

BISHOP GAILOR AND THE
SOCIAL GOSPEL

MARGARET ALEXANDER JOHNSON

BISHOP GAILOR AND THE SOCIAL GOSPEL

A Research Paper

Presented to

the Graduate Council of
Austin Peay State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by

Margaret Alexander Johnson

May, 1982

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a Research Paper written by Margaret Alexander Johnson entitled "Bishop Gailor and the Social Gospel." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in History.


Major Professor

Accepted for the
Graduate Council:


Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

----To Dr. Richard Gildrie who has "a great knowledge of words;"

----to Charlotte Marshall who has "a way with words;"

----and to Our Lord Jesus Christ who is "The Word."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF INTENT	1
II. EARLY LIFE AND CAREER.	4
III. THE SOCIAL GOSPEL.	11
IV. THE RACIAL ISSUE	17
V. FUNDAMENTALISM	21
VI. PROHIBITION.	23
VII. CONCLUSION	26

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF INTENT

This investigation attempts to analyze the role played by a prominent Tennessee bishop in formulating the Episcopal Church's stand on the conflicting social issues of the early twentieth century. This research explores the episcopal career of Thomas Frank Gailor, Bishop of Tennessee, 1898-1935 (consecrated 1893). During this period Gailor was Chairman of the House of Bishops, assessor to the Presiding Bishop, first President of the reformed National Council of the Episcopal Church, in the 1920's head delegate to the Lambeth Conference, and Chancellor of the University of the South.

Gailor's intellectual impact has been enormous as an expositor of the Episcopal tradition in the early 20th century. The sermons, addresses, and autobiography of Bishop Gailor reveal a man, his ideas and ideals, struggling to apply the gospel and the Episcopal tradition to the problems of his time. His world was post-Civil War and pre-War II, not the best of times nor the worst of times.

Bishop Gailor's interpretation of the Social Gospel was from an Anglican-Catholic point of view with a conservative Southern slant. He felt the American Episcopal

Church's appeal was more universal or catholic than either the Church of England or the Church of Rome because the English Church was a state church with its hierarchy politically appointed and the Roman Catholic Church was under control of the Pope. Too, Gailor with his deep sense of human worth may have seen the English class system, at that time a system which restricted each person by birth to a particular stratum, as limiting and un-Christian. If there were class distinctions in the American Episcopal Church, it was, to Bishop Gailor, the distinction of the intellectual class, and that class by its gift from God was duty-bound to love its neighbor. Just as all of us are composites of personal prejudices and incongruities, Bishop Gailor perceived the universal appeal of the Episcopal Church through the eyes of Southern, "separate-but-equal" segregationist. His contemporaries considered him a liberal because he advocated better understanding between the white man and the Negro. The Negro was not considered an equal, but in the light of the gospel, a personage of worth, one for whom Christ died. He would go no further. Bishop Gailor's Southern heritage juxtapositioned with the universality of the American Episcopal Church brought to fruition his version of the Social Gospel.

Bishop Gailor's Social Gospel was predicated on his

belief that only through the love of Christ could people minister to the less fortunate, and only by faith, which is a gift from God, could their lives be changed. If nations, governments, churches or societies failed, it was because faith in God had not been the motivating force. His solutions to the complex problems of race, economics, and government, which included the thorny problem of prohibition and the influences of fundamentalism, were often idealistic and simplistic. It was faith, not works, that Bishop Gailor saw as society's redemption. This tension between faith and works, and one might add, reason, occasionally renders his positions on specific issues somewhat ambiguous; but his overall stand for human dignity, for social justice, for a truer democracy, and for intellectual freedom is clear and it is possible to grasp and appreciate his version of the Social Gospel.

Chapter II

EARLY LIFE AND CAREER

Thomas Frank Gailor, born in Jackson, Mississippi, in 1856, possessed the qualities of leadership necessary to be a Bishop in the Episcopal Church. This leadership again was founded on his nurture in the tradition of Episcopal Church--its universality, its love of liturgy, its pomp and ceremony--and in his sense of familial and regional loyalty and propriety. His father was killed in the battle of Perryville, Kentucky, in 1862, and his mother, Charlotte Moffett Gailor, a devout Episcopalian, became the guiding force in his life. Mrs. Gailor made certain that her son received the best education available, sending him to private elementary schools which were run by Episcopal clergymen and to the Memphis Public High School. His high school principal, Major T. C. Anderson, a Confederate veteran, always allowed his students who liked to study to advance far beyond the regular courses. His education to this point was initially classical and the young Gailor gave the valedictory for his class before his sixteenth birthday.

Still having in mind that her son must receive the best possible education, his mother chose Racine College in Wisconsin, where entering as a sophomore, he came under

the influence of the great scholars, Dr. James DeKoven and Dr. J. J. Elmendorff. "Dr. Elmendorff, the professor of English Literature and Philosophy, taught me to reason and think; and Dr. DeKoven taught and exemplified the grace of manners and the breadth of vision of a Catholic Christian."¹ Young Gailor was already formulating his perceptions of the Social Gospel as he brought together his intellectual pursuits and his Christian traditions.

Again he was valedictorian of his class and won the fifty dollar Greek Prize. Using this money he went to New York to enter Union Theological Seminary. There his piety and capacity for leadership deepened. In his senior year at Union, Gailor became concerned with the manners of the students and with their lax chapel attendance. So, together with James O. D. Huntington,² he helped organize the "Brotherhood of the Holy Cross," which held devotional services twice daily. Gailor brought to seminary his Southern ideals of gentility and good manners and his high regard for excellence, and he worked to make those values accepted by others.

There he awakened to the social and economic problems of the late nineteenth century. Gailor's education was furthered by his work with the underprivileged as he taught Sunday School in Trinity Chapel on 25th Street. He visited his students' homes and became aware of degradation in

the New York tenements and developed an understanding of the suffering of the children of poverty. Surely he was exposed to poverty in the black ghettos of Memphis, but he only became aware of the privations of poverty when he faced it in the white world. In 1990 before his graduation, he returned to Tennessee where he was ordained a priest, but he only served as parish priest three years in Pulaski, Tennessee.³

Here in Pulaski his sense of propriety and his loyalty to church tradition were accommodated to as his respect for people's "feelings" came before the "letter of the law." When confronted with a family who wished to have their children baptized at home, Gailor quickly assessed the problem, decided to compromise, took several church members with him, read the service for Public Baptism, and baptized the children at home. When he justified these baptisms to the Bishop of Tennessee, Charles Quintard, they agreed that the ends justified the means. This sense of adjustment and propriety, inherent facets of the Episcopal tradition, stood him in good stead when bringing the good news of the Gospel to the real world.

In May, 1982 Gailor left Pulaski and accepted a position at the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee, as teacher of ecclesiastical history. This ten years

of immersion in church history gave him a deep sense of the on-going tradition of the church and how, from generation to generation, God calls his people to be faithful and persevere. Propriety and tradition were enhanced for Gailor by his association with the faculty at Sewanee--men who were generals in the Civil War, men who had a high sense of honor and courtesy. They could not perpetuate their ideals and traditions by war; therefore, they sought to instill their ideas in others by what they taught and by the way they lived. Always Gailor considered the mountain top to be his spiritual as well as physical home.

While at Sewanee Gailor was not a cloistered scholar. As a priest and one of the Church's more noted intellectuals he gained and maintained contacts throughout the American Church. In Baltimore in 1892, at the Episcopal General Convention, Gailor met Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan whose church, St. George's in New York City, was a beehive of socialist activities and from this contact he got his foot in the door of influence and philanthropy. Morgan was impressed with Gailor and he made handsome donations to Sewanee.⁴

On April 23, 1893, Gailor received a telegram officially notifying him of his unanimous election to the office of Bishop Coadjutor (assistant to the bishop with right of succession) of the Diocese of Tennessee. Although

he had previously declined the Call of the Diocese of Florida and of Trinity Church, Chicago, Gailor elected to stay in Tennessee and accept the call. He was consecrated in the University Chapel at Sewanee on July 25, 1893, and continued to work with his old friend, Bishop Charles Todd Quintard, for five years. When Quintard died Gailor became the third Bishop of the Diocese of Tennessee.⁵

He felt the will of God had singled him out, calling him to service to his Church, his University and his Diocese. His experiences and horizons were further widened at the General Convention held in St. Louis in 1916 where he was elected unanimously as the chairman of the House of Bishops, the upper house of the governing organization of the American Episcopal Church. His duties were to preside over the meetings of the House of Bishops as Assessor to Bishop Tuttle, the Presiding Bishop, and to assist him with counsel and advice.

Tuttle respected Gailor's judgment and he asked his direction on numerous occasions. For example, when the Archbishop of Canterbury wrote to Bishop Tuttle asking the American bishops to help reestablish the Lambeth Conference, a world-wide gathering of Anglican bishops, he asked Gailor for direction. Gailor suggested 1920 as a tentative date, reasoning that Europe needed time to recover after the war but that delay beyond that date

might preclude Anglican participation in the search for solutions to the great problems of Christian international unity and post-war social and industrial order. His answer reflected his tendency to interpret even practical questions of church government as opportunities to further the Social Gospel. Other American bishops shared his views on the purposes of the international conference and, when the Lambeth Conference met in 1920, Gailor was chosen to lead the American Bishops.

Earlier, when the General Convention met in Detroit in 1919, the House of Bishops decided to legalize and consolidate the Church's National organizations of activities--education, mission, finance, publicity, social service--into one central organization. Since the Constitution of the National Episcopal Church, which defined the office of Presiding Bishop, would have to be amended, the Convention created the office of the President of the Presiding Bishop and Council. Gailor was elected its first president.

The Anglican Communion bestowed the highest honors on Gailor. Twice he was chosen to lead the American delegation to the Lambeth Conference--in 1920 and 1930. He preached at Westminster Abbey, St. Paul's Cathedral, and at St. John's London, an honor not often given to American clergy. "Before preaching at St. Paul's Cathedral, he was

told by the Dean that if he expected to be heard he must speak straight across the dome to the statue of Sir Joshua Reynolds and to remember he was stone deaf."⁷ Gailor was heard throughout his career.

King Edward VII was so impressed with Gailor that he requested a private audience where they discussed promoting friendship between Great Britain and America. Gailor told the King not to be dismayed by the clamor made by a few politicians. The majority of Americans had good feelings toward their cousins in Britain.⁸ Gailor was an "anglo-phile" and he was proud of the honorary degree bestowed upon him by Oxford University. He often signed his correspondence with "Oxon", which means he held a degree from Oxford. He was looked upon as one of the great Bishops of the International Anglican Communion.

Chapter III

THE SOCIAL GOSPEL

The source of that international influence was his reputation as an expositor of the Social Gospel. His interpretation of the movement growing out of American experience was deemed relevant throughout the Anglican Communion. The Social Gospel, initiated by the impact of modern industrial society and scientific thought on the Protestant Churches in the years following the Civil War, called for the application of Jesus' teaching to society--economically, socially, and individually.⁹ The Protestant Episcopal Church was one of the first major denominations to receive the new doctrine with any general enthusiasm, in spite of its reputation for dignified conservatism.

Gailor saw the Church's duty as twofold. He interpreted St. John's gospel in which Jesus commissioned Peter to "tend my sheep," literally and figuratively. In his actions he translated Jesus' command "to tend my sheep" to mean physically as well as spiritually. Gailor understood it as his personal responsibility to follow the exhortation of St. Paul in his letter to the Ephesians "that through the church the manifold wisdom of God might be made known to the principalities and powers."¹¹

Gailor believed that, through his God-given gifts of intellect and rhetoric, it was his duty to convince the wealthy upper and middle classes of his nation and state that if they would accept in faith the teaching of Jesus Christ, then the Social Gospel could be implemented in American society. The Social Gospel of Bishop Gailor has a constant theme; a continuous thread woven into his sermons and speeches. He believed that the Church's responsibility was to the present life of men, not just in the hereafter. The Church should set the example and be the inspiration for social justice in the world.

Jesus did not build monuments or political empires. He created the Church in order that those who claim to follow might prove their love for Him by showing their love for one another. If we sinners who profess to believe that He is the Redeemer and Savior of Souls, could only live up to that ideal of brotherhood for which the church stands, we could convince the gainsayers.¹²

Gailor felt the best way to spread the Social Gospel was to emphasize the universality of the Episcopal Church which would bring about good will and understanding between all baptized Christians. "Men's opinions may differ, but Christianity is unchanging."¹³ Gailor proclaimed the Episcopal Church as a democratic institution with a book of Common Prayer for all people and its sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion as social institutions for the public good.¹⁴ This may have been true

but Gailor in his naivete failed to realize that the Episcopal Church was "exclusive" in that its liturgy demanded that its people be able to read the Prayer Book and be flexible enough not to seek simple answers to complex problems. His love and faith in his church, with its all-inclusiveness, were closely followed by his love for country with its democratic institutions.

As an ardent patriot, Gailor believed the government also had a responsibility to better the social welfare of its people and he believed it was those people's duty to support their country. The purpose of government was to insure and protect the liberty of each of its citizens. The government was not the democracy; the government was only the agency by which democracy could express itself. Therefore the basic concept of democracy was not the right of the majority to rule but the recognition of every individual's worth and value. To Gailor this was a uniquely Christian precept and he expounded it in his sermons over and over again when he said, "The first tree of liberty to be planted was the cross of Jesus Christ."¹⁵ As he told the Diocesan Convention in 1918, "God became Incarnate in Jesus Christ, and Jesus defied class and caste to proclaim the eternal value of the individual soul."

These ideals grew out of Christian theology and their

grasp was essential to get a clear understanding of Gailor's concept of the nation's responsibility. But extreme nationalism and the exploitation of persons was anathema to Bishop Gailor. He was in Europe when World War I broke out, and in 1915, while in London, he was asked to address the British troops as they embarked for the fighting in France. He chastized all nations who sought to inflict hardships on their citizens in the name of commercial enterprise. He decried Germany's military autocracy when it "denied the rights of individuals and regarded men as cattle." "The war in Europe did not prove the failure of Christianity; it only showed that nations were only partially Christian."¹⁶

In 1919 Gailor was asked to speak to the "Egyptians," a men's organization in Memphis, and he took this opportunity to compare the conflicting philosophies of Socialism and Democracy and to reiterate his theories on the purpose of government. He assured the men that they could continue to believe in Democracy because it was founded on the eternal principle of right and justice and that the "tyrannical rule of the majority, without regard to the minority, was the worst kind of despotism." The Bishop quoted Professor Ely with whom he agreed: "Socialism is too optimistic about the future, too pessimistic concerning the present. It is a menace to individual freedom

and it is against the natural laws of production and distribution."¹⁷

Gailor retaliated in 1928 to the criticism concerning the Church's conservative approach to the economic problems facing the country. He realized that human beings were not machines to be controlled by external restraints. Legislation alone would never solve the problem. If society wished to improve permanently a person's condition, it must persuade him to change his outlook on life, to change his values. "As long as the majority of men, rich and poor alike, are content to be selfish and greedy we will never have a true democracy. Revolutions are not what is needed. We need a people who will honestly respond to the message and appeal of Christ."¹⁸

To Gailor the Depression was proof of what could happen when the world surrendered to materialistic values. "The selfish war of unlimited competition had degraded trade into speculation and deprived labor of its self-respect."¹⁹ In his last report to the Diocesan Convention in 1935, Gailor said the economic order had broken down because the desire for profits and material gain had blinded capital to its obligation to labor. Although Gailor quoted Walter Lippman in support of government management of the economy, he felt there must be a moral

basis for that control and it must be Christian. Jesus, in Gailor's interpretation, calls for mankind to live in fellowship, but the real social power of Christianity came from within each individual. That was how people's lives were changed. That was the Gospel. Then Gailor asked the question: "Will they be content to be less wealthy, less powerful, less secluded if they know they could give more health, greater freedom, and more opportunity to the whole body of people?" As he saw it, material wealth was valuable only so far as it could be used for the salvation of mankind.²⁰

Chapter IV

THE RACIAL ISSUE

Gailor could see the lack of Christian brotherhood and social justice nationally and the evils of extreme nationalism and the exploitation of persons internationally, but regionally, still blinded by inbred prejudice, he could not extend brotherhood and justice to the Negro. If there is a chink in Gailor's armor, it can be found in his attitude toward the Negro. Gailor could not transcend the social and cultural prejudice of his own age. His early experiences during the Civil War and Reconstruction colored his views on the issue, although his feelings did mellow over the years.

From 1905 to 1925 sermons and speeches survive in which Gailor spoke on issues concerning the black man, his place in Southern society, and what the Church's stance should be. As far as Gailor was concerned, Reconstruction was the cause of the "Negro" problem in the South. The white Southerner had lived in poverty and had been harassed for forty years; he must make a stand for his own self-protection. Gailor called for the nullification of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments because he was opposed to the dishonesty of the literacy tests which were used to prevent the Negro from voting. He

believed that suffrage was a privilege and not a right, but later amended his opinion to say that Negroes who owned or produced property should have the right to vote.²¹ Even though Gailor felt Southern "noblesse oblige" had been replaced by hatred and mistrust, he remained a paternalist to the very end. He was vehemently opposed to lynching. From 1915 to 1918 he wrote letters to newspapers and organized meetings opposing the outrages committed. He decried people taking the law into their own hands. Gailor seemed to be as upset over the thought of women and children seeing the dead bodies as he was over the loss of human life.²²

As Gailor saw it, the Church had an obligation to civilize and Christianize the Negro. They were not animals or brutes; they were human beings even if they were inferior to whites. The Church's obligation was to make the Negro as well as the white man realize that. Later in an address to the 1925 Diocesan Convention, he stated his solution: "Awaken in the Negro pride in his own race, his own work, his own leaders; then he will not want to be an imitator of the white man. This goal could only be accomplished by Christian Education rooted in faith in God."²³

Gailor never believed in any kind of equality for the Negro except in religion; even then it was as peaceful

co-existence. In 1907 he suggested a black missionary Bishop to be elected to care for all Negroes, irrespective of Diocesan ties. Later he rejected the idea for fear that a separate black Episcopal Church would emerge.²⁴ At the next Tennessee Diocesan Convention, special black convocations were authorized. They were administered by black archdeacons chosen by Gailor, and the Bishop would preside over their meetings. Although the black churches could appoint and send delegates and could discuss their progress and methods of work, they could not legislate and they had no voting representation at the Diocesan Convention. "It gave the Negro the right to talk but to do very little else."²⁵ Since Gailor had little faith in the Negroes' worth and ability to live a Christian life, the black churches were at the mercy of their black archdeacons. If the archdeacons were enthusiastic and active on the Diocesan level, then the black churches were represented and they thrived. After E. T. Demby, a very active and influential black archdeacon, left Tennessee to go to Arkansas in 1919, no further convocations were held and there was very little attention given to the black churches for almost ten years. In 1928 the Negro churches petitioned the Convention to send their own clergy and lay delegates. This proposal was promptly defeated and convocations were reinstated. In 1935 Gailor's last Convention,

the Negroes again asked for an archdeacon. They felt they received fairer treatment and got better representation from a white Bishop than from a white Diocesan Convention.²⁶

This account gives some insight to Gailor's attitude toward the Negro and to society's for that matter. Certain clergy were invited to the Bishop's residence in Memphis for luncheon and separate tables were set for the "colored" priests. When a white clergyman unexpectedly arrived, there was no place for him at the main table, so the Bishop gave up his seat to the priest and sat with the Negro priests.²⁷ Gailor may have been a gracious host and something of a diplomat, but he was not a trendsetter in the area of racial brotherhood. He could not see the incongruity of his actions. Even though he was acclaimed by the press for working for racial understanding, it was in truth Christian paternalism he expressed, not brotherhood.

Chapter V

FUNDAMENTALISM

As the years following World War I unfolded and the country began to experience disillusionment because world peace and prosperity had not brought peace of mind, Episcopalians sought guidance and strength from Gailor. Some Protestant denominations thought these problems were caused by the new scientific knowledge and change in social mores, and they sought solutions in a literal interpretation of the Bible and rigid legislation. Gailor sought to steer the Episcopal Church clear of narrow Biblical interpretation to answer complex social problems.

Gailor felt that science helped give Christians a clearer understanding of the profound truths of the Bible. "The Bible had gained new depths and value since men's minds had been turned from worshipping a Book to worshipping the Person to whom that book bears witness."²⁸ To his mind science supported faith rather than undermined it. To the Bishop Scripture was the inspired word of God to man and a record of progressive revelation to Himself to mankind; but reason and tradition could not be eliminated from the interpretation of the Bible. The fundamentalist trend was to make the Church independent of history, but the Episcopal Church was based in history, as its

liturgy, its documents, its creeds will attest.

To Bishop Gailor the "theory of evolution did not contradict the idea or fact of God; the theory was absolutely impossible without God."²⁹ Man's intellectual, moral, and spiritual nature came from an intellectual, moral, and spiritual source.³⁰ "If evolution led to atheism it was irrational; if it produced fundamentalism it was a tragedy."³¹ Gailor pled for unity and tolerance:

In this controversy our own Church has taken no part and issued no decree, leaving the decision of the question to the sound and reverent learning of those who have made it their special study. The historic Church is not bound and not constrained by any theory as to the origin of its own documents and literature...

However, there are so many varying shades of opinion in this modern mental attitude, and so much ground for reasonable debate, that we must not permit ourselves to be panic-stricken on the one hand, nor too drastic in our judgments on the other.³²

Chapter VI

PROHIBITION

The "moral majority" of Bishop Gailor's day not only carried the banner of literal interpretation of the creation story, but took literally the Bible's admonition that "wine is a mocker, strong drink a brawler; and whosoever is led astray by it is not wise."³³ During most of Gailor's episcopate, Prohibition kept the American Protestant Churches in an uproar. Gailor was opposed to State and Federal legislation banning the sale of alcoholic beverages, and when asked, he made his views known. If intemperance was a problem in certain communities, then the community level was where the problem was best handled. Gailor felt Prohibition to be the exact opposite to temperance and a violation of one's personal freedom. He denounced intemperance and encouraged all Christians to practice restraint. The Bishop encouraged all Christians to develop their character by using their conscience and then obeying it. Drastic laws like Prohibition usually caused deceit, lying, and disrespect for the law. In 1922, Gailor asked:

"What is the attitude of a Christian towards the confusion of the age? I say first of all it must be that of charity. We must not be hasty in passing judgment upon our fellow men and women..."

Christianity is not negative, but positive. It is not best exhibited by declaring against evil but by pointing out and encouraging goodness; not by railing at vice, but by inspiring virtue. A good Christian ought to be more busy in cultivating and developing high qualities of character than discussing and denouncing the kinds and ways of sin."³⁴

Jesus was not severe or morbid, he told the Diocesan Convention. He performed his first miracle at a wedding feast, turning water into wine. The Episcopal Church found nothing that was created by God to be absolutely evil. If there was evil in alcohol, it was man's over-indulgence in its use. "There was no reason Jesus' teachings should be looked upon as a restraint to enjoying life."³⁵

Gailor was acclaimed by the press and Episcopalians of the state and country for his courage in challenging the ratifications of the Eighteenth Amendment and working for its repeal. Even so Gailor received a great deal of abuse for his public statements. In 1922 he was called the "Wet Ecclesiastic" by William H. Anderson, the President of the National Anti-Saloon League. Anderson classified Gailor and the Episcopal Church of New York in the same league with criminals, outlaws, and bootleggers. The New York Churchmen were furious at the attack but Gailor refused to dignify the slander with a reply.

In 1928 while attending the General Convention in Washington, D.C., he refused to support or vote for a

resolution encouraging the government to enforce the prohibition amendment. He denied that the Church's business was to identify herself with any political faction and she would have done just that if she advocated any one method of legislation on alcohol. He felt the amendment was a mistake because decent people were forced to break the law and were setting bad examples for their children. He participated in the state campaign to repeal the Eighteenth Amendment in 1933.³⁶

Chapter VII

CONCLUSION

On July 25, 1935, hundreds of Episcopalians from all over the South and the nation made the long, arduous trek to Sewanee to pay homage to the man who had served them so faithfully for forty-two years. Gailor had not advocated revolution. He had called for a slow change in which the hearts of men were changed. Gailor believed that his whole life was, as he said, a "training for eternity--otherwise it was hardly worth the living."³⁷

He was a brilliant man but he was not complex. As the Southern Churchman called him in a tribute at his death in 1935, he was a "cosmopolitan provincial."³⁸ Gailor could intelligently converse with scholars, feel at ease with magnates and kings; he possessed that rare equality that put all men at ease--regardless of station--and that endeared him to all he met. He had the ability to associate with the powerful people of the world and still retain that witty simplicity for which great Southerners were renowned. His messages have continued to be preached by those who came after him. The Episcopal Church in Tennessee was deeply affected by Gailor's version of the Social Gospel, and when the great crisis of civil rights came in the 1950s, and 1960s, that church

drawing on Gailor's legacy, was able to go beyond his views on race relations and, however unfavorably, embrace the notion of racial equality in the Church and in society. Gailor believed in an "unchanging Christianity" by which he meant that the essential theological and ecclesiastical structure of the "Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church" were "eternal" but that the application and preaching of the Gospel changed as society changed. The Social Gospel was, in his view, the message to and for his age. His determined advocacy of that doctrine made him one of the most influential American clerics of his time and the major shaper of the Twentieth Century Episcopal Church in Tennessee, perhaps even in the United States.

The Episcopal Church structure remains unchanged from his time; Gailor would have wanted it no other way. Episcopalians were proud of their image and maybe a little haughty but, after all, they were advocating solutions to nation's problems in an orderly and proper way!

Footnotes

¹Thomas Frank Gailor, Some Memories, (Kingsport: Southern Publishers, 1937) p. 20.

²James Thayer Addison, The Episcopal Church in the United States, 1789-1931, (n.p., Archon Books, 1936), p. 286.

³Gailor, Some Memories, p. 57.

⁴Gailor, Some Memories, p. 138.

⁵Gailor, Some Memories, pp. 131-132.

⁶Gailor, Some Memories, p. 330.

⁷Gailor, Some Memories, p. 257.

⁸Gailor, Some Memories, p. 260.

⁹Charles Howard Hopkins, The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), p. 3.

¹⁰Addison, The Episcopal Church, p. 285.

¹¹Ephesians 3:10 (RSV).

¹²Gailor Sermon, October 1932, Bishop Thomas F. Gailor Collection, University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee. Hereafter cited as the Gailor Collection.

¹³Patricia Farrell Sharber, "Social History of Tennessee Episcopalians, 1865-1935, With a Guide to Research in Local Religious History." (D.A. dissertation, Middle Tennessee State University, 1973), 249.

¹⁴"Bishop's Address," Diocesan Journal, 1918. The Episcopal Church produces a Journal of the proceedings of its annual conventions, one portion of which is the annual, "Bishop's Address." These are quite brief and often the Journals are but sporadically paginated.

¹⁵Gailor Collection, January 14, 1919.

¹⁶"Bishop's Address," Diocesan Journal, 1918.

- 17Gailor Collection, sermon, 1919.
- 18Gailor Collection, address, 1928.
- 19"Bishop's Address," Diocesan Journal, 1934.
- 20"Bishop's Address," Diocesan Journal, 1935.
- 21Gailor Collection, address, n.d.
- 22Gailor Collection, unidentified newspaper clipping.
- 23"Bishop's Address," Diocesan Journal, 1925.
- 24"Bishop's Address," Diocesan Journal, 1907.
- 25Sharber, "Tennessee Episcopalians," p. 253.
- 26Sharber, "Tennessee Episcopalians," p. 257.
- 27Gailor Collection, unidentified newspaper clipping.
- 28Gailor Collection, sermon, n.d.
- 29Gailor Collection, address.
- 30Nashville Banner, 3 October 1935.
- 31Sharber, "Tennessee Episcopalians," 201.
- 32"Bishop's Address," Diocesan Journal, 1928.
- 33Proverbs 20:1 (RSV).
- 34"Bishop's Address," Diocesan Journal, 1922.
- 35Gailor Collection, sermon.
- 36Gailor, Some Memories, p. 334.
- 37Gailor Collection, unidentified newspaper clipping.
- 38Gailor Collection, Southern Churchman clipping.

Bibliography

- Addison, James Thayer. The Episcopal Church in the United States, 1789-1931. n.p. Archon Books, 1969.
- "Bishop Stresses Christians Need for Knowledge." Nashville Tennessean, 12 January 1925, sec. 1, p. 1.
- Gailor, Thomas Frank. Some Memories. Kingsport: Southern Publishers, Inc., 1937.
- Hopkins, Charles Howard. The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1965-1915. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.
- Jenkins, Al Warren. "The Diocese of Tennessee, 1898-1978." Unpublished Paper, University of the South, 1978.
- "Obituary" Nashville Banner, 3 October 1935, Section 1, p. 1.
- Protestant Episcopal Church. Journal of the Diocesan Convention. 1902-1935.
- Sharber, Patricia Farrell. "The Social History of Tennessee Episcopalians, 1865-1935, With a Guide to Research in Local Religious History." D.A. dissertation, Middle Tennessee State University, 1973.
- Wilson, Charles Reagan. "Bishop Thomas Frank Gailor: Celebrant of the Southern Tradition," Tennessee Historical Quarterly 38 (Fall 1979) : 322-331.