

FRIEND JOSEPH JOHN GURNEY



1788

August 2: [Joseph John Gurney](#) was born at Earlham Hall near Norwich, England, the 10th son of [Friend John Gurney](#), a partner at the Gurney Bank. He would become a prominent Quaker minister and author, as well as following in his father's footsteps as a banker in Norwich. He was a younger brother to Friend Elizabeth Gurney Fry.

1817

➡ Friend Joseph John Gurney joined his older sister, Friend Elizabeth Gurney Fry, in attempting to bring an end to capital punishment and improve the quality of life for prisoners.



➡ March: When Friend Elizabeth Gurney Fry and Friend Joseph John Gurney pled with the Home Secretary to spare the life of Harriet Skelton, a maidservant to a solicitor who, under pressure from her husband, had passed forged banknotes, Lord Sidmouth warned the House of Commons that these reformers were dangerous since the effect of their reforms would be to “remove the dread of punishment in the criminal classes.” This prisoner would be escorted to the gallows right on schedule:


Name	Place of execution
Harriet Skelton	Newgate

1818

 [Joseph John Gurney](#) became a recorded minister of the [Religious Society of Friends](#).



1819

 Publication in London of [Friend Joseph John Gurney](#)'s NOTES ON A VISIT MADE TO SOME OF THE PRISONS IN SCOTLAND AND THE NORTH OF ENGLAND, IN COMPANY WITH [ELIZABETH FRY](#); WITH SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF PRISON DISCIPLINE. At Aberdeen, they reported, the county gaol was housed in an ancient, square tower. In the woman's room measuring fifteen feet by eight, there had been confined five women and in addition one sick child. At Newcastle-upon-Tyne, prisoners were unable to exercise. In the gaols of Glasgow, Nottingham, Sheffield, Leeds, York, and Liverpool conditions were at least as bad as those that had been discovered at Newgate.

[READ THE FULL TEXT](#)

1824

➡ Publication at London of [Friend Joseph John Gurney](#)'s OBSERVATIONS ON THE RELIGIOUS PECULIARITIES OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

STUDY THE 7TH EDITION



On holiday in Brighton [Friend Elizabeth Fry](#) was alarmed by the presence of beggars and sponsored a Brighton District Visiting Society the members of which were to visit the homes of the poor to see what might be done. Soon such visiting societies would be springing up all over Britain.

1825

➡ Publication of [Friend Joseph John Gurney](#)'s ESSAYS ON THE EVIDENCES, DOCTRINES AND PRACTICAL OPERATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY.



1828

➡ November: Joseph Fry declared bankruptcy. Although she had not been involved in her husband's business dealings, this of course impacted [Friend Elizabeth Fry](#)'s good name. In the past subscriptions to the Association for the Improvement of the Female Prisoners in Newgate had been sent to Fry's Bank, and so rumors began to circulate that some of this money had been used by Joseph Fry to help solve his financial problems. Although this was not accurate, for a time such stories would damage the reputation of charities in which Friend Elizabeth was involved. Friend [Joseph John Gurney](#) took over Fry's business interests, made arrangements for his debts to be repaid, and settled an annuity of £1,600 on his sister Friend Elizabeth.

1831

➡ Publication of [Friend Joseph John Gurney](#)'s HISTORY, AUTHORITY AND USE OF THE SABBATH.



1832

➡ Publication of [Friend Joseph John Gurney](#)'s THE MORAL CHARACTER OF JESUS CHRIST.




1834

➡ London publication of the 7th edition, revised, of [Friend Joseph John Gurney](#)'s OBSERVATIONS ON THE RELIGIOUS PECULIARITIES OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS, retitled less offensively as OBSERVATIONS ON THE DISTINGUISHING VIEWS AND PRACTICES OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

STUDY THE 7TH EDITION



1837

 [Friend Joseph John Gurney](#) would be on campaign trips against human slavery, to the North American continent and to the islands of the West Indies, until 1840.



1843

[Friend Joseph John Gurney](#)'s RELIGION AND THE NEW TESTAMENT.



FRIEND JOSEPH JOHN GURNEY

FRIEND JOSEPH JOHN GURNEY

1844

June 15: At the Temperance Hall in Jersey, [Friend Joseph John Gurney](#) made a presentation opposing the ingestion of [alcoholic](#) beverages the gist of which would soon be printed up as an 8-page tract, WATER IS BEST.



THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT

Waldo Emerson and Isaac Hecker went to Harvard MA for a weekend with the Alcott family in their three rooms in the Lovejoy home (Fruitlands was no more) and with Charles Lane, and to tour the Shaker community. Emerson commented in his journal:

A second visit to the Shakers with Mr Hecker. Their family worship was a painful spectacle. I could remember nothing but the Spedale dei Pazzi at Palermo; this shaking of their hands like the paws of dogs before them as they shuffled in this duncedance seemed the last delirium. If there was anything of heart & life in this it did not appear to me: and as Swedenborg said that the angels never look at the back of the head so I felt that I saw nothing else. My fellow men could hardly appear to less advantage before me than in this senseless jumping. The music seemed to me dragged down nearly to the same bottom. And when you come to talk with them on their topic, which they are very ready to do, you find such exaggeration of the virtue of celibacy, that you might think you had come into a hospital-ward of invalids afflicted with priapism. Yet the women were well dressed and appeared with dignity as honoured persons. And I judge the whole society to be cleanly & industrious but stupid people. And these poor countrymen with their nasty religion fancy themselves **the Church** of the world and are as arrogant as the poor negroes on the Gambia river.

1845

Publication of [Friend Joseph John Gurney](#)'s PUSEYISM TRACED TO ITS ROOT.



[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edward Bouverie Pusey](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Edward_Bouverie_Pusey)

1847

January 4: [Joseph John Gurney](#) died where he had been born, at Earham Hall near Norwich, England.

In the High Sierra, the Donner Party disaster continued on this day and the following days. Mrs. Reed, her daughter Virginia, Milt Elliott, and Eliza Williams set out to cross the mountains, leaving the smaller Reed children with others. First Eliza, then the others, gave up and returned to the cabins. The Reeds took refuge with the Breens, Eliza with the Graveses.



COPYRIGHT NOTICE: In addition to the property of others, such as extensive quotations and reproductions of images, this "read-only" computer file contains a great deal of special work product of Austin Meredith, copyright © 2008. Access to these interim materials will eventually be offered for a fee in order to recoup some of the costs of preparation. My hypercontext button invention which, instead of creating a hypertext leap through hyperspace —resulting in navigation problems— allows for an utter alteration of the context within which one is experiencing a specific content already being viewed, is claimed as proprietary to Austin Meredith —and therefore freely available for use by all. Limited permission to copy such files, or any material from such files, must be obtained in advance in writing from the "Stack of the Artist of Kouroo" Project, 20 Miles Avenue, Providence RI 02906. Please contact the project at kouroo@brown.edu.

"It's all now you see. Yesterday won't be over until tomorrow and tomorrow began ten thousand years ago."

- Remark by character "Garin Stevens"
in William Faulkner's INTRUDER IN THE DUST



Prepared: October 13, 2008

ARRGH: THE AUTOMATED RESEARCH

REPORT GENERATION HOTLINE



This stuff presumably looks to you as if it were generated by a human. Such is not the case. Instead, upon someone's request we have pulled it out of the hat of a pirate that has grown out of the shoulder of our pet parrot "Laura" (depicted above). What these chronological lists are: they are research reports compiled by ARRGH algorithms out of a database of data modules which we term the Kouroo Contexture. This is data mining. To respond to such a request for information, we merely push a button.

Commonly, the first output of the program has obvious deficiencies and so we need to go back into the data modules stored in the contexture and do a minor amount of tweaking, and then we need to punch that button again and do a recompile of the chronology – but there is nothing here that remotely resembles the ordinary “writerly” process which you know and love. As the contents of this originating contexture improve, and as the programming improves, and as funding becomes available (to date no funding whatever has been needed in the creation of this facility, the entire operation being run out of pocket change) we expect a diminished need to do such tweaking and recompiling, and we fully expect to achieve a simulation of a generous and untiring robotic research librarian. Onward and upward in this brave new world.

First come first serve. There is no charge.
Place your requests with kouroo@brown.edu.
Arrgh.

[WHAT IS THIS STUFF DOING ON THE INTERNET?](#)

It occurs to me that I owe you an explanation, how come I am placing all this Quaker information and Rhode Island historical information on the Internet. Here it is, here's my explanation. Five years ago I came to Providence, Rhode Island from Southern California as a retired person, and as a member of the Religious Society of Friends, and as part of making this move, I promised my wife that I wouldn't just hang around our townhouse – but would find a way to get out there and make myself useful. Since the Moses Brown School was a Quaker institution, and since it is just down the street from our new digs in Providence's East Side, I thought I would fill in the slack hours of my retirement by providing volunteer services for the school.

The first thing I did to be of service to the school, was write up a biography of Friend Moses Brown, founder of the school, and a history of the legacy that he left to provide for the institution that he had founded. When I had this all written up (you can read what I had written at <http://www.kouroo.info/kouroo/thumbnails/B/FriendMosesBrown.pdf>), I took it over to the teachers and staff at the Moses Brown School, and presented it to them. "Here," I went, "Take this, make any alterations and elaborations as you see fit, take my name off of it and put your name on it, use it in your publicity, and use it in the teaching of your Quaker students. I give you all rights."

I was startled by their response. Instead of going "Thank you, obviously you put a lot of work into this" they went "So, who's going to pay us for looking at that?" They were more than uninterested, they were downright hostile.

And things went downhill from there. As I created more and more of these Quaker biographies, about Friend John Greenleaf Whittier the Quaker poet, about Friend Lucretia Coffin Mott the antislavery activist, about Friend Paul Cuffe the black and Native American sea captain –electronic stuff that they could use in their teaching if they chose, stuff that the computer-savvy kids could relate to a whole lot better than dusty old yellowed falling-apart Quaker paper publications– relations kept on getting worse and worse. After months and months of my finangling and their stalling, I was allowed to make a presentation of my materials to their "History Department" staff, in a classroom at the Moses Brown School. When I arrived to give my presentation, they refused to prepare the classroom's presentation equipment, and so I was unable to use their overhead projector or other tools. Instead I needed to stand in front of them holding up my laptop so they could see the screen, while attempting to explain this Kouroo Contexture I had created by use of the FrameMaker tool, and how it worked to display Quaker biographies and general Rhode Island history. They were politely unimpressed and uncommunicative, but they did grant me permission to load the database I had created into their History Department computer, a computer which was in a locked conference room not normally accessible to their students.

strange and unexplained intransigence I had been running into.

So I presented the machine and the database to our meeting's Library Committee. A member of the Library Committee then stood up after Meeting for Worship one First Day and publicly thanked me for my "magnificent gift," and briefly described it for the benefit of the members and attenders of the Quaker meeting.

But after this thanks, the machine and the database failed to appear in the meetinghouse library. Finally I confronted the Library Committee with "What is going on?" I learned from this committee, with reluctance, that the Ministry and Counsel committee of our meeting had taken the machine and the database away from the Library Committee. This Ministry and Counsel committee has members who are deeply involved with the operation of the Moses Brown School. They were keeping the stuff under lock and key in a dark room upstairs. Evidently they were looking it over? Then I found out they sabotaged the machine by ripping up the cover in order to get at the hardware OFF switch - forcing the machine into a hard shutdown from which it was not possible to restart the database. They had, for reasons of their own, rendered the machine unusable.

Well then, I fixed the machine, doing a file system check and restore routine, and getting everything re-initialized. Then I found myself being eldred and warned. I was to examine my conduct! Nobody had asked me to do this! Nobody wanted me to do this! What did I think I was going to pull off? I should be grateful that they didn't just throw the machine, and my Quaker and Rhode Island historical database, into the Dumpster! I found that, for having written these materials on Quaker history and Rhode Island history, and for having donated this PC to the meeting, I needed to be treated like some kind of criminal.

They appointed a censorship committee, to meet with me and put pressure on me, falsely terming it a "Listening Committee." This committee contained a Moses Brown employee who was livid in his anger. He protested that of course the Moses Brown School was a Quaker school, because his own children went there. He protested that of course the Moses Brown School was a Quaker school, because its football team went by the name "Quakers." Disregarding the fact that the school has had free use year after year of several hundred millions of dollars of Quaker educational assets, he indignantly protested that one of the problems was that the Quakers weren't "doing anything" to help the school. Where I had reported that in the graduating class of 2004 not a single student had gone on to a Quaker institution of higher education, he accused me of a falsehood - because, since then, in the following year's class, 2005, he indignantly pointed out, one-count-'em-one graduate of the school had gone on to a Quaker institution of higher education thus demonstrating that the school was Quaker.

One of the arguments for what is presently going down at the Moses Brown School has been the argument that the Moses Brown children come trooping over in columns to our meetinghouse for their own episodes of silent worship, therefore they are receiving a Quaker education. I should tell you that this is not an argument that I find persuasive. There's nothing particularly

religious about being required to sit still for a period of minutes. This sitting still **can** be religious in nature, if properly done (in a Quaker context, in a Zen context, etc.), but it can also be merely disciplinary, or merely an opportunity for daydreaming. It is only in the context of our Quaker lives that our silent worship becomes religious, which means, that if the silent sitter knows nothing whatever about Quaker lives, then the silent sitting is of necessity without religious content. It is not education because no fact is conveyed. Instead, it amounts to indoctrination, or persecution, and is naturally resented by every school child who has ever encountered it anywhere. Quite typically, being leaned on in mandatory Chapel in an institution of higher education drives young people away from religion for the rest of their lives. Thus we create persons such as Nobel-Prize-winner K. Barry Sharpless, who attended Friends Central School in Philadelphia in the 1950s, who now writes about his religious education as follows:

From 6th through 12th grades I attended a Quaker school on the Philadelphia city line. Twice a week the entire school attended Quaker Meeting, silent gatherings except when someone received a personal call to speak. I never got a call, but nonetheless my head was full: I thought about fishing and boats. Or else I thought about when next I could get from Philadelphia to our cottage on the New Jersey Shore in order to go out fishing in a boat.

Quakerism is "a historical religion" in a very important sense. What other religions attempt to convey to the following generation by creed and dogma and symbols and scriptural stories, we attempt to convey to the following generation through the study of previous Quaker lives. When, therefore, we deny to the following generation an opportunity for them to learn about these previous Quaker lives, what we are denying them is a Quaker education, and what we are replacing Quakerism with amounts to sheer self-righteous posturing.

The censorship committee accused me of having failed to follow traditional Quaker procedures, in offering this PC and these materials to the monthly meeting's Library Committee. The fact that this accusation is the precise inversion of the truth—that it has been me who has been following traditional Quaker procedures and others who, in this instance, in their insistence upon the primacy of censorship, have not been following traditional Quaker procedures—seems entirely lost on them.

Someone had written to a Quaker discussion group on the internet, "outing" a teacher at the Moses Brown School as entirely unqualified. This Moses Brown employee on my censorship committee brought this message to the group (with its identifying headers removed), and accused me of having posted that message. I of course insisted that I was neither the person who had originally carried this information as to the unqualified teacher out of the school, nor the person who had originally posted this information to the Quaker discussion list on the internet – but this did not persuade him to stop treating me with contempt. The information was "hurtful," end of story. I was going to continue to be gunned to death by these yappity yappity Quaker attack puppies, end of story.

I repeatedly asked the obvious question – whether this information, information that had originally been supplied by, and then had first been posted to the discussion list on the internet, by persons other than myself, was true, or was false. No response, as to whether this information as to an entirely unqualified teacher was true, or was false, has ever been supplied. Why should they answer such a question – the information was “hurtful,” end of story. We have transited from being Friends of the Truth (yes, we used to call ourselves that), to being instances of “Mr. Politenessman” and “Ms. Churchlady.” Evidently it is deemed to be nobody’s business but the administration of Moses Brown School, whether they have appointed a teacher who is entirely unqualified. Evidently, it is inappropriate to be concerned over the quality of the “Quaker” education that is being offered. (This callous disregard for the truth causes me to wonder whether my censorship committee, which terms itself an appointed “Listening Committee,” might not more accurately be characterized as an appointed “Enemies of the Truth” committee!)



The censorship committee has repeatedly accused me of a refusal to negotiate in good faith. I would offer that it is not my negotiation, but their own, that has been disingenuous, and I will offer two instances in corroboration of their bad faith. One of their complaints has been that the PC I donated is simply too large, and another is that as an object of value it is too likely to be stolen. When I brought my laptop to one of the censorship meetings, and pointed out that I might donate it, my gesture was met with nothing more than a stony silence, despite the fact that the laptop would have overcome the “to large” objection. (Clearly, when they had made out that their concern was with size, they were simply telling a lie as to the nature of their concern, or they would not have been exactly as absolute in regard to their rejection of the gift of a laptop PC as to the gift of a desktop PC.) Since then, the meeting has celebrated the acquisition of what the meeting newsletter describes as “a Roland console model piano with a full, rich sound which is a substantial piece of furniture.” It is at least twice the size of the largest desktop computer, and also, it fully qualifies as an object of value that is available to be stolen. They have not indicated why it is that they would be concerned that someone would steal a donated laptop, but unconcerned that someone would steal a donated electronic piano.

Again, one of the complaints of this censorship committee has been that electronic materials are maintainable, and thus I could sneak in at any time and load new, unapproved materials onto the machine without their knowledge or consent. When I offered that it was not necessary that the electronic materials be maintained –that I would not insist upon maintaining them, that there were technical ways by which the materials could be

preserved in the form they had been originally as donated— my gesture was again met with nothing more than a stony silence. (Clearly, again, when they had made out that their concern was with the introduction of new, unapproved materials in a surreptitious manner, they were simply telling a lie as to the nature of their concern.)

I have, I acknowledge, made us of the word "lie" in relation to some of these activities of the meeting's Ministry and Counsel committee. (You'll notice that I am not apologizing for this: you will not catch me apologizing for holding Quakers to a higher standard of truth.) For instance, when they posted an innocuous notice, on the machine that they were privately demanding that I remove from the building, to the effect that all meetinghouse computers had simply "been turned off for the summer," and then Summer went into Autumn into Winter while they demanded that I remove this machine that had simply been turned off for the summer, I taunted them by way of response by pointing to this innocuous notice: "Your lie has expired, time for you to invent a new lie." In general, their attempt has been to sneak around in the shadows, concealing what they were attempting in the way of censorship from the view of the general membership of our monthly meeting. Their response to my use of this term "lie," in regard to various of their efforts to conceal what they are doing, has been email to this effect: "For you repeatedly to impugn other people's characters (by calling them liars) serves only to alienate them and to end any possibility of dialog." In no case have they offered any specific explanation or justification for any of their remarks which I have been categorizing straightforwardly as lies, in no case have they apologized, and in no case have they altered or revised any of their lies.

It is as if this group were a group of Puritans rather than a group of Quakers. It is as if this were the 17th Century rather than the 21st. We are still debating censorship as if no-one had ever heard tell of freedom of speech and of the press. We are concealing what is going down as if we had never been known as the Friends of the Truth.

My donated PC, with the Quaker and Rhode Island historical materials it contains, has since disappeared from the locked room in the meetinghouse. I do not know what has happened to it. (I do not suspect that they have actually thrown it into the Dumpster as threatened. I suspect that, instead, probably, they have carried it off and have secreted it somewhere out of the public view.)

The general membership of our meeting has had no idea what has been going on. All they know is that I have been publicly thanked. Some year and a half earlier I had put my original biography of the life and works and writings of Friend George Fox in the context of his times on the internet at <http://www.kouroo.info/RSOF/FriendGeorgeFox.pdf>, and yet the local stonewalling of my efforts has been so total that the general membership of my own monthly meeting was still, after this year and a half, totally unaware that I had done this work, that I have authored a 390-page biography of this founding father. Thus, recently, Jordan Vernier needed to ask the other members

of our meeting for the origination of a quote from Friend George's "journal":

> Does anyone know the original wording of this (rewritten)
> quote by George Fox? I've been looking for it for a while.
>>"Be patterns, be examples in every country, place, or
>> nation that you visit, so that your bearing and life
>> might communicate with all people. Then you'll happily
>> walk across the earth to evoke that of God in everybody.
>> So that you will be seen as a blessing in their eyes
>> and you will receive a blessing from that of God within them."

– and in response, no-one referred Jordan to page 126 of my biography of Friend George! Every single person on our Ministry & Counsel Committee is very much aware of this work, yet none wanted to alert him to the fact that it existed!

Now, this Ministry & Counsel Committee has repeatedly asserted, that the suppression and stonewalling that they are practicing is due to the fact that I have written this offensive protest against their censorship (the very document that you are even now reading), a protest which they never dare characterize as false but which they repeatedly characterize as "hurtful." That this is a false description of my historical work can easily be demonstrated, technically, by going back to one of the historical "mirror" sites of the history of the internet which have captured snapshots of internet content at various earlier points in time (the current version of the file, in which hypertext links to other historical files have been added, is at <http://www.kouroo.info/kouroo/thumbnails/F/FriendGeorgeFox.pdf>), you will see that it had been created in about 2002 well before this protest and therefore had not contained this protest. Their stonewalling of my work began considerably before I began to protest against their stonewalling, and therefore for them to now allege that their censorship is due to my having protested it is, straightforwardly, disingenuous. It is an inversion of the truth: it puts what came before, after, and what came after, before. To put this in the Anglo-Saxon, the Quaker elders of my meeting are lying.

All this activity of censorship that has been going on behind the scenes in our meeting, has been entirely surreptitious, and their explanation for their secrecy has been that they are seeking to "protect me" from the general censure that obviously would be my fate were my activities known. My protests, that I do not want to be thus protected, have been completely ignored. The true explanation, of course, for why they have been sneaking around in the shadows, is not that they have been trying to protect me from censure, but that they have been trying to protect **themselves** from censure. (When someone videotaped the beating of Rodney King by police in the street, from the front window of an apartment facing the scene, the first reaction of these US coppers was that private citizens should not be allowed to make such videotapes of police brutality – the police, however, would need to bring themselves kicking and screaming into the world of responsibility for one's own conduct, because this new spotlight on police actions was not going to go away – with this new technology generally available, citizens were simply not going to stop videotaping acts of police brutality.

Similarly, when military personnel began sending around picture-phone images of brutality inside Iraq prisons, the first reaction of the US brass was to ban all taking of picture phone pictures inside their military prisons – the military was going to need to learn that this new spotlight on covert abuse was not going to go away, for with this new technology generally available, individual soldiers were simply not going to stop snapping images of instances of prisoner abuse. These are two instances of good technological development and its benevolent social consequences, minicams to bring our coppers under control and picture phones to bring our brass under control. Similarly, now, the initial reaction of this Ministry and Counsel committee of the local monthly meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, to my attempt to provide usable electronic Quaker educational materials, has been this egregious attempt to ban Quaker history as in the same pot category with internet pornography, from which our children do need to be protected – but our control committee of meeting elders is going to need to learn now, that the good new technology of the Internet is not going to go away anytime soon, and that instead of being able to continue their long habit of sneaking around in the shadows whispering falsehoods to one another, they are going to have to learn to conduct their control operations with a spotlight of truth and disclosure shining directly upon their conduct. This transition is going to be painful, admittedly, but the outcome is eventually going to constitute a real improvement in Quaker governance.)

Incidentally, in recent years there has been another Quaker historian in this Providence meeting, Friend Rosalind “Posie” Cobb Wiggins. She had served as a teacher at the Moses Brown School, as clerk of our meeting, and as curator of our New England Yearly Meeting Archives, archives which are now kept at the Rhode Island Historical Society on Hope Street in Providence, Rhode Island. Since then she has published works about Friends and African Americans in 18th- and 19th-Century New England. Unable to sufficiently compromise in her historical researches into Quaker race history, she was driven away. She is now dead, buried as an Episcopalian, and I have pledged in her memory that I am going to prove myself to be of sterner stuff – that I will never allow myself to be driven away by these elders and their intransigence in the manner in which she had been driven away.

Posie encapsulated her difficulties with the Friends in an article “Paul and Stephen, Unlikely Friends,” which appeared in Quaker History, Volume 90 Number 1, for Spring 2001. The article appears on the surface to be about problems in the Providence Monthly Meeting in the 19th Century, which is polite, but if you read beneath the surface of this bland treatment of past problems, you can see that Posie was describing the same problems as were, more than a century later, driving her away from the Providence Monthly Meeting. Now, at the time of Posie’s death, I obtained a copy of this article, which is not otherwise available in Providence (not, for instance, at the Brown University Library, or at the Moses Brown Library, or in our meeting library), and I bound it and specially presented it to a member of our meeting’s library committee. I described the article as a reproach of our behavior, and asked that it be

included in our library for us to consider. Since that point in time, months and months have elapsed, the one copy we have of this article in Quaker History has disappeared, and the members of our library committee have nothing to say to me. It is my considered opinion that this material, because it would induce re-examination, has been suppressed by the local thought police.

Twice I have requested an audience before our Ministry and Counsel Committee. The first time, I requested this verbally of the Clerk of our Monthly Meeting, Friend Elizabeth Zimmerman, after our Meeting for Business at Saylesville Meetinghouse. The second time, I requested this verbally of Friend William Monroe after our Meeting for Worship on a First Day, while he was sitting in the meetinghouse's library room as the official representative of our Ministry and Counsel Committee. Both requests for a personal appearance before this committee have, to date, been ignored. All official contacts from this committee to me have been by email.

These folks seem to have not yet learned the First Rule of Holes, which is "When you're in a hole, stop digging." Rather than make public disclosure of which of them are on the payroll of the Moses Brown School and therefore guilty of a conflict of interest (as I have formally requested that they do, in our Meeting for Business), they have responded that they have discovered a flaw in my paperwork, a flaw which means that although everyone had been presuming, for five years, that I was a member of this meeting, actually I am no member – and since I am no member, they don't have to respond to my questions about their private finances or their possible conflicts of interest. I honestly have come to suspect that they would disown me – if they dared. So, for the time being, what I have been doing, in frustration, is distilling my historical materials, which are in FrameMaker 7.0, into Adobe Acrobat .pdf documents of the sort that I could put up onto a website on the Internet – documents such as this file you are presently looking at. These Acrobat distillations are extremely limited in comparison with the database materials that can be seen by use of FrameMaker, but any port in a storm. My thought is, maybe the students at the Moses Brown School, as they are surfing the Internet from their home PCs, will come upon these Acrobat materials. -Well, that's a forlorn expectation I know, but it is what I am presently reduced to.

I am left in an inexplicable situation of great hostility. What has caused this strangeness to occur? It seems to me that there are a number of possibilities:

- A.) Am I dealing with a bunch of Quaker Luddites, people inherently hostile to anything electronic?
- B.) Is there something very wrong about my approach to these historical materials, something that is rendering all my work totally wrongheaded and unacceptable?
- C.) Have I failed to find the proper channels, through which I should have gone but through which I have neglected to go?

D.) Would it be, maybe, that this Moses Brown School is a Quaker institution in name only? Is the school, maybe, as I have belatedly begun to suspect, merely a toney pricey prep school, designed around getting middle-class white kids into name colleges, with this Quaker stuff being merely window-dressing designed to make the school appear congenial, and, importantly, designed to hold onto the Moses Brown endowment of Quaker educational funding – but with the school authorities basically hostile to the idea that their students should ever learn anything real about Quakerism and its people and its history?

Of these four possibilities, A, B, C, and D, I would submit that possibilities A, B, and C are non-starters. If these people were Luddites, they would be a strange sort of Luddite indeed, because they themselves have computers, they send Email, etc. If, on the other hand, there is something wrongheaded about my approach to the writing of Quaker history, then I would have expected their hostility to manifest itself **after** the officials had looked at the materials that I had created, rather than **before** they had even so much as glimpsed the materials. If it is that I have failed to go through proper channels, then for sure nobody has suggested this to me as an explanation: nobody has offered to me any idea of some channel of exploration that I might fruitfully pursue, other than "Go away." So, at the present time, I am left only with possibility D. Is it, maybe, that Moses Brown School is merely a pretend Quaker school – a Quaker school in name only – and that they are finding me annoying because I keep coming at them as if they were interested in teaching their students something about Quakerism, when actually they are not at all interested in such an agenda?

My personal suspicion is that what we have here is the classic case of the slowly cooking frog. They say that if you put a live frog in a pot of cold water, it will hide in the bottom of the pot and as you heat the pot on the stove, it will continue to hide down there, making no attempt to free itself, until little pieces of frog meat begin to appear at the bubbling top of the pot. I don't know if that is so or not, never having conducted the requisite experiment, but it may well be that the transition of this Moses Brown School, from being a Quaker institution to being a hoity-toity college preparatory school for middle-class white kids in which Quakerism is actively shunned, has been so gradual over the years, that the Quakers have not noticed that the institution is continuing to sit on several hundred millions of dollars of Quaker educational assets, while lately delivering to us, in the way of Quaker education, what amounts to chump change.

The school proclaims that it has an annual budget of approximately 20 million dollars. However, nothing on its balance sheet reflects the real worth of the hundreds of millions of dollars of Quaker educational assets that it holds within its grasp. If those hundreds of millions of dollars of real assets are captured in their accounting as part of their annual budget, I believe, a case can be made that their annual

budget is not approximately 20 million dollars, but instead approximately 30 million dollars. In other words, Quakers provide about one third of the annual budget for this school. In return for this, in return for funding a full third of the school's annual operational budget, we receive one class, maybe. This is a crime which we Quakers are committing against ourselves.

Buddy Cianci is a product of this school. (For those of you who are not up to date on Rhode Island history: Buddy Cianci was the mayor of Providence, and has been in prison for his egregious personal conduct, and is at this moment back in prison again, this time as the result of a federal prosecution for egregious political corruption.) Is it really necessary for me to point out, that if this Moses Brown School which bills itself as a Quaker school had continued to be a Quaker school, rather than becoming a pretend Quaker school – Buddy might at this moment be the mayor of Providence rather than a jailbird? – That we might, given half a chance, have been able to teach this man some ethics and self-discipline?

The East Side of Providence, Rhode Island has had two major benefactors, the Ebenezer Knight Dexter who gave us his farm for use as a city poor farm and the Friend Moses Brown, right across Lloyd Avenue from Dexter's poor farm, who gave us his farm for a Quaker school. The city broke Mr. Dexter's will in the 1950s, and where the poor farm used to be is now – a Brown University sports complex. (You can read about the breaking of the Dexter bequest at <http://www.kouroo.info/kouroo/places/DexterAsylum.pdf>.) Right now, even as you read this, an attempt is being made by the administrators of the Moses Brown School to similarly break the bequest of Friend Moses Brown that originally set up their school. Obviously they are struggling to eliminate whatever is left of the influence that the New England Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends once had over this once Quaker school, but of course they are not admitting that this is their agenda. In our Friends Meeting, which is adjacent to the Moses Brown School campus, we have one member who is most especially affiliated with the Moses Brown School, our present clerk Elizabeth Zimmerman. She is the teacher who presided over the ghettoization of Quakerism at the school, by confining it to one-count-'em-one course that they offer to their graduating class. Now, when the school began to attempt to break the will of Friend Moses Brown, one of our first points of concern was to discover what in fact had been in the will of Friend Moses Brown – where might we obtain a copy of this will, to read it, and discover what it had said? It proved to be extraordinarily difficult to obtain a copy. The New England Yearly Meeting was the custodian and executor for this will, but we were unable to obtain a copy of the will from the New England Yearly Meeting. The archives of the New England Yearly Meeting are stored at the New England Historical Society on Hope Street, yet these archives contain no copy of this foundational document. The permanent staff of the New England Yearly Meeting was unresponsive to our request. Therefore, Friend John Kellam and I undertook a historical investigation, and we discovered a clerk's copy of the will in storage with Providence real estate records under the mansard roof of our Town Hall downtown. Friend John and I carefully transcribed the

Moses Brown bequest document, word for word, and our idea was that we would distribute this document to the members of the Providence Monthly Meeting by putting it on our meeting's listserv, <providence_quakers@yahoogroups.com>. When we attempted to communicate this document, however, our meeting's clerk, Friend Elizabeth Zimmerman, prevented us from so doing.

Why, under such circumstances, would the clerk of our Quaker meeting seek to prevent the communication of the truth? If you would like to attempt to answer such a question in your own mind, you will find the contents of the Moses Brown bequest document at pages 106-121 of <http://www.kouroo.info/kouroo/thumbnails/B/FriendMosesBrown.pdf>. Read it and weep.

A comparison may be useful, between the financial underpinnings of the two discrete major investments of the New England Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends. They are the New England Friends Home in Hingham, Massachusetts and the Moses Brown School in Providence, Rhode Island. Careful comparison reveals that they are in the same boat. The same deceitful accounting obfuscations are in play at both venues. This will call for some explanation of the concept "return on investment."

A couple of decades ago, Cutler Cleveland, an energy scientist at Boston University, helped develop a concept known now as "EROI," or Energy Return On Investment. This is a simple ratio of the number of useful therms of energy which one can extract from a natural resource such as an underground pool of oil, for each therm of energy we must put into the extracting, refining, and distribution of the natural resource. He developed this measure during a period in which our usual EROI was as high sometimes as 25 to 1, although nowadays a return of 15 to 1 is more usual. Also, we are considering the exploitation of the tar sands of Alberta, Canada, which must be heated during processing, at an estimated prospective EROI of but 4 to 1. In what follows, I will be writing of an "EROI," but my EROI will not be an Energy Return On Investment. Rather, it will be an Educational Return On Investment. How much do we need to put into the Moses Brown School per year in order to output one unit of Quaker education during that year, and is that the most bang we can expect to get for our buck? How much do we need to put into the New England Friends Home per year in order to output one unit of proper elder care, and is that the most bang we can hope to get for our buck?

The issue here is that, year after year, Quakers are being prevented from finding out what their ROI is. They are being stonewalled endlessly.

We need to know what ROI we are achieving in order to know whether it would be better:

- A.) to continue our current institutional trajectory,
or
- B.) to liquidate our assets on the open market, put the resultant moneys into an investment pool, and dispense the annual proceeds of this fund in furtherance of our objectives.

In the case of the New England Friends Home, would we be able to provide better elder care for more people by retaining the existing home, a converted mansion, or by closing this establishment and funding the retirement of selected elder persons at nearby for-profit commercial facilities?

In the case of the Moses Brown School, would we be able to provide a Quaker education better by continuing to support the institution that now uses our facilities rent free, providing its students with little or no Quaker-specific educational materials, or by sending this institution an annual rent invoice (without an appraisal we cannot know, but my personal back-of-the-envelope calculation indicates something in the range of \$10,000,000 per year) and using the proceeds to fund a specifically Quaker educational context? What is our "EROI," our Educational Return On Investment?

In both the case of the New England Friends Home and the Moses Brown School, as I have previously indicated, the institution is currently stonewalling our efforts to determine the cash-out value of the asset, and thus preventing us from discovering whether or not our ROI is the best that might be generated. They are insisting that they will not allow their performance to be realistically measured. Their argument is that it isn't nice to question people's intentions and performance in such a manner. The methodology with which this stonewalling is implemented is a refusal to allow a full independent audit and asset appraisal made in accordance with the highest and best economic uses to which the assets might be subjected.

It is to be noted that there are clear conflicts of interest at play. Some of the people who are loudest in denial have financial interests at stake, such as being on the institutional payroll, having received a subsidy for their own children, or anticipating the future receipt of such a subsidy. The people who have these financial conflicts of interest are refusing to disclose them – arguing that their financial affairs are none of anybody else's business, this whole affair amounting to a disruptive incursion upon their personal privacy!

Rather than those with financial conflicts of interest being identified and barred from the governing process, the inmates have taken charge of the asylum. Those with conflicts of interest are on the inside of the governing process reacting with hostility in order to totally exclude anyone who is not subject to their same conflict of interest. Those without a conflict of interest are now being considered unreliable, untrustworthy, loose cannon.

Have you seen the 1997 Hollywood movie "Men in Black"? There is a farmer character "Edgar," played by Vincent D'Onofrio, who lurches through the movie filled with malice, who is lurching and filled with malice not because he is a farmer or because he is Vincent D'Onofrio but because his body has been hollowed out by enemy aliens who resemble cockroaches, who are manipulating his corpse, using it as their "cover" as they attempt to achieve

their own mysterious designs.



This resembles the present Moses Brown School, lurching through its current educational trajectory of preparing the children of the well-to-do white people of Providence for their upward mobility as graduates of Ivy League colleges. The body of this Quaker school has been hollowed out by non-Quakers who do not in any way resemble malicious enemy alien cockroaches, who instead in every way resemble plain simple Quakers, and who have in this manner made themselves the proud custodians of the educational grant that had originally been made by Friends Moses Brown and Obadiah Brown for the sheltered-from-the-lay-world education of young Quaker scholars. The purpose of this grant, which today amounts to an endowment worth several hundred millions of dollars, has been in this manner entirely subverted and misappropriated and realigned into free money, available only for this new use. The school's moles have over the years become more Quaker than the Quakers, and dominate all the regulatory committees, never forgetting which side of the butter their bread is on, institutionalists who serve but one master. Follow the money and you will see that, in a classic instance of regulatory capture, the tail now wags the dog.

The nature of this seems to come into focus in the latest update to the recommendations of The Project Group, to the Board of Overseers of Moses Brown School and New England Yearly Meeting, adapted April 16, 2007, in their Recommendation No. 5- Separate Incorporation for Moses Brown School. In this recommendation, I note, interestingly gone are all their previous demonstrably bogus attestations that their actual concern is merely for issues of liability and insurance! "That Moses Brown School be separately incorporated and that title to all real estate (land and buildings) used by the School be transferred out of New England Yearly Meeting, subject to existing deed restrictions, and into a corporate entity to be identified by the Board of Overseers of the School. The purpose of the recommendation is to recognize, and formally reflect, the long standing reality that the operations of the School are, and have been, de facto separate from those of New England Yearly Meeting." As I parse this recommendation, it seems to me to mean that 1.) those currently in power in the school administration don't want to have the Quaker property appraised for its current market value,

because 2.) they don't want it to be known how much it is worth, because 3.) they don't want to be asked to pay for it or to pay annual rent on it, but instead 4.) they want to appropriate it to themselves in order to be able to use it more freely for purposes which are noncongruent with Quaker purposes, 5.) they are resolved not to correct the "conflict of interest" issues that have to do with their infiltration of their governing boards, amounting to "regulatory capture," and 6.) they need to appropriate the Quaker property by means of some legal maneuver that will render to what is blatantly a theft the appearance of legitimacy.

The above has been reinforced, during August 2007 at the New England Yearly Meeting, by the official report and recommendations of this "Project Group." It reported to the assembled Quakers that there is a "Friends Council on Education" and this trade association has set up a standard for what can be considered to be "a Quaker school." This minimum standard does not include any requirement that the instructional curriculum of "a Quaker school" include any information about Quaker history. The instructional curriculum of "a Quaker school" can in fact be entirely indistinguishable from the instructional curriculum of any secular institution of education. They can offer their students information about Quaker history, or not, and it doesn't matter one little bit one way or another. All that is required, from the standpoint of the students' acquisition of information, is that they offer incidental lip service:

- "Intentionally teaches about and models Quaker testimonies" (this isn't documented, so you'll just have to take our word for it that we do in fact do this; by the way, did I mention that this won't be on the test?)
- Conducts business in the manner of Friends (the students of course are not present so this has nothing to do with them; just take our word for it that we know how Friends conduct business and just take our word for it that we actually do follow such procedures)
- Holds regular meetings for worship (although the students don't need to be there, and any non-Quaker parent can forbid their child to be included)
- Has a substantial portion of Quakers as Board members (for board members we of course want rich people, because of course we expect them to become donors)

This "Friends Council on Education," this excuse for low standards, has a presence on the internet at <http://friendscouncil.org/> as a trade association similar to, say, the cheese council that urges: "Eat more cheese!" How could we tolerate that they so blatantly not have a requirement, that the curriculum of instruction of a school for it to be considered a Quaker school must differ to some degree from the curriculum of instruction of a lay school, must importantly include the offering of considerable factual information about the history of Quakerism? Quakerism is in a very important sense a historical religion, for in the entire absence of a theology and a creed, the only way we have of learning what a Quaker ought to be, is by careful reconsideration of the lived experiences

of real Quakers down through the centuries.

To the contrary, insists Friend Don Gates of the Providence monthly meeting. "What the word 'Quaker' indicates is 'excellence.' Any school that is excellent is therefore a Quaker school, and that is true regardless of whether the school offers its students any information about Quakerism." According to Friend Don's estimate, therefore, even a Roman Catholic school taught by nuns on behalf of the local diocese, or a Moslem madresseh teaching the memorization of the Qur'an, if what they offer is an excellent education, fully qualify as "Quaker schools."

To the contrary, also, insists Friend Carl T. Bogus of the Providence monthly meeting, a professor of law. Friend Carl, a person who had attended the Moses Brown School during a time period in which he admits that there was no Quaker presence whatever in the daily life of the school, declared to me: "I have not read anything that you have written but I have seen the origination document by Friend Moses Brown. Its requirements have been fully met whenever there is a school -any school, regardless of the extent to which it is Quaker or not Quaker-on the premises." According to Friend Carl's estimate also, therefore, even a Roman Catholic school taught by nuns on behalf of the local diocese, or a Moslem madresseh teaching the memorization of the Qur'an, whether or not what they offer is an excellent education, if only they are geographically situated upon the property donated by Friend Moses Brown, fully satisfy the stipulations of the deed of trust.

You will be able to understand, from the manner in which I am writing this report, that I myself consider such attitudes to be preposterous evasions of responsibility, if not tantamount to collusion in theft. Dear reader, if you have any thoughts on this subject, please do inform me at <Kouroo@brown.edu>. Do you find the bequest document of Friend Moses Brown to be problematic? Do you find my internet materials wrong, or offensive? Am I approaching you in an offputting manner? Is there some explanation **other than** that the Moses Brown School is actually a mere pricey toney prep school, not a Quaker institution at all? Is there some explanation **other** than that the clerk of our Providence Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, and her Ministry & Counsel Committee, are captive to this outside influence from an educational business corporation, and are presently representing, not the Quaker interest, but instead the interest of these nearby pseudo-Quakers? Is there some explanation **other** than that pseudo-Quaker infiltrator and mole employees from this school have long invaded this "House of the Lord" and by now have transformed it conveniently into a den for thieves? My inquiring mind needs to know!