: Pluralism and the Body Politic in Contemporary America." In Cohen and Numbers, 297-319.
- Massa, Mark S., S.J. "A Catholic for President?: John F. Kennedy and the 'Secular' Theology of the Houston Speech, 1960." *Journal of Church and State* 39, no. 2 (Spring 1997): 297-317.
- Maxwell, Melody. "'We Are Happy to Co-Operate': The Institutionalization and Control of Birmingham's Baptist Good Will Center, 1909-1928." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 38, no. 3 (Fall 2011): 249-65.
- McCarran, Pat. "Statement by Senator McCarran Regarding the Report by the President's Commission." In Ziegler, 112-13.
- Methodist Board of Missions. "Resolution at Annual Meeting, January 18, 1957." In American Immigration Conference, 20-21.
- Moore, Russell. "Exclusive: The Letter Russell Moore will Send Trump about the Refugee Order." *Washington Post*, January 30, 2017. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/acts-of-faith/wp/2017/01/30/exclusive-the-letter-russell-moore-will-send-trump-about-the-refugee-order/?utm_term=.59be6b707bae (accessed April 22, 2017).
- Morawska, Ewa. "The Sociology and Historiography of Immigration." In Yans-McLaughlin, 187-238.
- National Council of Churches. "Brethren—Dwell Together in Unity." Race Relations Sunday, February 13, 1955. The King Center. <http://www.thekingcenter.org/archive/document/race-relations-sunday#> (accessed April 23, 2017).
- "National Quotas for Immigration to End." 1965. *CQ Almanac*. Online ed. <https://library.cqpress.com/cqalmanac> (accessed 9/17/2016).
- Ngai, Mae M. "Immigration and Ethnic History." In Foner and McGirr, 358-75.

- Rosenfield, Harry N. "The Prospects for Immigration Amendments." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 21, no. 2 (Spring 1956): 401-426.
- Schultz, Kevin M. "The Blessings of American Pluralism, and Those Who Rail Against It." In Sutton and Dochuk, 269-85.
- Shapiro, Fred R. "Earlier Evidence for the Acronym WASP." *American Speech* 64, no. 2 (Summer 1989): 189.
- Shenton, James P., and Kevin Kenny. "Ethnicity and Immigration." In Foner, 353-73.
- Smith, Timothy L. "Religious Denominations as Ethnic Communities: A Regional Case Study." *Church History* 35, no. 2 (June 1966): 207-26.
- . "Religion and Ethnicity in America." *American Historical Review* 83, no. 5 (December 1978): 1155-85.
- Spear, Sheldon. "The United States and the Persecution of Jews in Germany, 1933-1939." *Jewish Social Studies* 30, no. 4 (October 1968): 215-42.
- Stevens, Callie. "Welcome to the Table." *NCM Magazine* (Winter 2016): 21-23.
https://issuu.com/ncm.magazine/docs/ncm_magazine._winter_2016/21?e=10810763/39967973 (accessed April 22, 2017).
- Sylvest, Edwin E., Jr. "Hispanic American Protestantism in the United States." In Sandoval, 115-30.
- Taylor, Sara. "Good Will Centers in Missions." In *Encyclopedia of Southern Baptists*. Vol. 1. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1958: 570.
- Thuesen, Peter J. "The Logic of Mainline Churchliness: Historical Background since the Reformation." In Wuthnow and Evans, 27-53.
- Truett, George W. "Baptists and Religious Liberty." In Shurden, 61-84.
- Truman, Harry S. "Address in Columbus at a Conference of the Federal Council of Churches." March 6, 1946. *American Presidency Project*, edited by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=12599> (accessed April 17, 2017).
- Wepman, Dennis. "di Donato, Pietro." *American National Biography Online*. <http://www.anb.org/articles/16/16-03520-print.html> [accessed January 6, 2017].

Dissertations, Theses, and Unpublished Papers

Koed, Betty K. "The Politics of Reform: Policymakers and the Immigration Act of 1965." PhD diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 1999.

Rodríguez, Moisés. "The Cultural Context of Southern Baptist Work Among Mexican Americans in Texas." PhD diss., Baylor University, 1997.

Wagner, Stephen Thomas. "The Lingering Death of the National Origins Quota System: A Political History of United States Immigration Policy, 1952-1965." PhD diss., Harvard University, 1986.

Wheeler, Lauren E. "Southern Baptists and Their Missions to Jews: 1930-1960." Unpublished paper. Baylor University, 2012.