

1

Introduction

“Without the Camp”

H E B R E W S 13:11

Perhaps the least known chapter in the history of American Pentecostalism is that of early Oneness Pentecostalism. The earliest era of this segment of the movement (1901–31) is especially relevant to Pentecostal history in general because of its unique and durative display of interracial fervor, an impulse which figured prominently into its formative development. This book is an in-depth look at the history and nature of this initial interracial vision as interpreted via the lens of one of the movement’s primary architects, Garfield Thomas Haywood, and within the early development of Oneness Pentecostalism’s central church and ministerial structures, the interracial Pentecostal Assemblies of the World.

It is also an attempt to rectify a one dimensional historical perspective currently pervasive in the overall historiography of Pentecostalism, and, therefore, decidedly inclusive of its Oneness dimensions, on the one hand, and a balance, on the other hand, to common interpretive models which have ignored the significance of race in the restorative framework of the early movement. As a starting point it is essential to trace this interracial fervor into the Azusa Street revival and to account for the Parham-influenced, power-struggle resistance to this impulse in the U.S. regionally. Several significant pieces of the historical puzzle have come to light in this research which give fresh and, in some cases, ground breaking

insight into the events, such as the 1906 Azusa Street Mission founding of the interracial Pentecostal Assemblies of the World.

These and other sources have contributed to a much better understanding now of two of Oneness Pentecostalism's most obscure early leaders, J. J. Frazee and E. W. Doak, as well as of the movement's early major centers. African American Pentecostal leader G. T. Haywood, as it turns out, figures most prominently into this history, not only as one of its leading proponents, but as its central interracial voice, as well as its most renowned leader in its foremost early epicenter—Indianapolis, Indiana.

Therefore, an examination of its interracial authenticity necessitates an extensive look into the pre-Oneness context of the PAW, the related battle for the newly organized, intricately related, Assemblies of God, and the transition of the PAW itself from “Trinitarian” to “Oneness” Pentecostalism. In the final analysis this book makes an effort at investigation into the whole scope of the eventual racial schism which came to Oneness Pentecostalism and to the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, in particular, in 1924, resulting in a majority withdrawal of the White segment of churches and ministers. The resulting rejection of the interracial impulse which followed within Oneness Pentecostalism as a whole produced a fractured movement with decades of resulting diffusion and the proliferation of separatism and independency. These events marked, indelibly, the movement's regional development in the U.S., as well as its critical global missionary and autochthonous segments, all of which were expanding rapidly by 1930.

1.1 DEFINITIONS AND PARAMETERS

The making of Oneness Pentecostalism, like that of the broader movement to which it is a prominent part, was largely dependent upon the motifs of restoration and revelation within its earliest development.¹ In turn, these elements greatly impacted its own theological receptivity to an early interracial impulse which largely shaped Oneness Pentecostal ideology for more than a generation. Yet it may very well have been equally impacted by the nature of the theological isolation and rejection experienced as a

1. Oneness origins are understood here to date to the popularly recognized initiating events which occurred in California at the Arroyo Seco Camp Meeting in April 1913. The initial epiphany-like events, the immediate scattered rebaptisms, and the planning, anticipation, and implementation of strategies resulted in a period of relative calm until April 1914.

result of its theological position, although it developed parallel to, if isolated from, broader forms of Pentecostalism.

The salient and emotive remarks of G. T. Haywood, for example, in the December 1916 issue of his influential periodical *The Voice in the Wilderness*, contain an excellent metaphor descriptive of the Oneness movement. They reveal his response to the events of October 1916—the resulting traumatic expulsion of the Oneness ministers from the young Pentecostal ministerial body in St. Louis known as the Assemblies of God:

There were quite a number who withdrew from the Council at the close of the session, because there was a spirit of drifting into another denomination manifested, when they began to draw up a "creed," which they termed "fundamentals." It is no doubt the same thing under a different name. I have no complaints to make, but by the grace of God *I shall endeavor to press on with the Lord "without the camp, bearing His reproach, for here we have no continuing city, but we seek one to come."*²

Oneness Pentecostalism, the term which has become the most popular designation for the movement, and the term of preference in this book, is known also as the Apostolic Pentecostal and as the Jesus' Name movement, all being equally acceptable common self-designations. From its inception the movement has, indeed, remained "without the camp," as an enigma, and as a Pentecostal antagonist to the broader movement, experiencing both imposed and self-imposed isolation from the religious mainstream. This has been due largely to rigidity in its deviations from the classical doctrine of the Trinity and its soteriology.

Haywood's use, nonetheless, of such an Old Testament "without the camp" analogy encompassed more than the mere theological rejection of the Assemblies of God. It was, in fact, intricately linked as well to the AG racial rejection.³ Some months prior to Haywood's remarks and the AG expulsion of its Oneness element in October 1916, well-known Pentecostal songwriter Thoro Harris also startled his AG Council compatriots by

2. Haywood, "St. Louis Council at St. Louis, Mo," 1; see Heb 13:11; cf. "They daily misjudge me and sneer, scoff and scorn; Reproach for Thy word and Thy name we have borne; Yet, Lord, we do love them, forgive them their wrong," Haywood, "O Lord, How Long," 15.

3. The terms "Unitarian" and "Jesus Only" are neither tenable nor common self-designations of the movement; cf. Yong, *Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh*, 205–6, who observed that Oneness affirmations distinguish it "from the Socinian and modern Unitarian denials of the Trinity" and served to reject "both Arian and modern theological liberal rejections of the deity of Christ."

converting to the Jesus' Name movement. As a rallying cry for the cause he immediately wrote "Baptized in Jesus' Name," and, in 1917, penned his most familiar of hymns, "All That Thrills My Soul Is Jesus." His baptismal hymn opens defiantly: "Today I gladly bear the bitter cross of scorn, reproach and shame; I count the worthless praise of men but loss, baptized in Jesus' Name."⁴

The Oneness proponents seemed to rather gladly identify such reproach with the suffering required for His Name, a theme which would loom large in Jesus' Name Pentecostalism. And, as Haywood vividly symbolized, their very identity was defined by a suffering "without the gate," a welcome plight, more or less, as the necessary spiritual badge of validation required in what they understood as the defense of restored truth.

1.1.1 Difficulties Inherent to Pentecostal Definition

In Pentecostal definition, Pentecostal-Evangelical assessments have typically stressed classical essentials, as in Menzies' 1971 research: "The 'baptism in the Holy Spirit,' is believed to be evidenced by the accompanying sign of 'speaking with other tongues as the Spirit gives utterance.'" Essentially, the dominant Evangelical, fundamentalist, and, ultimately, Assemblies of God definitions, as well as dominant history, were usually viewed as adequate and representative, as, more or less, "a microcosm of the Pentecostal movement as a whole," and even "the most representative of the Pentecostal organizations."⁵

Such a starting point is, obviously, a problematic definitional standard, not only for Oneness Pentecostalism, but for large segments of diverse Pentecostals, not the least of which are the burgeoning autochthonous Pentecostals worldwide. Also to the point, Assemblies of God and related denominational histories, until Edith Blumhofer's work, were typically critical and biased in their analyses of Oneness origins, and only a scant number of Oneness histories existed, none of which were broad, in-depth studies.

These earliest discussions of the movement refer to Oneness Pentecostalism as "The New Issue," setting the discussion in the "negative" terms of the AG perspective, as having come after another divisive issue, the sanctification issue which split Pentecostalism by 1910–1912.⁶ The

4. Harris, "Baptized in Jesus' Name," 1.

5. Menzies, *Anointed to Serve*, 177–227.

6. Ibid., 114, for example, frames the events in terms of Oneness hysteria; cf.,

opponents, therefore, set the definitional parameters. For example, they inevitably over-emphasize the emergence of the movement in terms of mischaracterized new revelations to the exclusion of equally compelling alternative explanations.

Beyond this, the challenge of circumscribing Pentecostal category placement and definition in this manner is displaced, to some extent, in David Martin's sociological analysis of Pentecostal identity and trajectories. Martin suggests a definitional shift away from placing "the expansion of Pentecostalism under the rubric of American hegemony," noting, as well, the potential for an evangelical mimicking of the same "incline and decline" trajectory of "Liberal Christianity."

Evangelical Christianity (of which Pentecostalism is a version) belongs to a phase in the process of modernity, with the corollary that the Pentecostalism now so expansive in the modernization of the developing world is likewise a phase . . . Insofar as Pentecostalism spreads it does so principally through a charismatic movement partly inside the older churches and partly "breaking bounds" in every sense.⁷

A more recent and far more "inclusive definition," however, is being suggested, for example, by David Barrett's new *World Christian Encyclopedia* and by such global studies as that of Allan Anderson in *An Introduction to Pentecostalism*. Beyond the earlier categories of "Pentecostal" and "Charismatic," the broad frame of reference for these emerging definitions make room for the inclusion of large segments of "Independents," including, notably the African Independent Churches and the Han Chinese Churches, which are Pentecostal-like, sharing the emphasis of empowerment and gifts, if not tongues.⁸

Brumback, *Suddenly from Heaven*, 191, "... a movement that brought forth a 'revelation' that almost tore the movement apart"; also, Brumback, *God in Three Persons*; Lindquist, *The Truth About the Trinity and Baptism in Jesus' Name Only*; and Rider, "The Theology of the 'Jesus Only' Movement."

7. Martin, *Pentecostalism*, 2–3; cf. also, the 250 million estimate for worldwide Pentecostalism (1), and the reference to "varied purposes of journalist rag-bags like 'fundamentalism'" in the explication regarding Pentecostal expansion (x).

8. Barrett, Johnson, and Crossing, "Christianity 2010," 36; Barrett's totals includes multiple non-tongues categories, such as "pre-," "post-," "quasi-." See Barrett and Johnson, "Annual Statistical Table on Global Mission," 25, 13; Anderson, *Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 1, 10–11; cf. Anderson, "To All Points of the Compass"; also, Johnstone and Mandryk, *Operation World*, 755–65, with less optimistic totals which exclude "Independents."

These additional categories of “Pentecostal” groups, according to the *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, boost the combined total to more than 614 million, and thus the basis for the oft-cited statistic of 600 million for the 2006 Azusa Centennial. Importantly, these totals include the diverse Oneness Pentecostal global constituencies, a characteristic feature of most assessments of general Pentecostalism’s numerical strength. The number of Oneness Pentecostals, above and beyond the hard data of 27.4 million reported for specific groups by the Oneness Studies Institute in 2009, now exceeds an estimated thirty million.⁹

Somewhat enigmatically, Oneness Pentecostals fall within the range of “classical” Pentecostal definition with respect to the emphasis on tongues. Therefore, on the one hand, Oneness Pentecostals are accurately depicted as “classical” regarding evidentiary tongues. It must be observed that, on the other hand, by such a definition, perhaps as few as a third of Barrett’s Pentecostal totals fit such a strong tongues categorization.¹⁰

Yet from almost every other perspective, the Oneness movement appears to be one of the most obvious examples of the difficulty of designating precise theological parameters to Pentecostal definitions. The observation that “Pentecostals have defined themselves by so many paradigms that diversity itself has become a primary defining characteristic” may, in fact, be nowhere better epitomized.¹¹

1.1.2 A Consideration of Theological Parameters

This is representative of the fact that the Oneness movement’s own definitive core is *theological*, deriving its distinctive identity from outside the mainstream, beyond the shared experiential Pentecostal elements of Spirit

9. Oneness Studies Institute, “Report of The Oneness Studies Institute,” 1, 4–5, reporting 620 of a known 750 Oneness groups and Independents. The largest U.S. groups: (White) United Pentecostal Church International, Assemblies of the Lord Jesus Christ; (Black) Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ of the Apostolic Faith, Bible Way Church of Our Lord Jesus Worldwide; (Hispanic) Apostolic Assembly of the Faith in Christ Jesus; The largest concentrations outside the U.S. are in China, Ethiopia, Colombia, Mexico, Indonesia, India, the Philippines, Nigeria, and Uganda.

10. Barrett, Kurian, and Johnson, *World Christian Encyclopedia*, “Table 1–5,” 16–19. Oneness groups are not always identified in the WCE. Though dated, the WCE includes 18 million Oneness Pentecostals, see also, “Table 1–6a,” 20–24, with newer stats for the TJC (1.83 million) and AWCF (6.63 million), Barrett, Johnson, and Crossing, “Missiometrics 2006,” 27–30.

11. Anderson, *Introduction*, 10.

and gifts. The precursors for such a primacy of theological conviction were interwoven into the fabric of the Pentecostal experience long before the emergence of Oneness ideology in 1913. They became the pre-suppositional Oneness starting point which Jacobsen picks up on when he suggests that Haywood's Oneness theology leaves undefined precisely what the relationship is "between the human and the divine."¹² These precursors are seen in Pentecostal themes of "Back to the Bible," Jesus-centered worship, and the power of Jesus' Name. These latent elements were uniquely, and zealously, radicalized by Oneness reordering and redefinition.

With descriptions, rather than definitions, being the usual methodology within Pentecostalism, it is consistent that the chief self-descriptive identifier for Jesus' Name Pentecostals is that of "Apostolic." They are, first, experientially connected to the Spirit-life of the Apostles, but not without the essential life of the Word. In this way Oneness Pentecostalism should be understood as a prioritization of the Name of Jesus rooted in pre-Nicene Old Testament symbolism, intent upon capturing the essence of God's absolute "Oneness" in the person of Jesus Christ.

First of all, in order to grasp the framework of Oneness ideology it is essential to recognize its tenacious reordering of the varied and popular early themes of Pentecostalism itself. An important key to the Oneness theological position is the literal interpretive understanding of several critical scriptural referents, which observers often see as proof texts, regarding the nature of God and Christ, such as the biblical expression "God was manifest in the flesh." According to Oneness thought, Jesus is nothing less than the human manifestation of the One Mighty God, thus without allowance for differentiation within the divine nature. This starting point assures that the Old Testament El Shaddai Himself is the One Who is "God with us" in the Incarnation.¹³

The Oneness view conceives of Jesus as the Son, in that He is a man, but as the Father, in that He is the one God. Father and Son are seen as descriptive of composite human and divine natures in Christ in such a way that the man Jesus is understood as being indwelt of the Father, not of a *second* divine person. Similar reasoning is applied to the significance of Jesus' name. Being the God-Man, or God as a man, the result of a supernatural uniting of the divine and the human natures, the name Jesus

12. Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, 212; cf., Haywood, "One True God," 2, and idem, "Dangers of Denying the Father," 3.

13. These aspects of the theology were most popularized in two of Haywood's most significant articles, "The One True God," appearing in *Meat in Due Season*, *The Present Truth*, and *The Voice in the Wilderness*, and "The Great Controversy."

is believed to be His exalted name, the Name above every name. “This then is substantially what baptism . . . really means,” wrote early Oneness advocate Frank Ewart. “This is God’s way to grant *remission* of sins. Every place in the New Testament that baptism is preached or commanded it is specifically stated that it is for the *remission* of sins, because we are thus *identified* with him in his death, which cancels or *remits* the entire debt, and sets us free.”¹⁴

Observers of Oneness theology usually recognize that it emphasizes the preservation the Deity of Jesus within the context of a form of sequential modalism, with a theology of manifestations, offices, or roles, minus a theology of persons. Jesus is not to be limited to, or perceived as, merely a portion or person of, or in, the Godhead, but as *all* of God Himself, “*the* God of the whole earth,” that is, the one “Mighty God.”¹⁵ This is what is usually thought of as the absolute or undivided Deity of Christ. Haywood stated boldly, “Jesus Christ is BOTH the Father and the Son,” being both the one divine God and that same God in human manifestation. Jacobsen, therefore, regards his Christology as weak, calling it “more evocative than definitive,” concluding that “Haywood’s God was Jesus.”¹⁶

As one might suspect, there is virtually zero allowance made in Oneness thought for creedal formulations, Nicene or otherwise, regarding a divine *ousia*, or essence, within the varied *hypostasis*, or persons, or any of the doctrinal formulations of church councils through the centuries. Father, Son, and Spirit are not viewed as separate persons, but, rather, as distinct manifestations. As with the Hebrew shema, the New Testament declaration “God is one” is taken as an absolute one, a profundity, in which Jesus, though genuinely man, is the *one* God, the *one* eternal “I Am,” the *one* “Almighty.”

Although most criticized for its scarcity of Christological solutions to questions regarding genuine interaction and relationship between the natures, versus persons, as well as between the manifestations, Oneness theology, nevertheless, conceives of only one divine person, manifested as Jesus, indwelt of the *totality* of God.¹⁷ Deity, or divinity, in Oneness perspective, therefore, is a singular being, an unshared essence, demonstrating

14. Ewart, “Identification with Christ,” 4; italics added.

15. 1 Tim 3:16; Matt 1:23; Phil 2:9; Isa 9:6 (AV); 54:5.

16. Haywood, “Jesus Is Both,” 1; all-caps emphasis original; Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*, 211, 215.

17. Deut 6:4; Gal 3:20; 1 Tim 2:5; Exod 3:14; Rev 1:8; Col 2:9 (AV).

that Oneness theology does not so much ignore Nicaea, or Chalcedon, or any of the councils, for that matter, but rather disagrees with them.

Related theologically to the issues of theology proper and Christology are parallel restorative doctrinal beliefs within the Oneness movement, characteristic elements which are derived from the uniquely modal conclusions that the Father and Spirit are divine expressions of the person (singular) of God revealed in Jesus, the union of the Divine and the human in one person. These additional identifying doctrines to the “Oneness of God” are the importance of water baptism in the singular name of Jesus, rather than tripartite, speaking in tongues, and the experiential unfolding of these elements within the Acts 2:38, three-fold paradigm.

1.2 DEFINITION IN CONTEXT—RESTORATIONISM

“Dear Brother Haywood: . . . Praise God! Of a truth God is most graciously blessing his people who are willing to walk in the light.”

—LEE FLOYD, KINDER, LA¹⁸

Haywood’s signature designation for the Oneness version of the miracle of incarnation is the popular Oneness expression “O Sweet Wonder,” having become one of his own dramatic and theologically indelible imprints, from the poetic lines of his most famous hymn, “Jesus the Son of God.”¹⁹ From the mindset of early Pentecostalism rooted in an oft articulated vision of restoration, the wonder of new light via the Spirit’s eschatological working was a guiding theological impulse, never more obvious than within Oneness Pentecostal circles.

It is not difficult, therefore, to see how the principle of “oneness” became a restorative theological foundation and a means of expressing both the divine reality, “I and the Father are one,” as well as permeating the church experientially, “one, as we are.”²⁰ Surely “Oneness” believers, they argued, would, of all people, insist upon the “oneness of believers” themselves—one God, one church. This perception became foundational to their impulse for interracial worship.

Nowhere is the movement’s restoration tendencies more visible than in Haywood’s own writings and hymnology, emphasizing, for example,

18. Reported in *Voice in the Wilderness*, No. 18, October 1916, 1.

19. Haywood, “Jesus, the Son of God,” 5.

20. St. John 10:30 and 17:11 (AV).

the special nature of the name “Jesus,” corresponding “in mystery” even to Father and Spirit, so as to be “the mystery revealed” and “the Name of Names.”²¹ Thus, for Haywood, His name is the paramount proof of His Oneness, linked from the outset to a Pentecostal “revelation” and “restoration” of truth. The highly popular early hymn by Hattie Pryor, published in Haywood’s widely used hymnal, translated such ideology into vivid worship. “To get in the Church triumphant you must go the *water way*!” It illustrates the way in which the Oneness mindset held to this sense of restoration in the Oneness mindset, focusing, for example, on “evening time” events and a present fulfillment of prophetic latter rain. “*It shall be light in the evening time . . . It is the light today, buried in His precious name.*”²²

The new Pentecost was seen as jumping the intervening years back to “the way the apostles trod.” Though shaped by identical motifs and impulses as the broader movement, it extracted its unique identity and self-understanding circumscribed by a distinct theological essence. Nowhere was this more pronounced than with respect to the Name of Jesus. Haywood’s 1916 song, “The Name of God,” is clearly characteristic of the way in which “the Name” was emphasized as a latter day revelation. The repeated final line emphasized this “truth” as a focus of worship: “Jesus is . . . the name of God!”

Manna true came down from heaven, Bearing with it Jesus’ name,
Held in mystery through the ages, Now ‘tis spoken clear and plain;
Christ in you, the hope of glory, Lord of heaven, Lord of hosts;
And in Jesus is the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost.²³

The restorative impulse and motifs were certainly not uncommon throughout the earliest Pentecostal period. B. F. Lawrence, one of the first to chronicle the Azusa Street revival, echoed shared sentiments of a dominant early Pentecostal restorationism in his 1916 history, *The Apostolic Faith Restored*:

The Pentecostal Movement . . . leaps the intervening years crying, “Back to Pentecost.” In the minds of these honest-hearted men and women, this work of God is immediately connected with the work of God in New Testament days . . . They do not recognize a doctrine or custom as authoritative unless it can be

21. Haywood, “Name of Names,” 1–2.

22. Pryor, “Water Way,” 20–21.

23. Haywood and Smith, “Name of God,” 12, stanzas 1 and 5.

traced to that primal source of church instruction, the Lord and His apostles.²⁴

Blumhofer, who argues that a “strong restorationist component” was at the “heart of the definition of Pentecostalism,” has also suggested that Oneness Pentecostals are best understood as simply “more zealously restorationist . . . than the mainstream.”²⁵ Along with the “restoration” of “tongues,” power, and healing to the church, they were including in the restoration priorities the additional theologies which they viewed as equally biblical—the power of Jesus’ name, the Deity of Jesus, and the absolute Oneness of God.

1.3 GARFIELD THOMAS HAYWOOD

A major focus of this work has to do with the significant role of the Black Oneness pastor in Indianapolis, Garfield Thomas Haywood, as a preeminent leader within the early Oneness movement and as the chief architect of the post-Azusa Street revival interracial dream of the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World. Haywood was clearly the ultimate champion of the cause, defender and preacher par excellence, and foremost leader in the advancement and success of the movement’s early interracial successes.

Gary B. McGee’s popular history, *People of the Spirit: The Assemblies of God*, for example, although it does not reference the Oneness movement per se, does honor the solitary ministry of G. T. Haywood. As such, eighty eight years after Haywood’s “without the camp” article concerning the Assemblies of God, McGee refers to T. K. Leonard’s derision of Haywood in the 1916 General Council Assemblies of God debate. Leonard denounced the Oneness doctrine as “hay, wood, and stubble,” raising the temperature of the debate a few degrees, but in doing so, demonstrating just how closely Haywood and Oneness theology were perceived.

McGee states observantly, though, that the “influence of Haywood on the Assemblies of God, however, could not be put down so easily.” This is all the more amazing, considering Haywood was never a member of the AG. Haywood was so highly respected that he preached throughout the predominantly White AG circles, was a “featured speaker at early General

24. Lawrence, *The Apostolic Faith Restored*, 12; Lawrence associated with the movement for a time and was rebaptized.

25. Blumhofer, *The Assemblies of God*, 15, 237–38; cf., Ware, “Restorationism in Classical Pentecostalism,” 1019–21; and Hall, “The Restoration Impulse.”

Councils,” and was even “granted the privilege of speaking from the floor” in AG Council meetings.²⁶

Then, as now, Haywood’s leadership, especially as the consummate representative of the Oneness position, was unparalleled. Although Blacks were unwelcome in the Assemblies of God, Haywood had long been a part of the lesser known, and largely western and northwestern regional group, the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World. A lesser known fact is that the PAW originated as an Azusa-based organization, interracial from inception, though largely White, readily credentialing Blacks and Hispanics. It served “under the radar,” partly, perhaps, for this very reason, but certainly so as to avoid any taint of denominationalism and creed-making.

Nevertheless, historical and doctrinal details aside for the moment, Haywood fought long and hard to bring the Assemblies of God into the Oneness camp, in spite of the fact that, in 1914, it was a newly formed, intentionally lily white Pentecostal ministerial body, licensing only White ministers. He, evidently, had hopes for its interracial future, once secured for the Jesus’ Name cause. After the Assemblies of God, though, was lost to Oneness effort, the eventuality of such interracial hopes and theological vision were tied to the success of winning over the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World.

1.3.1 Haywood, Indianapolis, and Interracial Pentecostalism

Growing very rapidly under Haywood’s leadership, the Indianapolis church, by the time of his 1915 rebaptism, was one of the largest Pentecostal congregations in the country. His “Apostolic Faith Assembly” was also the most fully interracial Pentecostal congregation in the movement, “at one time . . . about sixty percent black and forty percent White.”²⁷ In light of the cultural norms, the limitations placed upon Blacks of the period, and the alarming rising presence of the KKK in Indiana, Haywood’s racial accomplishments were staggering.

26. McGee, *People of the Spirit*, 204–6 (a 665-page popular history). Haywood was emphatic that he was never credentialed, which is verified by the AG ministerial rosters, in Golder, *History of the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World*, 36.

27. Haywood, “The Convention,” 1: “There were about 1,000 or more present, besides the throng outside looking in at the windows.” Senate and Eleventh was enlarged by 1919 to seat 1,000, yet Apostolic Faith Assembly outgrew it, see Haywood, *Brief History of Christ Temple Church*, 37 and Golder, *Haywood*, 11.

Few ministers, regardless of race, were more beloved and admired for depth of ministry and leadership. In spite of its miscarried hopes, the Oneness movement's seven year "interracial era" and earlier interracial activities were entirely counter-cultural, inspired to success by a yearning for a return to a "new Pentecost," certainly, but also by the Pentecostal example of Haywood's life and ministry. Indianapolis became the focus of the fulfillment of the dream of interracial unity.

As Seymour's influence in the Azusa Street revival had caused the epicenter of Pentecostalism to shift to southern California, Haywood's international influence resulted in the Oneness movement's shift, from the west and northwest, to Indianapolis and the Midwest. In contrast, though, Seymour evidenced little organizational vision, except perhaps in the early efforts of the PAW, viewing Mason's Church of God in Christ as adequate, especially with its early White component.

With the 1910 division over Durham's sanctification views, Haywood, probably as early as 1911, represented a genuine schism within the Black Pentecostal leadership and thus a concern for both Seymour and Mason. As a radical convert to this new Finished Work theology Haywood was the chief visionary in the attraction and assimilation of large numbers of African Americans, a vision which also included the pre-Oneness PAW's original commitment to interracial unity. It was this very unity of purpose that would serve to later galvanize Haywood's influence as a major force for the Oneness movement early in 1915.²⁸

Certainly, the interracial failures of the Azusa Street revival for Haywood hit close to home, producing a yearning for the aspirations of what many viewed as an essential element of the original Pentecost. Additionally, the sting of such failures were felt more acutely when demonstrated at Azusa in the very actions of Haywood's own doctrinal hero, William H. Durham. With the exclusionary race policies of the AG following closely on the heels of such controversies it is little wonder that so many hoped for the rejuvenating "winds of God" to prove both the authenticity of the Oneness aspirations and the vitality of an original, all-inclusive Pentecost. They trusted that their own Apostolic heirs to "Pentecost" would do better.

R. C. Lawson, one of Haywood's most notable converts, founder of the Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ of the Apostolic Faith, lamented their later, ultimate failure to do so. "We trusted that the apostolic people would rise to redeem man by example and precept. It is all right to sing and shout and pray and preach loud, but what this poor world is longing for is living

28. See, for example, Tyson, *Early Pentecostal Revival*, 196–97.

the real love of God. For, after all, the greatest badge of discipleship of the Master is love.”²⁹ It was this belief in just such a “badge of discipleship” that successfully drew an ever increasing number of Black adherents to the movement.

More than perhaps any other figure, Haywood has remained a persistent legend, of sorts, for this racial heroism, as it were, and as a symbol almost larger than life. He has been described as a preacher’s preacher, and a teacher par excellence, sought after the world over. He has been noted, too, as having an exceptional pastor’s heart. Renowned Haywood convert, Morris E. Golder, said of him: “I can recall Bishop Haywood coming to our home, riding on a bicycle, to pray . . . Holding us on his knee while praying . . . He was a dynamic preacher, preaching always under the anointing of the Holy Spirit. His voice rang like an expensive cathedral bell when he spoke under God’s unction.”³⁰ He was also a truly exceptional musical talent, composer, and poet.

Jesus, Thou art the good Shepherd, Our gateway to enter in
Prophet Thou art, King and High-priest, Who sacrifice made for sin
Altar Thou art, and the incense, Thou art the Lamb that was slain
Jesus, Thou art the Temple, The Vail that was rent in twain.³¹

1.3.2 Haywood’s Impact on Black Oneness Pentecostalism

Former AG Superintendent E. S. Williams, in an interview with James J. Tinney, unflatteringly and quite inaccurately, referred to Haywood as “a White man’s Negro.” The characterization is indicative, though, of the failure of many in early Pentecostalism, especially in the AG, to reconcile their racial attitudes with their theology. Tinney writes:

The primary person responsible for the inter-racial character of Apostolicism was, of course, G. T. Haywood. In fact, it may be argued that Haywood, more than any other person, was responsible for the growth and development of the Oneness movement, especially in its formative years. No figure looms as large in all historical accounts of the movement . . . Haywood, as it turns out, becomes the central link between all the early leaders

29. Lawson, *The Anthropology of Jesus Christ*, 34.

30. Golder, *Life*, 70, 76.

31. Haywood, “Jesus Our All in All,” *The Bridegroom Songs*, 34, the popular song-book released by Haywood in 1916.

of both the Trinitarian and Apostolic movements, and among both White and Black Pentecostals.³²

In contrast, another commonly held perception is that Haywood seemed to transcend race, at least in as much as he overcame long held, previously unyielding resistances to integration, and initiated, along with an array of White, Black, and Hispanic leaders, a meaningful and viable interracial organism, genuinely unique to its day. Only after more than thirty years, from 1906 to the interracial failures of 1937, did adaptation to cultural racist "norms" and race division sever the interracial ties in irreversible finality.

Also attributable to Haywood's leadership, to a large extent, is the impressive growth of Black Oneness Pentecostalism, suggestive also of its broad appeal within the African-American and other Black culture populations. Black Oneness growth has, in fact, consistently outpaced that of Whites. A few small groups formed directly from the Azusa Street revival and from COGIC, but Haywood and the interracial vision of the PAW were the major influence attracting African American ministers. This tendency continues to the present, with the largest of the Oneness constituency groups being Blacks, with 40 percent worldwide, Asians thirty, Hispanics twenty, Whites only nine. The recent withdrawal of the Apostolic Church of Ethiopia from the UPCI made it the largest Black Oneness constituency globally, although the PAW remains the largest Black Oneness group in the U.S. In the U.S., of the estimated 4.5 million Oneness Pentecostals, 60 percent are African-American.³³

1.4 RESEARCH SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS

The paucity of prioritized preservation has resulted in minimal availability and accessibility of critical Oneness Pentecostal primary source archival material, reflecting a decidedly oral, non-reflective early history.

32. An early Azusa participant, Williams became AG Superintendent in 1929; see Tinney-Williams 1979 Interview, cited in Tinney, "The Significance of Race in the Rise and Development of the Apostolic Pentecostal Movement," 61, 66.

33. See Oneness Studies Institute "Report of The Oneness Studies Institute," May 2009, comparing a 1999 report constituency total of 15–20 million. Additionally, Blacks in the report totaled 11,230,000 in 215 U.S. groups and 208 groups outside the U.S. The PAW had 1.5 million worldwide (1998), approaching 2 million (2010), the UPCI, 3 million in 4,200 churches in the U.S. and Canada and 30,000 churches elsewhere.

EARLY INTERRACIAL ONENESS PENTECOSTALISM

The earliest historical account did not appear until 1947, when one of its key participants, Frank J. Ewart, published *The Phenomenon of Pentecost*.³⁴ Much later, in 1965 and 1970, respectively, two works by UPCI historians were published, Fred J. Foster's *Think It Not Strange* and Arthur C. Clanton's *United We Stand*.³⁵

After this period African American historical works began to appear, the first being Morris E. Golder's 1973 *History of the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World*. The first Haywood biography, *Before I Sleep*, appeared in 1977 by James L. Tyson, along with Golder's second work, *The Life and Works of Bishop Garfield Thomas Haywood*.³⁶ In 1980 James C. Richardson published a broad study inclusive of the PAW, *With Water and Spirit: A History of Black Apostolic Denominations in the U.S.*, and Ross P. Paddock wrote a PAW history, *Apostolic Roots: A Godly Heritage*, in 1985 as a popular PAW history. Tyson later produced his two most significant studies, *Chalices of Gold* (1990) and *The Early Pentecostal Revival* (1992).³⁷

A very brief work on Haywood appeared in 1968 by Paul Dugas, *Life and Writings of G. T. Haywood*. The other known Haywood biographies are more recent and thorough studies, the first being Victoria M. Peagler's *Garfield Thomas Haywood (1880–1931): From Migrant's Son to an Internationally Renowned Churchman* in 1993. The other, most recent biography, *A Man Ahead of His Times* by Gary W. Garrett (2002), is uniquely significant in its incorporation of author interviews with the last living key eye-witness participants in Haywood's life and times.³⁸

The most comprehensive work on Oneness Pentecostalism has been *Our God Is One: The Story of the Oneness Pentecostals*, a work which has enjoyed a fairly wide circulation. *Our God Is One*, the author's Wheaton College MA thesis, published in 1999, is a detailed study of the movement's history, theology, and present expansion. A popular history of the

34. Ewart, *The Phenomenon of Pentecost*. A few, more limited autobiographical works also appeared.

35. Foster, *Think It Not Strange*, revised as *Their Story: 20th Century Pentecostals*; Clanton, *United We Stand*, revised, by Charles E. Clanton, *United We Stand: Jubilee Edition*.

36. Golder, *History of the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World* and idem, *The Life and Works of Bishop Garfield Thomas Haywood*; Tyson, *Before I Sleep*; cf., Sims, *From Grace to Glory*.

37. Richardson, *With Water and Spirit*; Paddock, *Apostolic Roots*; Tyson, *Chalices of Gold* and *Early Pentecostal Revival*.

38. Dugas, *The Life and Writings of Elder G. T. Haywood*; Peagler, *Garfield Thomas Haywood*; Garrett, *A Man Ahead of His Times*; Garrett is the Founder/Director of the Apostolic Archive International, Joplin, Missouri.

era was published in 2007 by J. L. Hall entitled *Restoring the Apostolic Faith*.³⁹ Remarkably few Oneness academic histories, though, have been produced, including biographical academic studies. The indication may be a limited interest in Oneness self-reflection, with emphasis remaining on the theological, although Robin Johnston's 2010 historical presentation, *Howard A. Goss: A Pentecostal Life*, is a clear exception.⁴⁰

The early periodicals themselves, therefore, remain the highest priority resource, especially since, at least up to about 1918, these writings tended to virtually chronicle the emerging movement. The effort of amassing extant issues has served to open a crucial primary source window into the era and allow access to a fairly cohesive, if sketchy, recapturing of details of the movement's early history. The largest collection of available pre-1925 archived periodicals may be that of the Oneness Studies Institute, Atlanta, Georgia, used in this work. The UPCI's Center for the Study of Oneness Pentecostalism, though, houses the largest total collection of archival material. Another important archival source is that of the Apostolic Archives International, Joplin, Missouri.

With respect to the most critical data from the OSI periodical collection, Haywood's *The Voice in the Wilderness*, Ewart's *Meat in Due Season*, originally *The Good Report*, D. C. O. Opperman's *Blessed Truth*, and Andrew D. Urshan's *The Witness of God* have been the most significant. Though rarely biographical, these publications, like the books they spawned, chronicled the early events, people, places, and theology as it was actually happening. Haywood, for example, started his periodical in 1910, and by 1922 it had become the official organ of the PAW, changing its name to *The Christian Outlook*.⁴¹

39. French, *Our God Is One* and "Oneness Pentecostalism in Global Perspective"; Hall, *Restoring the Apostolic Faith*.

40. Johnston, *Howard Goss*. A section on Oneness history was also included in the third volume of Bernard's *History of the Christian Church*; cf., also, Bernard, *The Oneness of God*; Chalfant, *Ancient Champions of Oneness*; Norris, "I Am"; Segraves, "Oneness Theology," 344ff.; Boora, *Apostolic and Post Apostolic Baptism*; idem, *The Oneness of God and the Doctrine of the Trinity*, and idem, *Oneness and Monotheism*.

41. The OSI collection includes 5 issues of *The Voice in the Wilderness*, 1916, 1918, and 1921, 10 issues of *Meat in Due Season*, 1915–1919, 7 issues of *The Good Report*, 1911–1914, 8 issues of *The Blessed Truth*, 1918–1921, and 103 issues of *The Witness of God*, 1919–1933. *The Christian Outlook*, 1922–1931, has been made available via the Apostolic Archives, www.apostolicarchives.org.

1.5 HISTORIOGRAPHY OF ONENESS PENTECOSTALISM

Historiography, considered “an established subfield within the discipline of history,” has potential for offering its own interesting insights into Pentecostal self-definition and perspective. The scant historiographical interest within the Jesus’ Name movement aside, the emergence of scholarly treatments and the altering of attitudes with respect to the movement toward a more broad-based inclusivity are important developments.⁴²

An example of an inclusive scholarly treatment is Robert Mapes Anderson’s ground-breaking 1979 study of Pentecostalism, *The Vision of the Disinherited*. Although from outside Pentecostalism itself, this scholarly history inclusively highlighted the substantial role of the Oneness movement as an integral part of the broader historical developments. “Interpretations for Fundamentalism which identify it as primarily theological in nature,” he explains, “must take into account a Pentecostal doctrinal spectrum of such variety and complexity that even *unitarianism* may be found within it.”⁴³

Anderson, also, is one of the first to grasp the racial implications of the AG “Trinitarian Controversy” itself and was ground breaking from the standpoint of Oneness studies. The book’s wide reception as a milestone in Pentecostal historiography influenced the initiation of an attitudinal shift toward Oneness Pentecostalism, from negligible, slanted, prejudicial treatment to more positive, scholarly, inclusive treatment.⁴⁴ As a balanced historical analysis of early Pentecostalism, it is probably unsurpassed, emphasizing the historical, socio-economic, and cultural paradigms, such as fundamentalism, dislocation and social deprivation, which shaped the movement.⁴⁵

Another major breakthrough has been David Reed’s 1978 Boston University dissertation which represented the first major scholarly, yet sympathetic treatment of the movement, entitled “Origins and Development of Oneness Pentecostalism in the United States.” Though not published until 2008, this has been the landmark study of Oneness Pentecostalism, having been thoroughly revised under the title “*In Jesus’ Name*”: *The History and Beliefs of Oneness Pentecostals*.⁴⁶ The book was awarded

42. Cerillo, “The Beginnings of American Pentecostalism,” 249.

43. Anderson, *Vision of the Disinherited*, 176–94; italics added.

44. Ibid., 177–78, 189, 330.

45. Ibid., 5, 136; cf. the critiques in Smith, “Disinheritance of the Saints,” 15–28.

46. Reed, “Origin and Development”; “*In Jesus’ Name*”; and “Oneness Pentecostalism,” 936–44; cf., Howell, “The People of the Name.”

the prestigious *Pneuma* Book Award of the Society for Pentecostal Studies in 2009.⁴⁷ A recognized scholar in Oneness studies, Reed's book and other scholarship are the most familiar available to academics and casual observers alike.

"*In Jesus' Name*" argues, essentially, for the identification of Oneness theology within the tradition and christologies of early Jewish Christianity, and, thus, for the movement's Christian legitimacy, drawn largely from interpretations of Danielou's *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* and Longenecker's *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. These same Jewish tendencies, Reed suggests, later prevalent in aspects of early Evangelicalism, influenced Oneness ideology, including, for example, the strong Christological differentiation between natures. Oneness Pentecostalism is viewed as a plausible re-emergence of these Jewish categories of thought said to "recur in renewal movements" in church history.⁴⁸

Reed also sees Oneness theology as a truncated, Jesus-centric view of God that results from a proclivity for christocentric reductionism which naturally obscures Christ's "identity within the Trinity."⁴⁹ "On the eve of the Oneness revelation most of the doctrinal elements were in place. Patterns and themes had already been developed and debated in Holiness, Evangelical and Pentecostal circles."⁵⁰ Ultimately, Reed argues that it is "a sectarian movement within the wider parameters of the Church rather than a cult, . . . heterodox rather than a heretical movement."⁵¹

Although pejorative treatments of the movement are usually theological, rather than historical,⁵² Thomas Fudge's *Christianity Without a Cross* (2003) appears to be the exception. The study focuses on theorized differences regarding Oneness salvation theologies rather than primary sources.⁵³ Interestingly, though, Fudge's research highlights quite another

47. French, "In Jesus Name," 267–73.

48. Reed, "In Jesus' Name," 69, 233–44, suggests that the strong Oneness differentiation between natures hints of inevitable Nestorianism; cf., Danielou, *The Development of Christian Doctrine* 1:7–9, 148, 151, 407, 46, 154–56; also, Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*, 41–46, 128.

49. Reed, "In Jesus' Name," 33–34.

50. Ibid., 50, 135.

51. Reed's analogies are based on Stark and Bainbridge, "Of Churches, Sects, and Cults," 117–31, and Hexham and Poewe, *New Religions as Global Cultures*, 27–40; see also, Reed, "In Jesus' Name," 9.

52. Boyd, *Oneness Pentecostals and the Trinity*, 9, 10, 12; see also, Dalcour, *A Definitive Look at Oneness Theology*; Reed, Review of *A Definitive Look*, 166–69; Ross, *The Trinity and the Eternal Sonship of Christ*; Beisner, "Jesus Only" Churches.

53. Fudge, *Christianity Without the Cross*, also from the perspective of a former

development initiated much earlier. Unwittingly, fresh interest in the movement was piqued by the 1980s due, at least partly, to the writings and scholarship produced in an exodus of former members eager, from their disparate perspectives, to reflect upon their familiar, if discarded, tradition.

A 1984 symposium convened at Harvard, called by a former Oneness participant, Jeffrey Gill, to explore “Aspects of the Oneness Pentecostal Movement.” Although the symposium papers were unpublished, they were significant in demonstrating the direction of theological reflection and scholarly interest in Apostolic origins, theology, and expansion.⁵⁴ Some, who represented especially critical scholarship regarding the movement, including James Tinney, were represented, including, for example, those who were researching the movement’s considerable expansion within autochthonous groups.

Roswith Gerloff was working on the Black Oneness trans-Atlantic and British movement. The first volume of her published work was subtitled *With Special Reference to the Pentecostal Oneness (Apostolic) and Sabatarian Movements*. Presenters Ken Gill and the Oneness scholar Manuel Gaxiola were researching the Mexican Oneness movement.⁵⁵ It should be noted, too, that Iain MacRobert in 1988 published important research from his studies at the University of Birmingham, *The Black Roots and White Racism of Early Pentecostalism in the USA*,⁵⁶ broadly inclusive of Pentecostal racial issues in general. MacRobert, originally from the Oneness tradition himself, brings those insights into his analysis of the racial realities which have plagued Pentecostalism.

An example of the more sensible and inclusive treatment of the movement can be found in the popular Zondervan resource on Pentecostalism, *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal Charismatic*

Oneness Pentecostal; Gill, “Book Review, Thomas A. Fudge, *Christianity Without a Cross*,” 149–50, especially, “the hypothesis . . . he has failed . . . to substantiate.”

54. See “First Occasional Symposium on Aspects of the Oneness Pentecostal Movement,” Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, MA, July 5–7, 1985. At least five of the Harvard presenters were formerly Oneness themselves: David Reed, Joseph Howell, Stephen Graham, Gregory Boyd, and Dan Lewis.

55. Gerloff and Gill completed their PhD research at the University of Birmingham, UK, and both were published by Peter Lang; see Gerloff, *A Plea for Black British Theologies*; and Gill, *Toward a Contextualized Theology for the Third World*. Gaxiola’s PhD research was completed at Birmingham, unrelated to Pentecostal studies, but his MA research on Mexican Oneness history was completed at Fuller, see Gaxiola, “The Serpent and the Dove.”

56. MacRobert, *The Black Roots and White Racism* and “The Spirit and the Wall.”

Movements, containing more than seventy articles regarding aspects of Oneness Pentecostalism. Recent histories of the Assemblies of God, too, such as Blumhofer's, are far more inclusive than previous works. Also notable are the works of Douglas Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit* and *A Reader in Pentecostal Theology: Voices from the First Generation*, which include sizeable sections on Haywood, Larson, and Urshan, as well as a chapter entitled "Oneness Option."⁵⁷

Allan Anderson's *An Introduction to Pentecostalism* and Amos Yong's *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh* represent new ground in this regard.⁵⁸ Probably startling to many Oneness Pentecostals themselves, Yong, nevertheless, in "Oneness and Trinity: Identity, Plurality, and World Theology," posits the issues relative to Oneness Pentecostalism as primarily illustrative of both the possibility and the necessity of inclusivity within a newly envisioned trajectory for global theology. Yong's effort has been to allow for a Pentecostal acknowledgment of a working of the Spirit in the context of other religions. Yet what must not be missed here is the reversal of attitudes to such an extent that Oneness Pentecostalism is not merely included, but is now at the discussion's core.⁵⁹

The SPS Trinity-Oneness Dialogue, though, seems to have been less significant than examples such as these.⁶⁰ In his most renowned writing to date on the Spirit, Frank Macchia, chair of the "Trinitarian side," reported a total ambivalence, in his words, of the meaning of "the Oneness protests."⁶¹ Unfortunately, without the public release of the annual dialogue papers and discussion, the success or failure of the effort, including reports of frustration and ambivalence, cannot be analyzed.

57. Burgess and Van Der Maas, eds., *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*; Blumhofer, *The Assemblies of God*; Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit*; and idem, *A Reader in Pentecostal Theology*.

58. Cf., Anderson, *Introduction*, especially "Chinese Pentecostal Churches," 132ff., and Castleberry, "Pentecostal History from Below," 271–74.

59. Yong, *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh*, 203–34.

60. See "Oneness-Trinitarian Pentecostal Final Report, 2002–2007," 203–24; also, Catholic scholar, McDonnell, ed., *Presence, Power, Praise*, 526.

61. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 115, 116, 110–25, 251. Macchia sees the problem as a Oneness failure to recognize their own Spirit baptism as a "Trinitarian act of God" and as a Trinitarian structured experience; cf., Macchia, "From Azusa to Memphis," 214–15.

1.6 CONCLUSION—SCOPE AND SEQUENCE

The ministry of G. T. Haywood, the history of the PAW, and the unfolding history the entire Oneness movement (1901–1931) cohere rather nicely as parallel events. Each of the following chapters attempts to retrace the sequence of these events, interpreted in light of the background and the context of the multiplicity of participants, yet without losing sight of Haywood's key role. First, the most significant pre-Oneness developments are the emergence of Parham's Pentecostal and Seymour's Azusa Street revival, especially in terms of their impact upon Oneness Pentecostalism (1901–1911).

By 1912 (Chapter Four) the structures taking shape which will be pivotal to the development of Jesus' Name Pentecostalism include both the AG and PAW, but most importantly the leadership of J. J. Frazee and the "pre-merger," pre-Oneness PAW (1912–1918). This Pentecostal force, which had been aggressively moving forward since 1913, moved into a new era by late 1918, the fully interracial, integrated era of the leadership of the E. W. Doak and G. T. Haywood (1918–1924). Unfortunately, the unraveling of this vision occurred in 1924, and the era of diffusion and independency ensued from 1925–1931 and beyond.

Of course, beyond the sequence of events lies the focus and scope of emphasis and impact on developments. The Azusa Street revival can be seen as central in its ideological influence, its shaping of leadership, and its structural influence, via the PAW. Considerably less obvious is the Frazee era obscurity historically which demands special attention. These previously obscure events must be traced through Frazee's inter-connectedness to Los Angeles, the relocation to Portland, Oregon, the nature of the PAW, and Frazee's own personal theological journey, all of which can be evaluated, for the first time, in light of relevant new documentation. The swirl of historical events must be included in this analysis as thousands were swept into the so-called "new issue" from the AG, the PAW, and the length and breadth of Pentecostalism.

Elucidation is also necessary regarding the Indianapolis context, with the roots of the early AG in its borders, shaping Haywood's ministry and hopes of real unity and an interracial Pentecost eradicating race divisions. Even more important is a meaningful comprehension of that interracial golden era in which the unique counter-cultural ideology of the Spirit of Pentecost actually informed and shaped the human structures and relationships of both church and ministry. On the other hand, several issues

are critical in the overall analysis, none more significant than the query regarding the Black "roots" of Pentecostalism or Haywood's particular forms of response to the racism that would shatter the dream of interracial harmony in the PAW. And regardless of varied attempts one might make at contextual, historical distancing, ultimately, the questions regarding present application resurface, not the least of which is whether or not historical hindsight can result in an ability to learn from past mistakes.

In the busy days immediately prior to the 1916 AG convention and the finality of their own ouster from their own ministerial body, many, like Haywood, were pressing hard for a new vision of fellowship. Rushing just such a message to the presses, Haywood wrote the following prayer for widespread distribution.

God help us not to be afraid to break our alabaster boxes . . . To-day many of God's People have some nice little alabaster boxes, which they prize very highly . . . Break your denominational boxes and let the odor fill the house! Break your second work of grace boxes . . . Break your manmade views concerning water baptism and let the name of Jesus have preeminence . . . Break your trinity boxes and let the glory of God be revealed in the face of Jesus Christ.⁶²

Oneness Pentecostalism, perhaps, then, was the story of a tenacious breaking of the boxes of tradition within just the right context and such that these creative minds were able, surprisingly, to succeed in actually capturing the imaginations of a generation of hopeful proponents bent upon a dream of restoration of a meaningful, living new Pentecost. That vision carried with it a Spirit-centered commitment to an "all flesh" acceptance of all races, though, admittedly, in radically new theological "boxes."

62. Haywood, "The Alabaster Box," 1.