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It seems abundantly manifest that an end has come to the usefulness of the bishop of Utah in his present field, and that no earnestness of effort on his part will suffice to regain it.

—Tuttle Commission Report, December 12, 1917

Expediency may make necessary the resignation of a bishop at this time, but no expediency can ever justify the degradation of the ideals of the episcopate which these conclusions seem to involve.

—Bishop Paul Jones, 1917 Convocation Report

If a writer of Greek tragedies had lived in early-twentieth-century America, and sought material for a next play, the encounter of Paul Jones, Utah’s pacifist bishop during World War I, with the Missionary District Council of Advice and the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church, would have provided rich subject matter. All the ingredients were there: wartime patriotic fervor; Jones, the idealistic and uncompromising bishop; and the unyielding local and national church leadership. All sped toward a collision, doing what they did in God’s name, led by Daniel S. Tuttle, a character of biblical proportions and founder of the missionary district, who presided over the removal of his successor. And, as in a tragedy, forces once unleashed led a life of their own which the protagonists could not control.

The story could begin with a snapshot that captures a moment in Utah church history. The fiftieth anniversary of the missionary district was commemorated on June 10, 1917 at St. John’s, Salt Lake City. Daniel
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S. Tuttle, Utah’s first missionary bishop, who had come west in 1867 and worked tirelessly for nineteen years to build the missionary district, returned for the event. He was presiding bishop now, by virtue of seniority, and had been bishop of Missouri since leaving Utah in 1886. The eighty-year-old Tuttle, a bishop for fifty years, stands for a moment not far from his younger colleague, Paul Jones, thirty-seven, a bishop for barely two-and-a-half years. The angular, thin Jones stares confidently ahead, as does Tuttle, forty-three years his senior. The passing shot suggests the future encounter between the two that would play out over the next nine months, resulting in Jones’s resignation, and raising questions about free speech in the church unanswered until decades later.¹

Paul Jones (1880–1941) spent twelve years in Utah, first in 1906 as codirector of St. John’s center for college students, Logan, then as archdeacon, or principal assistant, to Bishop Spalding in 1913. After Spalding’s death in 1914, he was named missionary bishop until forced to resign because of his anti-war activities in 1917.

Jones was more than a one-issue antiwar activist. A gifted pastor and administrator, he adroitly managed such assets as the district possessed, and frequently visited with the dozen diocesan clergy scattered throughout the state. He urged that women be elected as convocation officers, an advanced idea for Utah and the Episcopal Church in 1915, and one not acted on for nearly a half-century. Articulate in offering the Episcopal Church as an alternative to Mormonism, during his three-year episcopate he also worked to outlaw the use of peyote, a hallucinogenic drug employed in Native American rituals, and defended Prohibition. In both latter instances, the church took a stand on public policy issues, and in doing so removed the wind from the sails of some of Jones’s opponents, who argued the church should say nothing about politics.

The bishop sought to raise clergy stipends, which averaged $1,200 in 1917 and provided no retirement insurance. “These men are expected to dress well, keep open house, hold their own often among people of wealth, educate their children and exercise leadership in their communities. It is obvious that eighty percent of them cannot be expected to save enough money to provide for old age,” Jones wrote.² He endorsed a Church Pension Fund proposal to provide clergy annuities of half the clergy salary at age sixty-eight, and a widow’s annuity of half that sum. Jones urged the missionary district to raise $5,000 to launch the program, and collected $1,035 from his own clergy for it. The bishop also made some attempts at national fundraising, but his eastern contacts were limited. Further, World War I was in the air, and his pacifism closed many of the Episcopal Church’s traditional doors to the impoverished missionary district.
The new bishop had little interest in ritual or ceremony; his daybook contains an entry for December 14, 1915: “Midnight celebration at St. Paul’s Church—assisted and preached. Incense used for the first time in the Episcopal Church in Utah.” He also supported a short-lived ministry to Utah’s four to five thousand–member Japanese community. The Rev. P. C. Aoki was hired in 1917 to hold services and teach English in three cities.

As archdeacon, Jones had traveled about the state at Spalding’s behest. In a swing through southern Utah he held services in dance halls and school houses, braved dust storms, hitched rides on grocery vans, took trains with erratic routes and schedules, and twice had his bag with vestments, prayer books, and hymnals lost. He described a service in Modena, normally a town of fifty persons, whose size swelled in the spring when pens were set up to shear 125,000 sheep. Two church members working for the weather bureau arranged for services in a dance hall. Seats were planks laid on boxes and oil cans, a pump organ was carried from a nearby house, and notices were hastily tacked up in the saloon and store. Once more Jones’s bag failed to arrive, and he spent Sunday afternoon copying the words of hymns on a typewriter. At the announced hour more than seventy persons gathered in the dimly lit room, and an LDS organist who could only play by ear led the hymns until she reached “Jesus, Lover of my Soul,” when she whispered loudly, “How does it go? I’ve forgotten!” Jones hummed the tune for her, and what was probably the first Episcopal service held in Modena continued. LDS strongholds like St. George, Cedar City, and elsewhere reported “no welcome for the Gentile visitor.” In Cedar City, “the fire marshal refused to allow the City Hall to be used for a service, and it was necessary to pay for the use of the tabernacle even though so few came out to the service it had to be given up and a few hymns sung instead.”

Later, when he was bishop, Jones calculated that on one trip to the Uintah Basin, which covered 807 miles, “416 miles was by standard gauge railroad, sixty-two by narrow gauge, fifteen by horse drawn stage, ten by sleigh, one hundred seventy-four by auto-stage, fifty-seven by private team, thirty by private auto, thirty-five on horseback, and eight on foot.” He held eighteen services that time, in churches, halls, schools, a YMCA, and outdoors.

The vicar of St. Paul’s, Vernal, owned two horses, and later a Model T Ford. In 1917 he purchased a motion picture projector, which was shipped weekly with a film to various outlying congregations. The trip from Vernal was by “stage,” a reconstructed Buick car used for carrying mail and passengers in isolated regions. Green River was crossed by ferry, but during high current a single person and the mail were carried across in a basket suspended from a cable.
As with Spalding, nothing in Jones’s background suggested the intensity of his later views on social questions. Jones graduated from Yale University in 1902, and from the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1906. At home in the Pennsylvania mining country during college vacations, he spent a summer as a strike-breaker in a coal mine, and another in a tax office, learning the skills with numbers that would aid him in church administration. He grew up, he said in a phrase that could have come from F. Scott Fitzgerald, “with right-thinking people of the best type,” adding, “My years at Yale did nothing to shake those sound conclusions . . . wealth as evidence of individual probity, punishment as the only possible treatment for crime, the foreigner to be kept in his place and to be treated kindly, but firmly, the army and navy as the loyal defenders of the nation, the worship of the church as the proper expression of all decent and respectable people—all these conceptions were mine by ordinary training and association.”

During Jones’s last year at seminary, Bishop Spalding made a recruitment trip to the Episcopal Theological School seeking two clerics to establish a community house for young men at Logan’s two colleges. The salary was $75 a month, less than an elevator operator would make, but Jones and a classmate, Donald K. Johnson, volunteered. Many of Jones positions on social and economic issues bear the influence of conversations with Spalding, but he was his own person, whose intellectual formation came a generation later than Spalding’s.

Jones knew the work of the English Christian Socialists F. D. Maurice and Charles Kingsley. The Social Gospel, emphasizing the church’s role in redeeming economic inequities in society, was taught in Cambridge, and Jones had heard the Bible spoken of as “a dangerous and dynamic book, radical, and revolutionary.” He “came to see that Christianity and socialism were not contradictory but supplementary,” a biographer of Jones wrote.

The young clergyman arrived in Logan in 1906. Eventually his salary rose to $90 a month, allowing him to marry Mary Elizabeth Balch, a New Englander and a pacifist herself, whom he had met on a trip to California. Their honeymoon was a covered wagon trip up Utah Canyon. Jones also staked out an eighty-acre isolated farm property in Box Elder County. When he had spare time in Logan, he took the train to Brigham City, transferred to the Southern Pacific heading west to Kelton, then rode another ten miles by horse to the farm. Jones cleared sagebrush and raised grain crops on the isolated property, until he moved to Salt Lake City. Years later, his grandchildren gave part of the property to St. John’s, Logan.

The Logan community center was a success. A “Common Room Club” was formed with a small chapel, gymnasium, classrooms, and club
space. Discussions, lectures, and “smokers” were its weekly fare. A seasonal membership cost five dollars, and after two years, women members were accepted. The center had several sleeping rooms, the only library in town, with nearly a thousand books and thirty periodicals, a pool table, shuffleboard, and tennis courts. The “Knights of King Arthur” for young men was eventually replaced by a Boy Scout troop, the first such recognized troop in the western United States. Jones was its scoutmaster, and it attracted several future community leaders. The lawn tennis court could be rented for ten cents an hour. A current events publication, *The Portal*, was published from 1908 to 1913. Its commentary on national and international political and social questions was of a high order. It promoted a Sportsmen’s Club to protect fish and game, and asked the local Commercial Club to open a room where farmers and their families coming to town could rest and warm themselves during the winter. *The Portal* urged streetcars for Logan, a modern sewer system, the piping in of pure spring water, and bringing Chautauqua cultural programs to the growing city.

Jones and Johnson preached on Sundays, attracting sizable congregations of young LDS men and others. When Bishop Spalding visited Logan, he wrote, “Jones and Johnson are doing splendidly. . . . It is wonderful what impression they have made on the town. It’s the first time really well-educated gentlemen have been sent there. I’m hoping for great things for Logan.”

Jones’s approach to problems was cerebral and analytical. His pamphlet, *Points of Contact: A Consideration for Dissatisfied Latter-day Saints*, was tightly argued for an audience of questioning or disaffected Latter-day Saints. Jones said nothing negative about the Latter-day Saints, but succinctly compared the Book of Mormon and the Episcopal Book of Common Prayer on points such as the sources of authority, the plan of salvation, God, revelation, and the intermediate state of the soul following death. It was unfortunate that the Episcopal Church was not represented in the smaller towns of New York State, such as Palmyra, in the 1830s, he said. Had that been the case, Joseph Smith might have found a welcoming denomination and not felt a need to organize a new church. “In many of his early ideas, his desire for an authoritative ministry . . . where he was out of harmony with the denominational Christianity around him, he would have found himself at home in the Episcopal Church. It is there that the Latter-day Saint today who has lost his faith in Mormonism may hope to regain and refresh his faith in God’s work in the world.”

In 1913, Jones was named archdeacon of Utah and vicar of two small congregations in Salt Lake City. A newspaper account said, “his appointment was attributed chiefly to his executive acumen, his wide grasp of church
matters and his organizing ability.” Jones gradually added a number of administrative roles, including secretary to the Episcopal Missionary District of Utah, clergy recruiter, and member of the religious education and social service committees. Spalding was bishop, but Jones was increasingly his second in command.

The new archdeacon and his wife, expecting a child, moved in with the bishop in the latter’s large house in downtown Salt Lake City. “It will be grand to have a baby in the house because I’ve always loved babies,” the unmarried bishop wrote his mother, shortly before his death on September 25, 1914. Paul and May’s baby was born on Spalding’s birthday, March 13; they named her Barbara Spalding Jones.

The House of Bishops, at a special meeting in Minneapolis on October 8, 1914, elected Jones, then thirty-four, as missionary bishop of Utah. The House in all likelihood saw continuity between Spalding and Jones. However, J. Walcott Thompson, a cathedral vestry member for over forty years and a Council of Advice member, found Jones immature and would have preferred a “bishop from the east with a big reputation” who would have access to wealthy donors.

As bishop, Jones was unwavering in his Social Gospel–pacifist beliefs, but they were presented in a matter-of-fact way, along with the rest of his religious convictions. He joined the Socialist Party, because socialism “seemed to represent the most honest effort in sight to apply Christian principles to the social order.” The bishop’s social theory was a straightforward, action-oriented response to Christ’s New Testament teachings. The Gospel provided practical solutions to correct inequities in the social order, he believed. Marxist theorists would find such writings puzzling deviations from their doctrine, for Jones never advocated anything but traditional American forms of government.

Jones lacked Tuttle’s forceful personality and Spalding’s range of interests. He was tall and thin, with angular features and an acerbic personality. Under attack he responded with a barrage of pointed questions. If he had stayed a socialist, he probably could have made it, but he was a vocal pacifist as well at a time of patriotic fervor, an explosive combination of forces. At that time, there were only seven Episcopal clergy nationally who were declared pacifists; Jones was the only bishop. When he came under heavy attack later that year, Thompson called him “a mere nobody.” Thompson, a local attorney, engineered the bishop’s removal, aided by the clerical and lay leadership of the cathedral and St. Paul’s parish. An irony is that flanking the high altar of St. Mark’s Cathedral are large memorial windows to the wife of Thompson, son of the commandant of Fort Douglas, and Bishop Spalding, a socialist and outspoken antiwar cleric.
The pacifist controversy took place in a growing church, and needs to be viewed in perspective. To read the four annual reports on Jones’s episcopacy is to read of a church gradually expanding despite difficult circumstances. Jones delivered all his annual reports in person, except for the 1918 one, read after his resignation. It would take careful reading between the lines to discern some of Jones’s political views, for he did not mention them, except for a brief statement at the time of his resignation. Meanwhile, church membership was little affected by the controversy. The number of communicants increased from 1,426 to 1,461, and Sunday school enrollment rose substantially from 1,289 to 1,629. The number of missions grew from nineteen to twenty-four from 1915 through 1917, including new missions in Helper, Castle Gate, Kenilworth, and Standardville, struggling mining or railroad centers. The parish and mission budget was $19,838 in 1915. At the time of Jones’s departure it had slightly decreased, to $17,851.

Of the world situation in 1917, Jones said that some people believed war was terrible but inevitable, while others believed that Christian love should triumph, even if it resulted in an individual believer’s death. The two viewpoints were irreconcilable, Jones believed, but a greater responsibility fell on Christian clergy than on the general public. It was their role to quicken the consciences of their people—to speak out fearlessly and adhere to a higher standard of ethical behavior—even in the face of opposition. “To ask that a priest or bishop modify or emasculate his preaching of the gospel, as some would do, is to strike at the one ground of hope that we have for continued upward progress of the Christian faith.”

Also, during this time Jones sought to continue the basic relationship with St. Mark’s Cathedral, formulated by Tuttle in November 1870, and by Leonard in a joint declaration of February 7, 1895, and again on September 11, 1909 by Spalding. The bishop would be ex officio rector of the cathedral, although parochial care of the cathedral congregation would be delegated to the dean. “Whenever a vacancy occurs in the office of Dean the wardens shall give notice thereof in writing to the bishop. The Vestry shall then proceed to the choice of a Dean but no election of a Dean shall be complete until it is confirmed by the bishop,” Article Four of the Joint Act stated.

Women in the Utah Church

Women were instrumental at every level in carrying on the church’s work in Jones’s time. Busily and without fanfare, they held the struggling churches together. Except for celebrating the Eucharist, several were priests in everything but name. Sara Napper, social worker and diocesan registrar, and Deaconess Frances B. Affleck kept the small missions of St. John’s...
and St. Peter’s, Salt Lake City, alive during interims between clergy, and Margueritte Schneider began missionary work on the city’s lower west side. St. Mark’s Hospital struggled with finances because of the war, but the hospital’s operating rooms were upgraded and a chaplain was hired, aided by women volunteers from the cathedral. Fourteen women’s groups reported at the Convention. Speaking of the role of women, Jones said, “there is no question, I think, but that our parishes and missions are kept up very largely by the devoted efforts of the women through their guilds and other organizations.” He then proposed that the canons be interpreted “to include women as well as men” as elected members of the annual convention. The proposal did not carry then, as it had not in 1889, when the three women from St. John’s, Logan, appeared as delegates and were turned away.

Jones continued Spalding’s work in Utah’s coal camps and mining towns. Helper was a stop near Price on the Salt Lake City–Denver route of the Rio Grande railroad, named for the “helper” engines attached to carry trains over Soldier’s Summit. Local railroad officials had erected a small chapel there and, since one railroad official was a Presbyterian and the other an Episcopalian, the two denominations alternated Sunday services. But the churches always led a tenuous existence and within a few years the basement became a machine tool shop and the church a bunkhouse. By 1917, services were resumed at St. Barnabas’s mission, Helper, which continued until the 1940s. Five miles up from Helper, high in the canyons, were the coal camps. “They are comparatively new towns; none over five years old. The coal company owns everything there except the lives of the men and their clothes,” a priest who visited them wrote. “The company store gets back on an average about forty percent of the wages each month. . . . The people, on their side, have no interest in erecting a church where they cannot buy the ground.”

Many of the miners came from England, but there were sizable Greek, Italian, and other European populations as well. Mine work was hazardous; safety standards were poor and cave-ins and equipment accidents were frequent. In Castle Gate, the first service was held in 1916 in a schoolhouse, the only available building since the community hall was used on Sunday nights for a picture show. The building was crowded, and those who could not sit at children’s desks sat on top of them. Many of the English people had not attended such a service since arriving in America fifteen years ago. “A elderly lady said, ‘It does me good to see the bit of white surplice again.’”

On the following Sunday sixteen children were baptized, gathering around the teacher’s desk as an altar. One child was named “Paul” in honor of Bishop Jones. The men, with English and Welsh names, were unaccustomed to attending church, and gathered in front of the store until the service
began. One parishioner asked that the service not take too long, as “The Submarine Secret” was showing at the cinema that evening and “we have not missed one in the series.” Advent Mission, Standardville, and Trinity Church, Castle Gate, continued their existence until the 1930s, Ascension Mission, Kenilworth, until 1949. By then the mines had played out and those who could moved on.

To the west of Salt Lake City were the copper mines, which Spalding had targeted for attention, and where Jones supported an active ministry. The minister there was Maxwell F. Rice, who spent a decade in Utah, first among the miners, and then at Emery House, near the University of Utah campus, and as chaplain to St. Mark’s Hospital. Rice described life in the Magna camp, part of the Garfield copper mining complex: “On the right of the road are rows of houses possessing baked alkali yards for lawns, with not a blade of grass nor a tree.” Rice, who helped build the church with his own hands, remembered “hiring a boy to sit on the ridge pole of our mission in this camp with a pail of water to cool the sheets of corrugated iron which I was nailing on the roof. There was no place for children to play except in the shadeless slop-soaked yards or the dusty roads until we built a playground.”

More than 2,000 men worked at Garfield; Rice called it “a steam shovel project larger than the Panama Canal.” At nearby Arthur, church services were held in the Odd Fellows’s Hall, and a Sunday school in Sunflower Hall. “No where was one more needed than at this settlement where the children were running wild in a vicious environment.” In response to local need, the company erected an attractive church, used by several denominations, and a clubhouse. Rice also started a Garfield Club to keep men out of the pool hall and saloon.

Sunday school teachers were hard to come by during the summer, so Rice had children act out different biblical scenes each week. In the Good Samaritan story, two boys portrayed robbers, the priest was dressed in an acolyte’s robe, and the Good Samaritan arrived in a Boy Scouts’ uniform, and applied his recently learned first aid techniques. Commenting on the meaning of the parable in the Garfield context, Rice wrote, “The scene at the inn gives us the opportunity to bring out the lesson. The Good Samaritan is thanked for having saved the robbed boy’s life at the risk of his own. He promises not to call foreigners ‘Dagos’ ‘Greasers’ ‘Bohunks’ etc. but to think of them as neighbors [italics in the original].”

“Our Christmas is often shrouded by smelter, smoke, and the angels’ song confused by the roar of machinery,” Rice wrote of the five Christmas services he held in 1918. The tree the missionary had bought had been given to the manager of the Garfield plant. A gymnasium full of children
gathered for the celebration and the manager “sent his machine forty miles to bring it to the children.” Next the tree was moved to the church for Sunday services, then to a camp for soldiers. Meanwhile, services were held at nearby St. Andrew’s, Rargetown. “Candles on many cakes lighted up forty very happy faces gathered about tables at the mission.” Refreshments gave way to Christmas songs and stories, and later to the lighted tree. Next, Rice headed for a motion picture theatre in Greek Town, watching red-hot slag pour down a long dump at a smelter, as he led two cars full of children to the next Christmas party. “The tree for the children of this Greek and Austrian settlement was smaller than the others, but it bore more presents and more candy for each child and was quite the wonder of their big black eyes.”

By 1917 St. John’s House, Logan, which Jones had helped found a decade earlier, would soon close. Most male students were off to war, the town had a new public library, and emphasis in Logan shifted to a regular parish ministry. Emery House at the University of Utah had thirty students in 1915, and enjoyed a few more years of active life.

**Native American Work**

Jones was interested in Native American ministries and, both as archdeacon and bishop, traveled to the eastern Utah reservations. In his sparse but observant prose, he described a 1915 winter hillside funeral near Ouray where a Native American was burying his infant daughter in the hills, a remarkable passage in religious writing:

> Half a mile up from the road we found the others gathered. Two Indian girls, one the mother of the baby, were huddled over a fire. Wissi-up, Ahchoop, and Buckskin Jim had just finished digging a grave in the hard gray shale. A dead horse, half eaten by coyotes, lay nearby pointing his feet to the sky, and on one side an old squaw sat in a wagon, while the saddle horses stood around. First the tent in which the child had died was placed in the grave. Then the body, wrapped in quilts, blankets, and shawls, was put in position with the head resting on a pillow.
While Mr. Hersey read a part of the burial service we stood with bared heads, and even Wissi-up and Ah-choop took off their hats, though they were none of them Christians. When the words of the service were ended the missionary told them of the little burying ground chapel at Randlett, where there would never be any danger of their loved ones being disturbed, as they might be up in the hills. Then the baby’s playthings were put in the grave, while one of the men broke up the dishes and pans that had been used in the tent, for the Indians bury with the dead all the articles that have been associated with the person that has gone. We turned to our team and went on our way, feeling that something had been done to bring that family closer to the Kingdom.

Also in 1915, Jones participated in a brief effort to bring together the Episcopal churches of Utah, western Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico at Four Corners, where the four states later comprising the Navajoland Area Mission met. Three bishops, and a clergy representative from Arizona, stood in their respective states and a communion service was held. An observer wrote, “The service was impressively reverent throughout, and no cathedral, with organ, choir, stained-glass and other embellishments, could have made a more glorious scene than did this open mesa, surrounded with the great mountains of the four states, with its rude stone altar, with the bishops in their Episcopal robes, and a congregation composed of Indians, sheep dippers, [and] a Mormon post-trader.” Jones, and the other church leaders, recognized the need for the Episcopal Church to work among the Navajo, principally through a medical or educational ministry. But a lack of resources and the coming of World War I left the vision unachieved.

The growing use of peyote among Native Americans was a mounting concern of missionaries. Native Americans who went north and south in Wyoming and Montana were active, both in using the drug during religious services and selling it to local people. By 1916, peyote use on the Uintah Reservation in Utah was estimated at fifty percent. One of the carriers was a Sioux named Sam Lone Bear, a trick roper and bronco-buster. While some Native Americans supported its use, others opposed it and approved of legislation outlawing its use. In his 1917 report, Jones noted that drug use among the Utes had dropped after the peyote cult had been outlawed. “A number of those who had been loyal to the church dropped away and all those who took up with peyote refused to have anything to do with us.” Of nineteen Utes on the Randlett mission list, eight never used peyote, two were doubtful, and six used the drug but gave it up. One person who used the drug died, two still used it. “When Mr. Hersey held his Easter feast for the Indians, after an interval of two years, there was good attendance of
Indians and an excellent spirit manifested. I think we safely feel that the worst of that trouble is over.”

Meanwhile, Milton J. Hersey worked hard to gain Native American support for traditional Christian feast days. At Christmas, boxes of gifts arrived at the nearest railroad station, sixty-seven miles away, from Chicago, St. Paul, and elsewhere. Once the missionary had assembled the gifts at the church, an invitation went out by word of mouth for people to gather. A visitor wrote, “Shaggy, obstinate-looking Indian ponies, with every kind of saddle-cloth, from Navajo blankets to old pieces of canvas, are tied in front of the church; comfortable family parties come in wagons and strange-looking sleighs. The church is filled, the squaws and children in front, the bucks by themselves in the rear.”

Missionaries wanted Native Americans to adopt non-Native American dress, cut their hair, wash, and learn English. The painting of faces is common in many cultures, but the missionaries discouraged Native Americans from adorning themselves this way. “Here and there a painted face, but not many in this church, for the Rev. Mr. Hersey stops at such a one in his progress down the aisle, and ridicules it with gentle irony,” a missionary magazine reported.

Gifts were piled about the front of the church, and Hersey read the Christmas story, explaining the gifts came, not from him, but from others, after which he and his wife distributed them to each person. While the white children were eager to open their gifts and see what others got, the Native Americans showed “no loud talk, no boisterous laughter! A gentle smile of satisfaction lights the faces of older Utes as the children receive their gifts. . . . In this distribution of gifts one thing is noticeable; no envy or jealously is shown or felt.” The author noted that sharing of possessions was a part of Ute culture, and “no Ute can be truly prosperous, for what he has another may claim of his hospitality.”

Hersey’s reports suggest he was a hard worker, going long distances by buggy to make calls, often in harsh weather, distributing food and clothing, holding services, and attending to the mission schools and small infirmary. He got along well with bishops. Leonard pointed to him as an ideal missionary; Spalding spoke glowingly of him, as did Jones. After almost two decades among Native Americans, Hersey concluded it was time now to think of recruiting native catechists and clergy, but no indigenous church leadership was raised up until after World War II. The family of Floyd A. O’Neil, a scholar of Native American history, grew up on the reservation where Hersey worked. “Dad knew him,” O’Neil recalled. “His name resounded for years and not always was the resonance affirmative.” Hersey’s mentality fit that of the Indian Rights Association, a group of
Philadelphia Quaker and Episcopalian reformers whose motto was “Kill the Indian and Save the Man.” Native Americans who sided with the reformers were called “progressive Indians” and were rewarded materially, as were “Rice Christians” in the Orient. But others were left confused and resentful of the system.

The search is in vain among such reports of Hersey’s as remain for any appreciation or defense of indigenous culture or beliefs. He was hard working and generous, as was his wife, who died at his side in 1916. But his aim was to “elevate the Red Man” —convince Native Americans to accept “Anglo” ways, abandon traditional roles of food gathering for sedentary farming, reject traditional religious beliefs and accept Christianity—with no effort to explore points of compatibility or incompatibility with existing belief systems. Hersey was representative of missionaries of his era; pious, long-suffering and hard-working, they dedicated their lives to civilizing the Native Americans, while simultaneously contributing to the destruction of Native American culture.49

If few records exist about what Episcopal missionaries thought about the Utes, an unanswered question is, how did the Utes view Christianity? Three different responses are possible. First, some Utes became devout Christians, adopting the new religion out of conviction while also hoping it would improve their lot. Second, many people engaged in passive resistance, avoiding the church, opposing its teachings, and finding in drugs, alcohol, or cynicism a defense against the intruder. Third, there was the large community of dualists, those who subscribed to traditional beliefs and practices at home, and sang Christian hymns fervently at church. It was not difficult to live in the two worlds, and many Native Americans found this the preferred way. “The gradations are mind-boggling. Some accepted, some succeeded, some died, some withdrew, some became violent,” O’Neil reflected. “The quality of interaction varied so differently. Families were caring and took care of the church, like the Pawwinnees; they were just fine Christian people. Then there were those associated with the church more informally. I think this was the biggest group. You cannot make a generalization.”50

War Clouds, the Drive to Remove Paul Jones as Utah’s Bishop

The Latter-day Saints, vilified for opposition to the federal government in the nineteenth century, outdid themselves as patriots in World War I. Enmity toward Germany and its allies was widespread. Salt Lake City’s German Avenue was renamed West Kensington, sauerkraut became “Liberty Cabbage,” and persons with German names kept a low profile. This was not a nuanced world. Fort Douglas became an internment center for three
hundred German nationals; pacifists, Socialists, and other peace activists were held there as well.61

A Salt Lake Tabernacle rally attracted ten thousand persons on March 26, 1917, and the “loyalty, unity and solidarity” of all Americans was urged “in support of whatever course becomes necessary.” Bishop Jones spoke the next day at a Socialist rally attended by five hundred persons at Unity Hall, voicing support of President Woodrow Wilson, but decrying the “hot-headed pseudo-patriots of today” who “put democracy, loyalty and truth in terms of guns, fighting and bloodshed, terms that this new world, if not the old, has grown beyond.”52 Jones spoke at a time when war fervor was mounting; the United States would declare war on Germany and its allies a few weeks later, on April 3, 1917.

Response from Jones’s opponents was swift, triggering the unrelenting pressure that forced his resignation by the year’s end. The engine of opposition was the Bishop’s Council of Advice, six men with only consultative powers, except when the missionary district was vacant. Five of the six members were from St. Mark’s or St. Paul’s, the city’s largest parishes. They included Dean William W. Fleetwood, recently arrived at the cathedral from Ogden, Morris L. Ritchie, senior warden of St. Mark’s and a three-term district judge; J. Walcott Thompson, junior warden of St. Mark’s who would be a vestry member for forty-seven years, J. Herbert Dennis, Rector of St. Paul’s, Professor George M. Marshall, secretary to the vestry of St. Paul’s and a lay leader there for over forty years, J. Herbert Dennis, Rector of St. Paul’s, Professor George M. Marshall, secretary to the vestry of St. Paul’s and a lay leader there for over forty years, and William F. Bulkley, since 1914 assigned to St. Mary’s, Provo.53 Missionary district vestry offices were not high turnover positions, yet Thompson and Marshall, the leaders of the anti-Jones movement, appear to have been record holders in their respective parishes. Bulkley, who said little during the controversy, and who would be the missionary district’s archdeacon for two decades, was the Socialist Party’s candidate for State Treasurer in 1916, collecting 4,621 votes out of 283,896 cast.54

The resolutions against Jones sent to the House of Bishops all originated with St. Mark’s, 385 communicants, and St. Paul’s, 300 communicants, the historians Sillito and Hearn note.55 Thompson was the leader, with Marshall his dutiful scribe. He had come to Salt Lake City to join his father, the commanding officer at Fort Douglas, after graduating from Yale Law School. Thompson composed the following prayer, read by Bishop Tuttle at the cathedral during his June 1917 fiftieth anniversary commemoration. The occasion was dedicating a flag given in memory of Thompson’s son, Captain Edwin Potter Thompson, who had died at Camp Bliss, Texas, on September 29, 1916, one of 665 young Utah men who died among 25,000 from the state who served during World War I.56 It is always dangerous to
turn political disputes into prayers, but with careful phrasing, Thompson stated his differences with Jones in liturgical language.

Almighty God, our refuge and strength, in this time of strife of war, we turn to Thee in humility and faith. Endue those in authority over us with courage and wisdom and thy holy fear. Strengthen and protect our defenders by sea and land and suffer no dishonor or crime to stain our arms. Accept at our hands, we humbly pray Thee, this flag of our country given to the cathedral. To the thoughts of our hearts and the guidance of our lives may it ever be unfurled in peace when peace is righteousness, for liberty when liberty is law, or for justice, when justice is unselfishness. Protected by it and protecting it may we stand fast, we beseech Thee, true Americans, true lovers of our country and true helpers of the world. In honoring and serving the flag, may we in hearts and lives honor and serve Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord.  

The prayer, an intimate statement of grief and patriotism, and the various written communiques of Jones and the Council of Advice, portray two positions on a collision course. The Council’s opposition was unyielding. Jones and Thompson apparently never tried to discuss their differences, no easy task in any case, for the two positions were irreconcilable. The challenge was not unlike asking Creon and Antigone to try and make common cause.

Tuttle, who had unsuccessfully urged Jones to soften his position, tried to offer something to both sides in an August 1917 “Letter from the presiding bishop,” written shortly after his visit to Utah. What greatly pleased him on returning to Salt Lake City was “the Americanism everywhere evident,” as demonstrated in public enthusiasm for the Liberty Bond and Red Cross drives. “As an American, I am proud of Utah. She furnished her fighting men, and good men they were too, for the Spanish War. She is furnishing men for the war we now have on our hands. And she is furnishing food as well as men. And money too.” But Tuttle was also generous to Jones. He noted with pride that Utah now had fifteen clergy and 1,445 communicants, and “the bishop is kindly, peaceful, faithful. The clergy are earnest, active, hopeful. May God’s guidance, grace and blessing be upon them and their important work.”

St. Mark’s vestry began the offensive against Jones on March 28, noting “with keen regret your recent utterances in reference to the present National Crisis” and requested the bishop “to issue a statement over your own signature . . . that your opinions are those of an individual and should not, by reason of your official position in the Church, be attributed to the
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Episcopal Church nor to any members thereof.” Jones replied tersely two days later: “At the time of my consecration, I promised to exercise myself in the Holy Scriptures, and call upon God by prayer for the true understanding of the same. No mention was made of calling upon St. Mark’s Vestry for guidance. . . . As my stand in the matter of war is based upon what I believe to be the clear teaching of the Scriptures, you can understand that I feel no necessity to make the statement you request.”

Marshall and the Council consistently misrepresented local church sentiment. Widespread support for Jones existed among the non-Salt Lake clergy and laity, if not agreement with his antiwar views. The Council of Advice, however, presented itself to the national church as representing the entire missionary district. It gave no evidence of talking to anyone but its own members or those supporting its position; its written briefs contained only anti-Jones arguments. In April 1917, Maxwell W. Rice, of All Souls’, Garfield, compiled a petition signed by a majority of clergy outside Salt Lake City, stating, “While we may not agree with Bishop Jones in regard to his view on this subject, we do emphatically assert that he is not only within his rights but that it is his duty as bishop to speak his convictions on subjects of such vital moral and spiritual consequences to the welfare of our country. We hereby record our disapproval of any attempt to curtail this privilege which the Episcopal Church grants at the consecration and ordination of its bishops and clergy.”

Another supporter was J. Wesley Twelves, a Philadelphia Divinity School graduate, who came to Vernal in 1916, attracted by Jones’s Social Gospel beliefs. Charles F. Rice, priest-in-charge of St. Andrew’s Church, Eureka, a mining district parish, wrote on July 31, “when the dean, wardens, and vestrymen of St. Mark’s presume to speak for the ‘rank and file of the Episcopal Church in Utah,’ they are getting out of the bounds of their jurisdiction.”

That summer, the Convocation of the Missionary District of Utah was held at St. John’s Chapel, Salt Lake City, June 7 and 8. It was business as usual, the only mention of the war issue coming late in the bishop’s address: “We clergy must then preach according to the light that has been given us with the hope of leading men on to the goal which we all desire.”

Despite the growing controversy, Jones maintained a sense of humor. He recalled receiving two anonymous letters from Salt Lake City. One warned him that God might bring him to an untimely end for speaking against Mormonism, as it had his predecessor. The second letter said Jones would become an LDS member in ten years unless he committed suicide. “I am not expecting either event,” Jones responded.

That fall the Council of Advice took its case to the national church, prompting a reply on September 28, 1917, from Bishop Arthur S. Lloyd,
head of missionary programs for the Episcopal Church, to Thompson: “Why don’t you do as the fathers did and assemble together men like yourself and ask God to do the thing men will never be able to accomplish—that is to help our friend to see and discriminate.”64 “The man is so fine,” Lloyd told Thompson, “and I know whatever the appearance may be—I read some clippings which criticized him pretty severely—there never was a clearer-minded man, or one with more single purpose for what is right and what he believes is Christian.”65 Lloyd most likely believed that if Jones would be more politic and soften his pacifist rhetoric, his episcopacy might be saved and the white heat of opposition be abated. But such compromise was not possible for Jones, whose bedrock religious convictions were on the line.

Tuttle, as presiding bishop, now watched things deteriorate in the missionary district he had spent almost two decades building. Without spite or underhandedness, he joined with those seeking to remove Jones.

On October 2, Jones was in Los Angeles on a family visit, and attended a local peace rally. When protesters appeared, the small group of people moved to a different house. The Salt Lake Tribune inaccurately headlined the story “Swarms of Police Chase Bishop Jones, War Veterans Keep Christian Pacifist on Run in California.” The vintage yellow journalism reporting of that era said:

The Rt. Rev. Paul Jones, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Utah, did not get far here today in his prayer for [German] peace. He was interrupted by civil and Spanish war veterans, citizens of Eagle Rock, a suburban community, who sang “The Star Spangled Banner” with such determination that the meeting of Christian Pacifists which Bishop Jones was calling on the Lord to bless, broke up in disorder and the delegates hied themselves by automobile to another part of the community, to meet in another private building and start all over again, hoping against hope to shake off the swarm of police and government operatives.66

Jones called the newspaper story “totally inaccurate,” and presented a different version of the story. He said he had been in California, not to attend the meeting, but to pick up his daughter who had been spending the winter with her grandmother.

The meetings were quiet and harmonious, given to the discussion of aspects of the question of the conflict between war and Christianity. No objection was made by the secret service men present to anything that was said. There were no interruptions, and no attempt was made to break up the meetings. Having then to leave the city, I cannot speak for
what happened at other sessions, but considering the inaccuracy of the reports of those two, I should not be inclined to put much faith in the accounts which appeared.67

The Council of Advice asked for Jones’s resignation, stating on October 4, “your affiliation with various seditious organizations, the shame and embarrassment experienced by the flock committed to your Episcopal care through persistent promulgation of unpatriotic doctrines, your steadfast refusal to heed the advice and remonstrances of your brother bishops and your clergy and laity in this matter, and the injurious consequences of your course upon the life of the Church in this state, have convinced your Council of Advice that your usefulness as bishop of the Church in Utah is at an end.”68

Jones replied four days later with a set of questions for council members, such as “Please state the names of any seditious organizations that you know of which the bishop of Utah has been affiliated” and “Please state, what, if any, unpatriotic doctrines the bishop of Utah has, to your knowledge, persistently promulgated, and the occasions on which he has done so.”69 It was a strategy Jones often employed, stripping away the emotional language aimed at him and asking for specifics, and it infuriated his opponents. “This is no time for academic discussion,” an irritated Professor Marshall replied. “If you have been able to travel over your jurisdiction, to read the public press, to listen to the Council of your coworkers, to read the solemn request of their Council that you resign and yet not be able to answer each of the ten questions you ask us to answer, we feel that it would be useless for us to do so.”70

The Council of Advice next wrote Tuttle, on October 5, urging the House of Bishops “to send in his place an efficient man in whom all the West and all the Church can have enthusiastic confidence and whose aggressive, loyal, and churchly leadership we can unqualifiedly support.”71

The House of Bishops took no action at its October meeting in Chicago other than to chide Jones for indiscreet speech. Marshall then wrote, on October 19: “The churchmen of this city, with rare exceptions, so rare as to be ignored in proportional influence, read with dismay the report in the morning papers that the House of Bishops saw in Bishop Jones’s attitude toward the war and in his utterances nothing more than indiscretions and that he was likely to return to Utah and continue to lead the church here. He is preaching and teaching exactly what known traitors and German sympathizers are preaching and teaching. The careless or ignorant child with a gun may kill as surely as the deliberate murderer.” Marshall continued, “The most bitter opponents of Bishop Jones’s sentiments here cast no imputations
against his personal or Christian character—he is above reproach. . . . We are not asking for his deposition, or the disgracing or humiliating of him in any way whatsoever. We’re simply insisting that his usefulness to the church in Utah is at a complete and permanent end.”

Intensifying their efforts, the Council sent a letter to all local clergy and missions on October 25, asking about “what the atmosphere or feeling of the city is regarding Bishop Jones and the action taken by the Council of Advice and House of Bishops. We know that it is a hard thing for any of you to act against a friend, especially one who has been so fine a friend as Bishop Jones but this is a time when personal feelings must be put in the background and the good of the church in the district and the needs and good of the nation be brought forward.”

Both support and opposition to Jones were voiced in the responses, but once more the Council never included the comments favorable to Jones in its reports. They also actively solicited anti-Jones mail; several surviving replies refer to a letter sent by the Council, with Walker’s law office the center of activity. Rice of Garfield had already written to back the bishop, and Edwin T. Lewis, from St. John’s, Logan, wrote, “the affair has been one of passing interest and surprise but of absolutely no influence or effect whatever. Neither the Church’s position not my own has been affected. Bishop Jones’s many friends have been much surprised by his attitude, but I believe I am right in saying that there were many more surprised by the request for his resignation. It was always a clear matter that the bishop expressed his personal opinion only. . . . Bishop Jones’s usefulness here in Logan is certainly not seriously impaired.” Backing for Jones was voiced from the mission in distant Vernal. “I do not know of but one person in the community who thoroughly agrees with the bishop, on the other hand I do not know of one person who heartily condemns the bishop,” wrote J. Wesley Twelves, vicar of St. Paul’s Church and Lodge there, adding, “There is general feeling of admiration for him in this particular instance. . . . Of course there are people here as there are in Salt Lake City who do not like the bishop and this is simply an opportunity to show their hatred, this is not due to anything the bishop has done.” Twelves continued: “A large number of people outside the Church have an idea that the Council of Advice is a body which controls the appointment and actions of bishops and that they having asked for his resignation, therefore it must be that he is in the wrong. Naturally I have corrected them and informed them that the body is simply his own appointed advisory board.”

An additional source confirmed popular support for Jones. On October 8, Jones sent a letter and questionnaire to 180 church members throughout the missionary district, asking them the same questions he had put to the
Council of Advice, requesting a reply in time for him to present the results at the House of Bishops meeting in Chicago on October 17. What use Jones made of the responses is not known, but a 1934 tabulation disclosed that 114 of the 180 questionnaires were returned, an unusually high sampling. Essentially 35 percent of the respondents agreed Jones should resign, 45 disagreed, and the rest did not fit either category. What is significant is that when the Salt Lake City sources of opposition to Jones, St. Mark’s and St. Paul’s, were filtered from the sampling, only 8 percent believed the bishop should resign. And apart from the clergy members of the Council of Advice, “only one of the remaining twelve clergymen of the District did not support the bishop.” 76

On October 19, the House of Bishops requested the presiding bishop to call a commission to look into affairs in Utah, “so that the bishop of Utah may govern his action by their advice.” The bishop of Missouri and presiding bishop, Daniel S. Tuttle, the bishop of Texas, George H. Kinsolving, and the bishop coadjutor of Iowa, Harry S. Longley, became a commission of inquiry. It smacked of a Star Chamber proceeding. The bishops first met alone on Nov. 7 with Fleetwood and Thompson in St. Louis without Jones being present, then again on December 12, when it summoned Bishop Jones to appear “when ever occasion demanded,” which meant briefly at the hearing’s end.

Jones again adopted his strategy of asking his interrogators pointed questions. He saw clearly this was a struggle of truth, as he understood it, versus church power. Jones was not interested in institutional power, and constantly kept the issue at a biblical–ethical level. His questions were answered cryptically:

Q. Does the Commission find that the allegations of the Council of Advice are justified (a) That I have been affiliated with seditious organizations?
   —A. The Commission does not charge seditious organizations, but does say questionable organizations in respect of loyalty to the Government.
   (b) That I have persistently promulgated unpatriotic doctrines?
   —A. The Commission is not satisfied that you have persistently promulgated unpatriotic doctrines; but the evidence shows that on occasions you have promulgated such doctrines.
   (c) That I have injured the life of the Church in Utah and elsewhere?
   —A. Yes, it seems to the Commission that you have injured the life of the Church in Utah and elsewhere.
Q. Does the Commission find that I have exceeded my prerogatives in coming to the conclusions I have in regard to war and Christianity?
—A. The Commission is of the opinion that in our free country you are not to be officially restrained in your maintenance of opinions which you hold as an individual; but it also thinks that weighty responsibility attaches to pronouncements by a bishop, and that thoughtfulness and reticence on his part are exceedingly desirable.

Q. Does the Commission believe that I should accede to the request of the Council of Advice and resign?
—A. Yes.77

Finally, the Commission wrote that most church members believed the war with Germany would lead to a “sound and lasting peace,” and any expression against the war “should not come from an Episcopal representative of this Church.” They concluded, “it seems abundantly manifest than an end has come to the usefulness of the bishop of Utah in his present field, and that no earnestness of effort on his part would suffice to regain it.”78

Jones believed that Tuttle, the report’s main drafter, old and deaf now, had completed it before their meeting. Bishop Longley of Iowa, to whom Jones had sent his own survey results, arrived late; his train was delayed, and the pro-Jones material sent him was never included in the document. Jones was ushered into Tuttle’s dining room, where the brief inquiry was held, and the report was read to him. Jones was not allowed to address the Commission in his own defense, only to comment on the completed document.79

The most chilling conclusion the Tuttle Commission advanced was “the making of such an Episcopal proclamation should be preceded by the withdrawal of the maker from his position of Episcopal leadership.”80 That argument, if accepted by the House of Bishops, would severely restrict free speech in the church, and provide a convenient way to limit any future controversial positions taken by bishops on public issues. World War I was the central issue now, but the Church was beginning to explore race relations, and other contentious issues were soon in the wings. Jones should resign, the Commission concluded, on or before March 12, 1918.81 The Commission knew it was seeking the resignation of a colleague against whom no canonical charges had been filed. Its action should not be seen as precedent setting, it noted, only a response to “an excited condition of public opinion.”82

Jones was on his way out. A newspaper report from St. Louis said the bishop, reached at Union Station while boarding a train for Salt Lake City, said he would comply with the resignation request, although he had not changed his viewpoint on war. “I think this action reflects more on the
church than it does on me," he remarked. "I will admit that if any war could be a righteous war, this one is it, but I can not believe there is such a thing as a righteous war. I have no sympathy for Germany. I am of Welsh descent." Newspaper accounts also quoted Tuttle as saying this was the first time in the history of the American Church that an Episcopal bishop was asked to resign for reasons not concerned with questions of religious faith or doctrine.\textsuperscript{83}

**Resignation, December 20, 1917, Effective April 11, 1918**

The end came swiftly. On December 20, 1917, Jones submitted his resignation, which then must be approved by a majority of dioceses. His parting shot to Tuttle was

\begin{quote}
I had hoped that, notwithstanding the 'excited condition of public opinion' referred to by the Commission, there might be room in the Church for a difference of opinion on the Christianity of warfare and ways of attaining peace, and that, if so, it was preeminently the duty of one supposed to be a leader of the Church to voice his convictions on those subjects. But the commission makes it perfectly clear in its report that a bishop should resign before venturing to differ from others on such a Christian problem, or to express opinions at variance with the Government. To me, that seems evidently to mean that the bishops of the Church should be followers and not leaders, and I have no desire to remain in such an anomalous position.\textsuperscript{84}
\end{quote}

Jones sent the Council of Advice a short letter on the same date, enclosing an official authorization "to act as the Ecclesiastical Authority of the District" and offering to meet with them to allow a smooth transition.\textsuperscript{85}

At the end of his 1917 convention address, he gave one of the few statements to the local church of his views on the effort to remove him from office:

\begin{quote}
I do not care to criticize the action taken by the Council of Advice. No doubt the Council acted according to its best judgment, and time will show the wisdom or folly of that judgment. . . . Expediency may make necessary the resignation of a bishop at this time, but no expediency can ever justify the degradation of the ideals of the episcopate which these conclusions seem to involve.\textsuperscript{86}
\end{quote}

The same report contained a chronicle of the actions, inserted by the Council of Advice "profoundly moved by a sense of their responsibility,"

\textsuperscript{83} See the previous page for details.
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\textsuperscript{86} Jones's letter to the Council of Advice.
detailing their steps to force the bishop’s resignation. They expressed no positive comments on his twelve years of active ministry in Utah.\textsuperscript{87}

The Council next passed a ponderously self-congratulatory resolution on March 29, 1918, urging the House of Bishops to accept Jones’s resignation. “The developments since said resignation was requested, have emphasized the correctness of their judgment and the wisdom of their actions,” the council concluded, urging the bishops to send “a strong loyal man, from without the District, to be the bishop of Utah.”\textsuperscript{88} A non-controversial pastor and “big Easterner” fundraiser is what the Council wanted.

It fell to the House of bishops, meeting at the cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York on April 10, 1918, to write the closing chapter in the Jones saga. Bishop Tuttle was at work as well. Aware of criticism of the Commission Report for violating due process and seemingly limiting the power of a bishop to speak out on public issues without first resigning, Tuttle stripped all such language from the document. The new report contained a single argument, “that the utterances and associations of the bishop of Utah had impaired his influence in promoting the peace and welfare of the Church in Utah to such a degree as virtually to destroy it.”\textsuperscript{89}

Tuttle hoped to move the matter quickly, but his plan backfired. When the Jones resignation came to the floor, several bishops asked that a Special Commission be appointed to examine the matter further. Documentation for and against Jones was appended to the record, and next day the bishops met in executive session. The bishops accepted Jones’s resignation, but before doing so passed a resolution supporting the government of the United States for obeying “the law of moral necessity in seeking to stop a war of deliberate aggression by the only means that are known to be effective to such an end.” Free speech should be balanced with responsibility; members are “entitled to the same freedom of opinion and speech as any other citizen of the United States,” but “should be guided by a deep sense of the responsibility which rests upon one who occupies a representative position.” This was a less restrictive position than Tuttle had advanced earlier in his report, which said “the making of such an Episcopal proclamation should be preceded by the withdrawal of the maker from his position of Episcopal leadership.”\textsuperscript{90}

Finally, referring to the December 12, 1917, report, the House of Bishops said it was “unwilling to accept the resignation of any bishop in deference to an excited state of public opinion, and therefore declines to adopt the Report of the Special Commission or to accept the resignation of the bishop of Utah for the reasons assigned by him in his letter of December 20, 1917.”\textsuperscript{91} That reason for Jones’s resignation was declined, but the issue was moot because part of the deal was Jones would still resign. The actual resignation was delivered a day later in a one-line letter, “I desire to present to you
my formal resignation as bishop of the Missionary District of Utah.” The missionary bishop of Western Colorado, Frank Hale Touret, became acting bishop, at Tuttle’s request, until 1920, when a new missionary bishop of Utah was named.

In retrospect, the encounter between the Council of Advice and Jones can only be described as brutal, and the action of the House of Bishops as lacking courage. The Council attacked the bishop relentlessly, and the House of Bishops failed to support one of their own who took a stand on a controversial issue. The bishop’s equivocation raised troubling questions for the church. Jones was never tried, yet the commission’s basic assertion was he was disloyal to the national government. But there was no state church in America, and free exercise of speech was guaranteed by the Constitution. The language the bishops used to muzzle Jones could just as easily apply to another church leader advancing any controversial issue of national policy, such as civil rights, the Vietnam War, or the place of women in the church. The larger question remains, what would have happened had Jones not resigned? He could not have been removed from office. The war would soon be over and he would have resumed his episcopal role, albeit with diminished support from some powerful Salt Lake City Episcopalians at St. Mark’s and St. Paul’s. Still, a majority of the Utah clergy and laity stood by him, and the missionary district could have weathered its crisis. Jones’s resignation was effective on April 11, 1918; the war ended seven months later, on November 11.

What does the church do with a thirty-seven-year-old bishop without a diocese? Jones never faced a trial, nor was he deposed. A bishop for life, he was given a voice but not a vote in the House of Bishops. Although he temporarily did supply services in some parishes for a bishop friend in Maine, Jones never held an episcopal appointment again. He became executive director of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a peace activist group, where he stayed until 1929. He also spent six months filling in as acting bishop of Southern Ohio. Nearby was Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio. Its president, Arthur H. Morgan, former head of the Tennessee Valley Authority, invited Jones, whom he had long admired, to become the college’s chaplain. A fixture on the college campus, Jones was voted Antioch’s most popular professor. He was sometimes called “Bishop to the Universe” because of his wide interests. William B. Spofford, later bishop of Eastern Oregon (1967–1979), was a student at Antioch from 1938 to 1942, and remembered Jones. “One female student and I were in his class—which was mostly two hours of reflection and discussion. Very dull but quite obviously a ‘saint’ of peace, gentleness, and courage.” An outspoken early advocate for equal treatment of Jews and African Americans, Jones ran for governor of Ohio on the Socialist
ticket in 1940. He lost, but stayed on at Antioch until his death of multiple myeloma in September 1941.

**As The Wheel Turns: Paul Jones Is Added to the Episcopal Calendar**

The last hurrah did come to Jones, however. In 1991, the General Convention of the Episcopal Church asked the Standing Liturgical Commission to add his name to its Church Calendar of Christendom’s venerated and respected leaders, in a class including Martin Luther, Hildegard of Bingen, Thomas Becket, C. S. Lewis, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, and the Martyrs of El Salvador. The action was completed in 1998. September 4, the date of his death, was marked as a day of special commemoration, and a collect was provided to commemorate the life of Paul Jones, bishop of Utah and pacifist.

Merciful God, who sent your beloved Son to preach peace to those who are far off and to those who are near: Raise up in this and every land and time witnesses, who after the example of Paul Jones, will stand firm in proclaiming the gospel of the Prince of Peace, our Savior Jesus Christ, who lives and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit, one God, for ever. Amen.

The ordeal of Paul Jones had come full circle.