

With the land case out of the way, Scofield went back to politics. The 1872 election campaign was conducted by the Republicans with a fervor most unusual for a state which seemed so solidly Republican. Samuel C. Pomeroy, United States senator for the previous 12 years, was up for re-election. He would have to face the new Legislature which would convene in January 1873. (This was years before the 17th Amendment.) Quite remarkably, the Republican Campaign Committee made no endorsement of Pomeroy and "forgot" to mention him in the early days of the campaign. Being senior senator, Pomeroy was still a power. In many areas hostility to him was intense. His reputation was getting a bit "ripe" from his handling of land deals which seemed questionable. But even without official blessing, Pomeroy was active in the campaign which on election day produced a major Republican victory.¹⁸

Early in the campaign, Scofield's renomination to the Legislature in the 4th District had been blocked. Some sources blamed Pomeroy. But Ingalls felt that Scofield's presence in the Legislature was essential. So Scofield filed from Nemaha County using Seneca as his base.

There is a non-contemporary newspaper account which says that Scofield established residence in Seneca, such being in conformity with accepted American political mores.¹⁹ Trumbull states that the move to Seneca was made because of the Regis Loisel case.²⁰ But Scofield's interest in the 8th District (Seneca) did not develop until after Judge Hubbard had decided the land case.

Here appears another discrepancy. When this writer checked Seneca in 1976, reference sources there reported no record of a residence for C. I. Scofield in the crucial period.²¹ The Atchison City Directory for 1872-1873 lists Scofield in the same office and residence as does the previous edition.²²

Obviously a man in Scofield's position did not keep his family in a sod hut on the prairie. The land office in Atchison was still active. Carpetbagging was then popular in other parts of the country under encouragement from the same sources which produced The Secret Six and their influence on Kansas. Whether or not Scofield established residence, he was accepted by the voters in the 8th District (Nemaha County) and elected in November 1872 as a Liberal Republican.

When the new Legislature convened on January 14, 1873, the most important business facing it was the election of a United States senator, either Pomeroy or his successor. Feeling was so intense that except for the formalities of organization, the two houses of the Legislature could not get down to serious business.²³ Pomeroy, looking out for himself, had come to Topeka and set up headquarters in the Tefft House hotel.

Pomeroy and anti-Pomeroy caucuses met nightly. The anti's were considering the names of then-Governor James M. Harvey, C. A. Lodge,

John M. Price and W. A. Phillips. Strenuous efforts were being made on behalf of each candidate to line up every member of the Legislature.

Realizing that his political life was at stake, Pomeroy, operating from his headquarters at the Tefft House, was making lavish expenditures for entertainment. He had engaged the main floors at all the principal hotels in Topeka. It was reported that he was buying votes like merchandise.

Scofield's activities at this point were not noted by the contemporary press.²⁴ (There is some difficulty reconciling press reports with what Trumbull reconstructed from his interview with Scofield 66 years later.) Indications are that Scofield was against Pomeroy but not openly committed to anyone getting overt attention from the anti-Pomeroy caucus. It is likely that some behind the scenes moves on behalf of Ingalls were already being made.

On the morning of January 28th, the two houses were required to cast separate votes for senator. The tally for the two houses was Pomeroy 50, Harvey 24, with 57 being needed to nominate. The houses adjourned hastily and the groups went back into caucus. The caucus of the anti's was enlivened by the story that Senator York of Montgomery County had gone over to Pomeroy.

According to Trumbull's story, on the afternoon of the 28th, Scofield was asked how he stood on Pomeroy's re-election.²⁵ "Against Pomeroy," Scofield replied. Then the anti's, according to Trumbull, asked Scofield for a suggestion of another name. Scofield reportedly said, "Ingalls," but sought assurance that Ingalls had a reasonable chance of defeating Pomeroy.

The now unidentified "anti" claimed to have evidence that Pomeroy would be defeated. He asked Scofield to try and commit Ingalls without specifics of his confidence in an Ingalls victory. Ingalls was that day still back in Atchison. A wire from Scofield impressed him with the urgent need for his presence in Topeka.

A special train on the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe brought Ingalls to the Capitol. When he arrived he conferred with Scofield. He acted as though he was not as confident of defeating Pomeroy as were those who were pushing his nomination. Confirmed politician that he was, Ingalls was willing to follow a trend. He did allow his name to be placed in nomination.

The caucus balloted all night. For the first 19 ballots, John M. Price (also of Atchison) was the leading candidates, lacking at one time only three votes for the nomination²⁶ After the 19th ballot, the support for C. A. Logan was given to Ingalls, sewing up the nomination. Scofield was asked to produce Ingalls. Ingalls came into the caucus room and made an impressive speech for "clean politics" in Kansas. The group remained in session all night, even having breakfast brought in to them early on the 29th.

After breakfast, the Pomeroy faction assembled in the House Chamber. The anti's came in shortly after, followed by the State Senate. The lieutenant-governor presided. Pomeroy was nominated to succeed himself as United States senator in a speech which recited his great service to the State of Kansas.

State Senator York arose and made a speech reciting his activities in Topeka in recent days, then to the utter amazement of all parties said: "Mr. President, I rise to second the nomination of S. C. Pomeroy, but" said Senator York, drawing out from his pocket a bundle, "not to a set in the United States Senate, but to a cell in the Kansas State Penitentiary at Leavenworth."²⁷ He called a page to his side and said: "Mr. President, I am sending you by the hand of this boy, seven thousand dollars in greenbacks that were handed to me last night by S. C. Pomeroy for my vote." In the light of later developments, much of the drama may have been for political effect rather than genuine moral concern.²⁸

In the silence that followed York's act, Scofield arose and nominated John J. Ingalls to the post of United States senator from Kansas. Member after member rose to second the nomination.

The lieutenant-governor, tense with excitement, asked for other nominations. None were made. The vote was taken. Every vote was cast for John J. Ingalls. Many, besides York, with Pomeroy's money in their pockets dared not vote otherwise than for Ingalls. The lieutenant-governor announced: "Every ballot has been cast for John J. Ingalls. I hereby declare him duly elected senator from Kansas for the United States."

Scofield was asked to produce Ingalls. In five minutes he returned to the hall with the victor. "Dazed" by the unexpected turn of affairs, Ingalls made a brilliant speech of acceptance.

CHAPTER 8 NOTES

1. *The Secret Six* is one of the most outstanding works of revisionist history to come out to date. Otto Scott is now associated with R. J. Rushdoony in the Chalcedon "think-tank." Remarkably, no standard periodical, no matter how serious, no matter how conservative, has taken notice of Scott's work. It has been noticed only in the seemingly "underground" conservative press. Its findings are too devastating to standard historical beliefs.
2. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 10, Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
3. *The Central American Bulletin*, Paris, TX, Sept. 15, 1981, p. 1.
4. "The Story of the Kansas Emigrants," *Whittier's Poems*, Boston, 1878.
5. See Chapter 7.
6. Atchison City Directory, 1870, p. 81.
7. Federal Census of Atchison, Vol. 3, Sec. 2, p. 35, July 2, 1870.
8. Basic data on Ingalls from "Who Was Who in America," checked with Otto J. Scott, *op. cit.*
9. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

10. *The Patriot*, Atchison, Kansas, November 9, 1871.
11. *Kansas Daily Commonwealth* (Topeka), February 9, 1872.
12. Pamphlet: "Judgment and Decree of the District Court of Nemaha County, Kansas, Vesting the Title to the Loisel Lands in the various parties of Interest," Kansas City, No., Kansas City Times Steam Book and Job Printing House, 1872. Copy in the Library of the Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.
13. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 12.
14. See footnote 12.
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*
17. *The Choteau Family, A Genealogy of the Descendants and Collateral Branches*, completed by Beatrice Clark Turner, privately printed, St. Louis 1906, p. 106.
18. The fate of Pomeroy is typical of those who serve conspirators like The Secret Six. It never pays to get caught. Once Pomeroy's shady deals became public, he was useless and dropped like a wornout shoe.
19. Pomeroy (Samuel Clark) was born January 3, 1816, in Southampton, Mass. He spent two years, 1836-1838, at Amherst College (Sadducean Leaven). He then located in Monroe County, New York, near Rochester, where according to Whitney Cross, he would have remained under the same cultural influences prevailing in Massachusetts. (Scott notes the importance of Rochester in the abolitionist movement.) In 1854, he was selected by The New England Emigrant Aid Society to lead a group of 200 to Kansas. He entered the territory on Sept. 8 at Kansas City. But the rough work of breaking the prairie and killing Southerners was not for Pomeroy. He settled in Atchison and is reported to have traveled extensively in the East to raise support for Kansas and the aims of The Secret Six. (Based on *Kansas and the Kansans*, vol. 3, p. 129, and U. S. Biographical Dictionary, p. 742.)
19. *Kansas City Journal*, August 3, 1921.
20. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
21. Seneca (Kansas) Free Library, reply of November 10, 1976, to writer's request dated October 31, 1976.
22. Kansas State Historical Society.
23. Based on report in the Atchison Globe, from file of Kansas State Historical Society.
24. We concede the activity of Scofield, but as will note at other points in the story, others never considered Scofield's role in anything as important as it is made by Trumbull and other Dispensational devotees.
25. Trumbull reported the Pomeroy story in his Chapter II, pp. 13-14. BeVier covered it on his pages 13-15, largely basing his story on Trumbull.
26. The Kansas Volume of The United States Biographical Dictionary, Kansas City, S. Lewis and Company, 1879, sketch of John M. Price. Price was born in Richmond, Kentucky, on April 10, 1829. The family spent some time in Missouri, returning to Kentucky in 1845. Price was active in politics as early as 1851. He moved to Kansas in 1858. Despite his Southern border background, he immediately lined up with the Republican Party and thus with the minions of The Secret Six. The 1872-1873 campaign, when he tried first for the governorship, then for the Senate seat, was Price's last fling into politics. He subsequently devoted himself to business and secret societies. A biographical sketch of 1879 (*op. cit.*) notes that he was a Mason of advanced degree. Memberships were noted for 10 other secret societies. The item noted: "he (Price) . . . takes great interest in secret societies and associations, and as a result of this interest, and his proficiency in ritualism, he has always been honored with the highest offices these orders could bestow. As a member and officer of these various secret societies and associations, it is claimed that Mr. Price is in possession of about three hundred and seventy different pass-words, signs and tokens, more perhaps than any other man in the United States."

27. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

28. This appears to have been the end of Pomeroy's active political role. The name Pomeroy is mentioned later in connection with social contacts of the Scofield family, especially the Atchison branch. Pomeroy died August 27, 1891, at Whitinsville, Mass., which is in Worcester County. Thus we note that he remained throughout his life in one cultural milieu.

CHAPTER 9

The Senator and the District Attorney

"For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil"

Rom. 13:3a

The new senator from Kansas, John J. Ingalls, took his seat in the 43rd Congress without challenge. He served three terms in the United States Senate. During his service, he introduced no important legislation. He was known as a witty, if not profound orator, and he was reported as being much given to "waving the bloody shirt" (Civil War heroics). He described John Brown's bloody acts at Ossawatimie and elsewhere as:

The most brilliant and important episode of the Kansas War. It was the high divide of the contest. It was our Thermopylae. John Brown was our Leonidas with his Spartan band.¹

Such a version of Brown, with blithe justification of ruthless murder shows that Ingalls remained empty of morality, the same disregard for the truth which marked the ideals of The Secret Six. This man was Scofield's mentor and partner.

During Ingalls's last term in the Senate, in 1886, President Cleveland appointed Zechariah Montgomery of California to the post of assistant attorney general of the United States. Montgomery was a strenuous and able opponent of statist education. He had just completed a study of schools in which the significant point was "that the cost of public school work in the State of New York increased in inverse ratio to the number of pupils taught, while as we have seen, crime increases in direct proportion to the cost."² Such a "heretical" statement aroused the ire of Ingalls. True to his New England heritage, he tried to block Montgomery's appointment. The move failed utterly, and Montgomery served throughout Cleveland's first term. Montgomery's study went unheeded for years. It is again commanding attention as its conclusions are even more valid 100 years later than when first published. After being out of print for years, Montgomery's work is again available and is receiving the attention of concerned parents.³

Ingalls was defeated in the Populist upheaval of 1890 (Raise more hell and less corn!) and retired to Las Vegas, New Mexico, where he died in 1901.

Senator Ingalls had not forgotten his client-partner-supporter. Almost as soon as he arrived in Washington, Ingalls submitted a rec-

ommendation to President Grant, bearing his name and the names of four other Kansans. The petition read:

We have the honor to respectfully recommend the appointment of Cyrus I. Scofield to the office of United States District Attorney for the District of Kansas.⁴

President Grant made the appointment and, in due course, Scofield gave up his seat in the Legislature and prepared to take the office of United States district attorney, replacing Albert H. Horner. At the time of his appointment, Scofield was 29, the youngest district attorney in the country.

Scofield took the oath of office on June 8, 1873. The ex-Confederate soldier solemnly swore that he had:

. . . never voluntarily borne arms against the United States since I have been a citizen thereof, that I have voluntarily given no aid, countenance, counsel or encouragement to persons engaged in armed hostility thereto . . . that I have not yielded a voluntary support to any pretended government authority, power of constitution, within the United States, hostile or inimical thereto. . . .⁵

Now that oath, as Scofield took it, was rank perjury. We know that Scofield had supported an authority hostile to the United States. His claims of military service to the end of the war, circulated in the Dispensational community, if true, would only intensify the perjury of that oath. Evidently Scofield in 1873 was not concerned about perjury.

With apparent unconcern about either the validity of his oath or his personal morals, Scofield went immediately to work in his new post. Since the West was still a bit wild, Scofield had to concern himself about the affairs of the Indians, especially in the Oklahoma Territory (then officially called Indian Territory) just south of Kansas. Two days after taking office, he made recommendations to Attorney General Williams in Washington.⁶

Reports were on hand which indicated, quite typically, that whiskey was being sold to the Indians by the whites. It was noted that the: "U.S. Commissioners, Deputy Marshals, etc. are in corrupt collusions with the violators of the laws."⁷

Scofield noted that his options were limited by the matter of jurisdiction. His authority ended at the Kansas line, as did that of the federal agents in Indian Territory. Thus, a white man could sell whiskey in the territory, and if not apprehended, cross back to safety in Kansas. The Indians could and did cross into Kansas, commit crimes, even murder, and return to safety from prosecution in Indian Territory. Scofield stated that keeping whiskey from the Indians would alleviate much of the trouble.⁸

In his recommendations, he asked for *per diem* and mileage allowances to make a trip to the border to confer with his deputy marshalls

and with the Indian agents. He noted that his chief marshal, Marshall Tough, was doing all in his power to handle the problem.

On July 17, 1873, the *Kansas Daily Commonwealth* of Topeka carried an editorial "Justice in the South-West."⁹ It noted that Scofield and Marshall Tough were undertaking to enforce the law, especially on the border of Indian Territory. The article noted that there was corruption in the courts in the southern part of the state. "The law prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Indians for instance is in some sections violated with shameless openness." The editor commended Scofield and Tough because they had "very sensibly chosen it for their first scene of duty".

Accompanied by an escort of cavalry, Scofield went after some men who were taking whiskey into Indian Territory for sale to the Indians. The men were desperate, and Scofield risked being shot. He was successful in rounding up some of the worst liquor traders and brought them back to Leavenworth.

When the "rumrunners" came to trial, most of the district attorney's witnesses were Indians who could not speak a word of English. A half-breed was secured who served as interpreter. The defense tried to break down the testimony of the Indians, but the Indians with a reference for the Great Spirit, recognized the nature of an oath and had a respect for honesty. The liquor men were found guilty and convicted.

Trumbull reports an incident after the trial:

When, later in the day, Scofield went to the lodgings where he had his Indian witnesses entertained, he found the leading one, a stately chief named "Powder Face", squatting on a bed. As the District Attorney entered the room, the Indian quickly raised his left hand high over his head, with his right hand patted his heart, and smiled—and a smile is a very rare thing to see on the face of an Indian. What it meant was, "I love you". And the interpreter explained to Scofield, "Powder Face would die for you now, after making that sign. It is a pledge of eternal friendship."¹⁰

The district attorney's office did not run smoothly. In August, Scofield requested the appointment of a new assistant district attorney for Kansas. The incumbent was violating an executive order of the president by occupying the office of assistant United States attorney while also holding the post of attorney general of the State of Kansas. Sadducean leaven must have been running out of loaves. Scofield recommended that one Thomas Ryan be his new assistant.¹¹

In addition to the prosecution of the liquor dealers, during the October term of the Court, Scofield conducted a vigorous prosecution of a case against Colonel Modoc Jennison, who was accused of defrauding the United States. *The Kansas Daily Commonwealth* quoted from three other Topeka papers.¹² Typical was the comment of the *Evening Call* which said that they: ". . . do not hesitate to assure the people of Kansas

that they will never have just cause to complain of his appointment.¹³ A month later, the *Commonwealth* (which seemed almost to be Scofield's own paper) said:

Our readers will recollect how a majority of the papers in the state attacked him so maliciously, at the time of his appointment last spring. Many expressed opinion at the time that he would disgrace the office, but were happily disappointed.¹³

Sic transit gloria. At the time Scofield's term of office had only a few more weeks to run. The termination and the speculation as to the cause, made a mockery of the plaudits of the newspapers.

Trumbull, discussing this period (at the opening of his Chapter III) states that Scofield during his term as district attorney, made frequent trips to Washington.¹⁴ It does appear that he was on the go during his term of office. Leontine, the girls and little Guy were left in Atchison. The time Scofield could have spent with his family must have been minimal. Little Guy was by that time ailing. The burden, physical and emotional, of the sick child would have fallen squarely on Leontine.

But Trumbull's statement of frequent trips to Washington is, at best, highly questionable. A check was made of the issues of *The Official Guide of the Railways* for the summer of 1873.¹⁵ From these volumes, it is apparent that a trip from Topeka to Washington would have taken at least three days going and three days on the return. This assumes that the trains ran on time and all of the many connections were made with no delays. In 1873, this was not at all likely.

It is unreasonable to assume that anyone who had taken three or four days on the train to Washington would immediately turn around and head back to Kansas. Any business which would justify a trip would, normally in Washington atmosphere, take several days to progress. (Then as now, in Washington, matters are *never* concluded.) In a Washington summer in the days before air-conditioning, things must have moved more slowly than molasses flowing uphill in a Kansas January.

In the light of Scofield's recorded activity in Kansas, the time consumed in travel and his short term of office, the reference to "frequent trips" must be added to the list of Scofield improbabilities.

That he did get to Washington at least once after Appomattox is hinted at by the references to President Grant and to the dinner addressed by Senator Roscoe Conkling (R-N.Y.). The recorded events in Kansas would suggest that the trip occurred late in June or early in July 1873. Ingalls invited to the dinner was happily able to include his protege who by chance was in Washington.

Note that in December 1873, there are newspaper reports which implied that Scofield was outside the State of Kansas.¹⁶ He might have

been in Washington again, but by December 1873, the denouement was approaching.

CHAPTER 9 NOTES

1. John J. Ingalls, "John Brown's Place in History" *North American Review*, February 1884. Written after conferring with Charles Sanborn an associate of The Secret Six and others in order to defend Brown against charges which had been made by one Rev. David N. Utter in the November 1883 issue of that periodical. Ingall's article failed as a defense of Brown, but the mass of historical writing and especially history as taught in public schools and state universities has, up to now, protected the Brown legend.
2. Zach Montgomery, *The School Question*, p. 25, Gilson, Washington, 1886.
3. Reprinted in the 1970's by St. Thomas Press, Houston, Texas.
4. United States Department of Justice, National Archives, Record Group 60, March 11, 1873.
5. Record Group 60, June 9, 1873.
6. Record Group 60, June 11, 1873.
7. Record Group 60, June 11, 1873.
8. *Kansas Daily Commonwealth*, Topeka, July 17, 1873.
9. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 23, 24.
10. Department of Justice, Record Group 60, Aug. 20, 1873.
11. Issue of October 17, 1873.
12. As picked up, *op. cit.*, October 17, 1873.
13. *Commonwealth*, November 22, 1873.
14. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
15. Official Railway Guides in the collection of Chicago area railfan, Arthur D. Dubin.
16. *Kansas Daily Commonwealth*, December 17, 1873.

CHAPTER 10

The District Attorney Resigns

"He that troubleth his own house shall inherit the wind."

Prov. 11:29

Scofield's term as United States district attorney for Kansas came to a sudden end in just over six months.¹ On December 14, 1873, the *Daily Times* of Leavenworth carried a story which suggested that something was amiss in the U. S. District Attorney's Office. A case against ex-Senator Pomeroy was pending. Reports circulated that Thomas Ryan, the assistant district attorney, was to prosecute the case instead of Scofield. There were hints that both men were somehow implicated. The article stated that an affidavit existed in which Pomeroy claimed to have paid Scofield a sum of money to keep him (Pomeroy) from being brought to trail. The *Times* editor concluded:

At first we were inclined to regard the appointment of Mr. Scofield with disfavor, but subsequently we have had high hopes for him, which were justified by his gentlemanly bearing and display of legal skill. We sincerely trust that an inquiry into the charges preferred by Mr. Pomeroy's affidavit will result in thorough vindication of his character.²

The other papers in Leavenworth, the *Kansas City Times*, the *Lawrence Tribune*, came to Scofield's defense and discredited what they alleged to be rumors.³ The *Commonwealth* (Leavenworth) did indicate that Scofield was absent from the state, but advocated a complete investigation of the charges on his return.⁴

Another item on the affair, with more detail, appeared in the *Times* on December 21, 1873. Scofield, Pomeroy and even Ingalls were involved. The incident was termed "the most infamous of all infamous political bargains ever transacted in Kansas. . . ." The report suggested that blackmail had been paid to Ingalls and Scofield by railroads and settlers in Southern Kansas. (If that report could be substantiated, Scofield's description of the "Loisel case" to the Dispensational constituency, through Luther Rees, was unprincipled.)

The *Times*, in its December article referred to previously, claimed that the Pomeroy party would "save" Scofield and that Ingalls was demanding that Scofield resign. In the light of the 1899 story,⁵ Ingalls' fury would be understandable. Pomeroy would not have minded seeing Ingalls discomfited. The *Times* commented: "It would be strange enough to see Pomeroy cherishing the discarded pet of Ingalls."⁶ The *Times* further predicted that Scofield would not resign and that Pomeroy's

case would never be brought to court because Scofield and Pomeroy had struck a bargain.

Unfortunately for the *Times* role in prognostication, on December 20, 1873, Scofield had written President Grant:

I hereby resign the position of United States Attorney for the District of Kansas.

Respectfully
Cyrus I. Scofield⁷

Remarkably as late as January 4, 1874, the Leavenworth *Times* was reporting the resignation talk as rumors of little value. Apparently Scofield had returned to the city by this time and continued to fill the office until George W. Peck, his successor, was installed.

In the light of reports connected with the resignation of Scofield, the righteousness displayed by the anti-Pomeroy faction a few months earlier seems to have been more for political effect than with any real moral basis. Note again that the Ingalls and the Pomeroy families remained on good personal terms with the Scofield families during the rest of their respective lives.

At this point, we enter into a second period of mystery, unbroken until 1877, not really cleared up until the end of 1879 or early 1880. Note, however, that Scofield was never again involved in politics. In considering the end of Scofield's political life we note the comment of one historian:

Throughout the period unscrupulous national and state legislatures were openly bought and sold by the highest bidders and during Ulysses S. Grant's Administration (1869-1877) part of the Executive Branch of the National Government was viciously corrupt.⁸

A more specific note is provided by Robert L. Pierce who notes that the national scene was governed by "a Grant Administration which many students believe was heavily influenced by the contemporary Insiders of the Master Conspiracy."⁹

Boston in that day was still a major source of capital. Boston financiers exercised major control of American business; the railroads were one major area. They encouraged the corruption of the period for their own gain.

Ernest Gordon, writing from a Christian viewpoint, is the only writer who has so far shown how these Proper Bostonians were permeated with and motivated by the values produced by Sadducean leaven. Gordon notes of the Unitarian advance around Boston:

Many churches went over *en masse*, taking buildings and endowments with them. This was the case with twelve of the fourteen churches in Boston.¹⁰

Thus as the Victorian Era advanced, Proper Bostonians still went to the meeting house, but to one whose message was Unitarian. As one Bostonian, Francis J. Child, who was later enlightened noted:

I ought to say that Unitarianism which ruined papa's happiness and peace and likely his eternal joy and spoiled all my childhood, and youth, and young manhood, I have observed to the always deteriorating and disintegrating in its influence and effect, spiritually and morally. I know many instances, especially in the leading families of Boston.¹¹

The Secret Six were not unique.

Under moral influences such as noted by Child, the Boston financiers came to their desks on State Street six days a week to issue orders in the economic area which abetted that sort of corruption which marred Ingalls, Pomeroy and Scofield. Those Proper Bostonians had the drive of the Puritan work-ethic, but without the Biblical morality which keeps that drive within decent bounds.

Theologian R. L. Dabney commenting on the period said:

There never was so much prosperous wickedness as in this day. Society calling itself decent, and even religious, never was so venal and cowardly in doing homage to prosperous wickedness. But I never felt so certain in my life that it was all a disgusting vain show; and that all of it is bound to come to utter grief; while those that fear God and keep His commandments will come out all right.¹²

Note Dabney's reference to "keep His commandments", a directive generally overlooked at the time. It is also overlooked today, thanks in part to the efforts of the "new" Scofield, of whom more anon. A wry note is offered by the fact that, when in the Progressive Era an unsuccessful effort was made to deal with these problems, the effort was made by people just as full of Sadducean leaven as those who had aggravated the problems in the days we are considering.

But back to Scofield. At this point, we have the phenomenon of a man in his early thirties, responsible for the support of a family of four, disappearing as a matter of record for three—even five-years.

Trumbull glosses over the separation period, merely stating that Scofield did not like the type of life and the associates and activities related to the office of district attorney.¹³ Since Scofield did keep in touch with the families of his associates to the end of his life, we must question at least part of Trumbull's statement. If we assume that Trumbull, like most Fundamentalists, was unaware that Scofield was married at this point in time, his evaluation is a bit fatuous.

The relatives accepted an actual separation between Cyrus and Leontine. Emeline Scofield Papin had her will drawn in 1877, signing the document on November 7th. She bequeathed equal shares of her estate to Cyrus, Laura and Victorine. But she took legal notice of the Scofield separation by a provision that if Cyrus and Leontine were not

living together, the share for Cyrus was to be divided between husband and wife.¹⁴ Emeline was well aware of the broken Scofield household.

One glimmer of knowledge in this period. The *St. Louis City Directory* for 1877 has an entry:

Scofield, Cyrus I., Lawyer
206 North 8th Street
Residence, 3029 Dickson.¹⁵

This entry means that Cyrus had written Kansas off, along with Leontine. It should confirm Trumbull's statement that Scofield returned to St. Louis to practice law, except for the following.

In ordinary usage, the practice of law means the ability to provide all legal services, including appearances in a client's behalf before courts of competent jurisdiction. Such service could not be offered by Scofield, himself. In view of his return to St. Louis with a besmirched name, it seems unlikely that any ethical, competent member of the bar would associate himself with the Scofield office.

Admission to the Bar of St. Louis and the State of Missouri, not obtained before he left for Kansas in 1869, was out of the question. Scofield's behavior between 1877 and 1879 made it impossible. It was never granted. "The Bench and Bar of St. Louis County", an official publication of the legal profession was checked.¹⁶ It shows that at no time in the 19th century was C. I. Scofield a member of the St. Louis Bar.

A member of the bar in one state can usually be admitted to that of another state when he relocates. But the Scofield who resigned an office of public trust in 1873 with a cloud on his name would have been rash indeed to call on his former associates in Kansas for the appropriate recommendations. The Choteau Clan would hardly have been much help. The reputation of the dashing young Tennessean from Michigan was tarnished in 1877.

CHAPTER 10 NOTES

1. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 25, specifically refers to "Two years of service as United States District Attorney". The source of his information had to be Scofield himself, who knew very well that his service lasted from his taking the perjured oath on June 8, 1873, to the letter of resignation, dated December 20, 1873, and the replacement by George W. Peck in January 1874.
2. *Daily Times*, Leavenworth, Kansas, December 14, 1873.
3. The papers all carried the story after its original appearance in Leavenworth on the 14th. The *Commonwealth's* item appeared December 17, 1873.
4. *Ibid.*, December 17, 1873.
5. The story, referred to in Chapter 9, appeared in *Kansas Topics*, *The Kansas City (Mo.) Journal*, December 28, 1899.
6. *Daily Times*, Leavenworth, Kansas, December 21, 1873.
7. U. S. Department of Justice, National Archives, Record Group 60, December 20, 1873.

8. Richard D. Heffner, *A Documentary History of the United States*, The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1959, p. 158–160.
9. Robert L. Pierce, *The Rapture Cult*, Signal Mountain, Tenn., 1978, p. 50.
10. E. E. Gordon, *The Leaven of the Sadducees*, BICA, 1927, p. 42. The term “Proper Bostonians” was coined by Cleveland Amory in his work of that title.
11. Gordon, *op. cit.*, p. 47.
12. *The Life and Letters of Robert Lewis Dabney*, by Thomas Cary Johnson, section entitled *Thoughts When Sixty Four* as published in *The Banner of Truth*, Issue 168, September 1977, Edinburgh, Scotland and Carlisle, Pennsylvania.
13. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 35, 36.
14. From papers of the Emeline Scofield Papin Estate on file in the St. Louis County Courthouse, Clayton, Mo. The document will be further discussed in Chapter 18.
15. St. Louis City Directory, 1877.
16. As checked for the writer by the St. Louis Public Library, History and Genealogy Department.

CHAPTER 11

Missing His Day in Court

"And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous."

I John 2:1b

When C. I. Scofield gave information to the publishers of "Who's Who in America" he mentioned being admitted to the bar in Kansas, but made no mention of the bar in Missouri.¹ That entry omits a reference to something important to the story of Scofield's life circulated in the Evangelical community. But as we suggested in the last chapter, the admission of Cyrus Scofield to the bar in Missouri at any time was highly improbable, and more pertinent, is not confirmed by some recognized reference sources.²

Trumbull's story of a successful law practice becomes very unlikely as we consider the references to the activity of Cyrus Scofield between 1877 and 1879.³ In that period, we find entries relating to Scofield in the Court Records of St. Louis which show that Cyrus, rather than practicing law, was highly in need of counsel for his defense.

In August and September 1877, the Circuit Court of St. Louis had on its docket, Case 0 44252, *Jephtha H. Simpson vs. Cyrus I. Scofield, Emeline E. Papin and C. F. Betts*.⁴ C. P. Ellerbe was attorney for the plaintiff. The case grew out of an act of Scofield on June 6, 1877. On that day, he signed a 60-day note for \$200 with interest at 10 percent per annum. The note bore signatures alleging endorsement by Emeline E. Papin and C. F. Betts. The record of the case indicates that the note was handled by the Boatmen's Bank, still a leading St. Louis financial institution.

After the 60 days, Ellerbe, on Simpson's behalf, attempted to present the note for payment. The petition to the court affirmed that Ellerbe was unable to locate either Scofield's residence or place of business. Apparently at some time between the closing date for the 1877 *City Directory* and August, the "law" office at 206 North 8th Street had been closed. Without an office, the "successful law practice" alleged by Trumbull (based on Scofield's relation) becomes more and more improbable. Simpson's petition further declares that both Emeline and Betts declined to pay the note.

With the petition, bearing the date of September 4, 1877, is a note of service signed by James Carroll, deputy of the sheriff of the City of St. Louis, stating that the petition was served on Betts, and a further

note, "The other defendants could not be found in the City of St. Louis." Emeline lived in Webster (now Webster Groves), Missouri, in the same county, and the petition was served on her by a deputy of the County Sheriff's Office.

In her answer, Emeline:

. . . denies and says it is not true that the note sued on and filed in this case was ever delivered to her—and further says that she never assigned said note filed in this suit by endorsement in writing or otherwise, nor did she ever deliver or consent to the delivery of same to the plaintiff or any other person whatsoever. She further says that she never wrote or endorsed her name on the note sued on . . .

She requested that she be dismissed from the suit.

Reports that Scofield engaged in forgery in this period were not silenced by his entry into the ministry. Emeline's denial is no doubt correct. The signature in her name seems quite probably to have been forged by her brother.

The case came up for hearing March 1, 1878. In preparation for the hearing, Emeline's attorney had subpoenaed Charles L. Bass, a teller at Boatmen's Bank, to testify in her behalf. As an outcome of the March 1 hearing, Simpson withdrew the action against Scofield and Papin, leaving Betts as defendant with \$219.30 owed as of date, with 10% interest still accruing. Copies of the note and protest were withdrawn from the case on December 8, 1879. The record gives no indication that Simpson ever got his money. A reporter was to assert a few years later that Emeline was helping Cyrus out of some of his scrapes.⁵

Scofield must have been very much in need of funds. On May 28, 1877, he made a 90-day promissory note for \$900.00 to the order of Emeline E. Papin. The note with apparent endorsement by Emeline was delivered to James H. McLean, who became the plaintiff in Case 46333.⁶ McLean was a doctor with an office at 316 Chestnut Street, just eight doors away from the office of Charles F. Betts. Again, this note appears to have been negotiated through the Boatmen's Bank. McLean's case for non-payment appears on the docket of the April term of court in 1878.

On June 4, 1878, Emeline filed her answer. In this case, also, she denied endorsing the note and disclaimed ability to testify regarding the facts about the note alleged by plaintiff. In the legal sense, we must consider her answer true. The endorsement which read "Emeline E. Papin" was a forgery, very likely made by Cyrus. We suspect that Emeline was aware of what Cyrus did.

The case did not come to trial immediately—due to postponements. The surviving papers indicate that Deputy Sheriff John Finn was unable to locate Scofield in St. Louis on October 7, 1878. Scofield's whereabouts

cannot be determined. The case was continued on December 18, 1878, and also on March 10, 1879.

In anticipation of a hearing May 6, 1879, subpoenas were issued against Dr. William Eames, Timothy Papin, Sam Semple (who lived at the same address as Timothy Papin on 6th Street) and Ben L. Chase of Boatmen's Bank. The papers bear the notation following the May 6 hearing, "Dismissed on motion of the plaintiff," But that notation gives no clue as to whether McLean ever got his \$900 or whether Scofield made any effort at restitution.

The transcript of the trial in the next case strengthens our belief that Scofield was quite active in mid-1877. The activity—forgery. Charles F. Betts, under cross-examination by Samuel Reber, Emeline's attorney, said, answering a question from counsel about Scofield: "He told me that he was raising money for a Mr. Watkins or some gentleman on Main Street.

Reber: "He was raising money through you?"

Betts: "And some others, Yes, sir."

Reber: "And he was raising money in Mrs. Papin's name?"

Betts: "Yes, sir, on her name."

The accumulated documents suggest that the phrase "On Mrs. Papin's name" was a euphemism for forgery. The case at hand gives a hint that Scofield was quite expert. He used different methods as suited the situations and the obstacles to be overcome.

The testimony of Mr. Betts was given in Case 44326, *Frank Vollmer vs. Emeline E. Papin et al*; heard on May 10, 1878, before Hon. James J. Lindley, Judge.⁸ The cause of the action was a promissory note for \$250 dated June 28, 1877 (a Thursday), bearing a signature which read "Emeline E. Papin." The endorsements were by Cyrus I. Scofield and Charles F. Betts. In the light of the testimony recorded in the case, it appears that Scofield actually made the note, writing both the signature reading "Emeline E. Papin" and his own endorsement.

Betts was identified as a real estate broker with an office at 308 Chestnut Street, St. Louis. On the stand, he admitted to being a "note broker." The suggestion is that Betts operated on the fringes of the business community, dealing in the leavings that the regular financial sources would not touch.

After the note was made, either Thursday the 28th or Friday the 29th, Scofield and Betts took the note to the St. Louis National Bank and several other banks as well. None of them would touch the note. By noon on Monday, the 2nd of July, Scofield and Betts had worked out a scheme for selling the note. It required Emeline's cooperation.

Betts owed a bill of \$48 to a tailor, Frank Vollmer, whose shop was in the building of the St. Nicholas Hotel. Scofield prepared what

purported to be a "Letter of Introduction" to Emeline. The two men appeared in Vollmer's shop about 1 o'clock on Monday. Vollmer's first reaction appears to have been skeptical. Responding to Vollmer's expressions of doubt about the note, Scofield said: "Do you expect that I want to go to the Penitentiary for \$250?"⁹ Vollmer's reply was that he was concerned about the soundness of the note as he did not want to lose his money. Since both Scofield and Mrs. Papin were unknown to Vollmer, Scofield suggested that Vollmer go out to Emeline's home in Scofield's rented horse and buggy and get Emeline's assurance on the validity of the note.¹⁰

Armed with the "Letter of Introduction" Betts and Vollmer (Betts most likely at the reins) drove the 12 miles out to the Papin residence on Big Bend Road in Webster Groves. Emeline received the two men as per instruction in Scofield's "Letter of Introduction," excused herself, went into another room to read it. It appears from the testimony given in court that Scofield did *not* present Vollmer as a prospective purchaser of the note. (The testimony has inconsistencies between the statements of the various witnesses, not at all unusual in such a situation.)

On the stand, Emeline referred to the visit as follows:

Well, then Mr. Betts asked me repeatedly "Will you say whether this note is good" and I said I will not say whether it is good not, I said my brother informs me in this note that he will be out here on the 6 o'clock train, I remember saying that, but what I said in connection with that I don't remember positively. I was very much agitated at the time, I thought it was a transaction that had already taken place, something that had transpired in which my brother was placed in danger and that Mr. Vollmer was brought out there as a witness or a spy or I didn't know what.¹¹

Vollmer noted that Emeline said she did not have money available as of that day (July 2) to discount the note. It is evident that at no time did she either affirm or deny the validity of the signature (her name) on the note.

The two men left and drove back to St. Louis. They stopped at the Commercial Bank, and talked to a Mr. Nicholls, who did not know Mrs. Papin. Since it was now late in the day, the matter was held over.

On the 3rd, Scofield and Betts returned to Vollmer's shop. Vollmer gave Betts a check for \$250 which was cashed at the Commercial Bank. Betts' bill at Vollmer's was considered paid. In turn, Betts gave Scofield \$100, holding the balance which Scofield owed him.

Betts was out of the city for several weeks. On his return, he again went out to Webster Groves. This time he was with a man identified only as "Mr. Anderson." A note was the reason for this visit. In court, Betts stated that during this visit, Emeline admitted that she knew the Vollmer note was a forgery.¹²

At the end of 60 days, Vollmer tried to discount the note. On August 14, 1877, A. K. Taylor, on Vollmer's behalf, filed suit against Papin, Scofield and Betts, the matter being assigned No. 44326 on the Docket. City Deputy Carroll was able to serve a summons only on Betts. A county deputy no doubt made service on Emeline. No record of service on Scofield was in the file, nor did anyone make any answer on his behalf. His name was ultimately dropped from the proceeding.

Emeline answered on September 28, 1877, with a denial of Vollmer's allegation that she had made the note. The case was originally set for hearing January 30, 1878, but postponed. In anticipation of a hearing on May 6, subpoenas were served on Betts, Charles L. Bush, a teller at Boatmen's Bank and on Dr. James McLean, the victim in Case 46333. Neither Bush nor McLean gave any testimony of record.

From Emeline's testimony on May 10, 1878, we reproduce the following:

Well, Mr. Betts came out there with Mr. Vollmer, I do not remember whether he introduced Mr. Vollmer to me as he says or not, but he handed me a letter, I opened it and asked to be excused as the letter directed me to do on the envelope, I retired and read the letter, it agitated me very much, so much so that I could scarcely stand, I was so completely surprised and agitated by the letter that I went back into the room and repeated something that was in the letter but I really can't say what it was, I understood from the letter that there was a note that was due and that my brother was in great danger and therefore I said . . . (Testimony at this point was interrupted by plaintiff's attorney)¹³

Emeline's statement suggests that she was more deeply involved in Scofield's nefarious capers than anyone had previously imagined. It is hard to know whether she considered the use of her name was merely being helpful to "Little Bub" or whether she was an active and willing collaborator.

As the cross-examination of Emeline concluded, the plaintiff's counsel asked her if she knew where Scofield was. Her reply was that she had last seen him about three weeks before in Carondelet.¹⁴ Asked if he was at the house on Big Bend Road, she replied that she had not been home since Sunday (the 5th) and could not tell (the court date being Friday, the 10th).

The glimpses of Cyrus in 1877 and 1878 as gathered from court records belie the story by Trumbull and others that Scofield was a successful lawyer, serving a respectable clientele.

Judge Lindley instructed the jury to find for the defendant as it had not been proven that Emeline had actually made the note. The jury ignored Judge Lindley and found for Vollmer with damages in the amount of \$384.41. A transcript read a century later does not tell us everything. It does not show mannerisms, inflections, expressions which

might have impressed the jury more than the attorney's pleadings based on statute.

Utilizing a bit of folk knowledge, the jury knew that Vollmer had been defrauded and was entitled to redress. And even if Emeline had not made the note, the jury may have felt that she was morally guilty, even if that guilt had not been established by evidence within terms of the statute.

On June 28, 1879, Emeline, continuing to utilize the services of attorney Samuel Reber, appealed the decision, posting a bond of \$800 with her appeal. The appeal was not heard until the October term of the Appeals Court in 1879. The Appeals Court decision of November 4, 1879, went strictly according to the letter of the law and found for Emeline. So Vollmer did not get his money back through the legal processes. We have no firm indication that Cyrus I. Scofield ever felt an obligation to make things right with Frank Vollmer.

Now, according to that which is official in Dispensational circles, Cyrus was, by the time the Appeals Court rendered its decision, within the Kingdom and starting on the road to righteousness. Note in this connection that Trumbull suggested that a good foundation of Christian teaching was implanted in the children in the Scofield homestead, whether in Saratoga County, N. Y. or in Lenawee County, Michigan.¹⁵ The antics of brother and sister in 1877-1879 suggests that if such teaching had been implanted, during those two years it was being ignored.

It has been suggested that reference to Scofield's early exploits overlooks the power of Jesus Christ to save a man.¹⁶ A possible valid point, but the reader, before consigning the matters related in this chapter to limbo, is asked to carefully weigh the story of Scofield's conversion as related in the next chapter.

The *Republican*, a St. Louis newspaper, in its issue of November 7, 1879, the Friday after the Appeals Court decision in the Vollmer case carried an item which adds confusion to the matter of Scofield's legal scrapes. It reads:

A case of forgery against Cyrus I. Scofield was disposed of in the criminal court yesterday. Mr. Scofield was arrested about a year ago and his case has been continued from time to time, and never come to trial. Yesterday it was admitted by the prosecution that a case could not be made, and as there was no proof to substantiate the charge against Mr. Scofield, who is a gentleman well known as having occupied positions of trust, a *nolle prosequi* was entered by order of Judge Laughlin. The defendant had employed Mr. Martin to defend him, and was determined in case the matter reached a trial to fight it vigorously. He had little fear of a conviction, but the happy termination of the case yesterday was a relief to him.¹⁷

The report presents a problem. If it was reporting the Vollmer case, it was in no way accurate. The inaccuracy of the report does not

make up for the fact that Mr. Vollmer evidently had a very incompetent, disinterested or incapable lawyer. If the report refers to another case, we must continue to question whether the assertion of lack of proof is correct. The charges against Scofield followed a familiar and well-authenticated pattern. The timing of the dismissal of the case, the conclusion of the other cases of record, suggest that Scofield was the beneficiary of what today is referred to as "clout."

At about this time, the local "Fundamentalist" community was deeply involved in final arrangements for an evangelistic campaign conducted by D. L. Moody. Scofield, a new convert, was to work in the campaign. Hence, clout was brought into play in Cyrus' cases, to clear him for his role in Christian work.

In the course of research for this work, the author has run across persistent rumors that at sometime in the 1870's, Scofield served one or more prison sentences in Canada. Now, in the period currently under consideration, there are unaccounted for intervals when such prison terms might have been served. However, prison authorities in the Dominion of Canada, including those of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, have no record of any term for a prisoner named Cyrus Scofield in the 1870's.¹⁸

BeVier, in his thesis, had just "discovered" Leontine and the girls. He assumed that they moved to St. Louis at sometime after the district attorney's post was vacated. He assumed that among the several changes in Cyrus' life in 1879, one was Leontine's decision to leave him and return to Atchison with the girls. Recent conversations with Atchison residents assures us that BeVier's assumption is unwarranted. Leontine never left Atchison.

Scofield's role as husband and father had been irregular ever since he had entered politics. Without regular employment and steady income, Cyrus did wander. We had tried in our minds to justify this as ostensible searching for new employment or for a new spot to hang out his shingle. Reports of the period do not permit such an allowance.

The fact that Scofield's life through this period was related to and by Trumbull as though he were a bachelor suggests that he considered his roles as husband and father unimportant. Even the supposedly submissive role of a Victorian wife would find this intolerable. Leontine had even endured the loss of one of her children. We cannot be sure that Cyrus was at her side to comfort her when the little white coffin bearing the remains of Guy was lowered into the grave in St. Louis on a wintry day late in 1874.¹⁹

It must be remembered that Scofield's chosen profession, the law, can be very lucrative, but only if a man sticks at it, endures lean years and builds up a practice based on confidence and mutual trust. Scofield barely scratched the surface of the income potential of a practice in

Kansas before he went into politics which, in its legitimate phases, was far less remunerative. From January 1874 on, we have no firm evidence of any earning capacity on Scofield's part.

Scofield became involved in questionable, even criminal activities, those already related and other possible ones as suggested in the *Atchison Patriot* story.²⁰ But late in 1879, he suddenly became acceptable in a group, a sub-culture utterly remote from any he had known or been in before.

The very sudden quashing of the criminal charges without proper adjudication suggests that Scofield's career was in the hands of someone who had clout never available to either Ingalls, Pomeroy or anyone of the Choteau Clan. But, that career was to be of such a nature that Leontine, the Catholic wife, had to go.

CHAPTER 11 NOTES

1. "Who's Who in America!", Vol. 7, 1912-1913, p. 1850.
2. See Chapter 10, Footnote 19.
3. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 26 and p. 40.
4. Papers on *Simpson vs. Scofield, Papin and Betts*, Case 44252, supplied by Circuit Court, Twenty-second Judicial Circuit of Missouri, Civil Courts Building, St. Louis, Missouri.
5. The *Atchison Patriot*, August 1881. See Chapter 13.
6. Papers on *McLean vs. Scofield and Papin*, Case 46633, source as above.
7. The court clerk was able to supply the transcript of the testimony for Case 44326, *Vollmer vs. Papin and Betts*, as well as copies of pleadings, subpoenas, etc. Scofield's statement was quoted by Betts, transcript p. 13, as he was undergoing cross-examination by attorney Samuel Reber.
8. From documents supplied by the Circuit Court.
9. As stated by Vollmer in answer to a direct question by his attorney, Frank Taylor.
10. Transcript. p. 2 and p. 13. According to Betts, Scofield offered either his own horse and buggy or to pay the hire of a rig from a livery stable. The idea of Scofield owning a horse and buggy at this time seems unlikely. It was probably hired as part of a stage setting to impress the "hook" Vollmer.
11. Transcript, p. 26.
12. Transcript, p. 29.
13. Transcript, p. 25.
14. Transcript, p. 29. Cross examination by attorney Taylor.
15. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
16. We think specifically of a letter dated Jan. 23, 1974, from Dr. John A. Witmer, Librarian of Dallas Theological Seminary, to Mr. John H. Mize, heir of the Scofield daughters.
17. *Republican*, St. Louis, Nov. 7, 1879. Supplied by the Missouri Historical Society.
18. Letters to the writer from appropriate Canadian authorities.
19. The death occurred on Dec. 23, 1874. *The Choteau Family*, St. Louis, Mo., p. 106.
20. See Chapter 13.

CHAPTER 12

The Role of Tom McPheeters

"Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow."
Isa. 1:18

Back in the days when this writer was a Dispensationalist, it was customary to give personal testimonies which included the day, the hour and often the exact minute of conversion. Such precision is not possible in the case of C. I. Scofield, the man responsible for it all. It has generally been repeated that his conversion occurred at some time in 1879. Scofield so stated in "Who's Who in America, 1912."¹ Trumbull so indicated in his story.² But the only established dates of 1879 relating to Scofield tend to confuse the matter. The published story, when examined, leaves us in considerable doubt about what actually happened and when.

The story published in Trumbull's book appears to be the source of all the reports of Scofield's conversion. It reads:

In his St. Louis law office, one day, McPheeters came to see him. After talking a while, McPheeters got up to go. With his hand upon the door-knob, he turned and faced Scofield, saying: "For a long time I have been wanting to ask you a question that I have been afraid to ask, but that I am going to ask now."

"I never thought of you as 'afraid' " said Scofield in hearty friendship. "What is your question?"

"I want to ask you why you are not a Christian?" came the unexpected reply.

Now Thomas McPheeters was an outspoken Christian himself, utterly devoted to his Lord, and a real soul-winner, at the same time a society man in the best social life of his day. He and Scofield had much in common—except Christ.

The lawyer replied thoughtfully: "Does not the Bible say something about drunkards having no place in heaven? I am a hard drinker, McPheeters."

"You haven't answered my question, Scofield," the other man came back. "Why are you not a Christian?"

"I have always been a nominal Episcopalian, you know," said Scofield, "but I do not recall ever having been shown just how to be a Christian. I do not know how."

Now McPheeters had his answer. He drew up a chair, took a Testament out of his pocket, and read passage after passage from the precious Good News, plainly telling his friend how to be saved. "Will you accept the Lord Jesus Christ as your Saviour?" he asked.

"I'm going to think about it," said Scofield.

"No, you're not," answered McPheeters. "You've been thinking about it all your life. Will you settle it now? Will you believe on Christ now, and be saved?"

The logical-minded, clear-thinking lawyer liked clean-cut statements and unequivocal questions and answers. After a moment's thought he looked his friend full in the face, and said quietly, "I will." The two men dropped down on their knees together. Scofield told the Lord Jesus Christ that he believed on Him as his personal Saviour, and before he arose from his knees he had been born again: there was a new creation, old things had passed away, behold, all things had become new.

Sometime after 1919, one B. McCall Barbour, related the story, making some modifications. Barbour's story has been picked up in a tract entitled *Christ the Cure*, issued by Good News Publishing Co., Westchester, Illinois. Another version appeared in 1934 in a periodical called *The World's Crisis*. Short pieces have appeared during the years as Scofield's role has been told.

The Trumbull story has one aspect which is somewhat objectionable. It related the story as it was a verbatim report of a completely private conversation. The other writers used the same technique. Now, the moment of conversion may be vividly etched on a convert's mind, but it is doubtful if Scofield's memory 40 years later justified use of the conversational form. Tape recorders were years in the future.

The story places the scene of conversion in Scofield's law office. But in the last chapter, we established that there is no record, in recognized sources of a Scofield law office in 1879 when the conversion supposedly took place. Deputies could not locate Scofield's office in 1877 or 1878. It must have passed out of existence almost before the ink was dry on the pages of the 1877 edition of the City Directory.

Another weakness in the story. Persons not admitted to the bar do not usually maintain law offices. We have established that Scofield was never admitted to the bar in Missouri.³ He in effect confirms this by mentioning only the Kansas Bar in his entry in "Who's Who in America, 1912." Not only did the office not exist, but the justification for the office is impossible, legally and economically.

The "instrument" in the conversion only adds to the problem. Trumbull refers to Tom McPheeters as: "... an outspoken Christian, himself, utterly devoted to his Lord, and a real soul-winner, at the same time a society man in the best sense of that word, mingling with the best social life of his day."⁴ And he quotes a friend of McPheeters: "His life was *all* the Christian life, in business as elsewhere."⁵

This evaluation is confirmed by official sources in St. Louis. It is further supported by comments of those who know his descendants. McPheeters was a man who wanted and used only the best of everything; this tied in with his love of Jesus Christ. His business interests required

the best legal talent available from among the members of the bar in St. Louis.

Thus we consider it very unlikely that the man involved in the forgeries noted the previous chapter would have been given an opportunity to handle the legal business of McPheeters.⁶ The two may have met more than once after 1879, but never as client and legal counsel.

By the time the story of Scofield's "conversion" in the "law office" received wide circulation, McPheeters had departed this life, well in advance of *The Rapture*. McPheeters' death occurred on October 5, 1909. He could not be reached to clarify any discrepancies.

The dating of the conversion should be simpler. BeVier assumes that it took place before the start of D. L. Moody's 1879-1880 evangelistic campaign.⁷ Before the campaign, Moody held a preliminary meeting of ministers in St. Louis on Nov. 25, 1879.⁸ Intimations are that Scofield was associated with the campaign virtually from its start. Hence, the conversion should have taken place before November 25. Scofield affirmed that he was 36 when he was converted. He reached that age on August 19, 1879. Thus we are limited to the period of Aug. 19 through Nov. 24.

But as late as November 6, Scofield was still involved with the courts in matters of forgery.⁹ The disposition of the case does not accord with the action of a new convert trying to right matters as he embarks on his new life in Christ. The case of *Vollmer vs. Papin and Betts* (0 43326) did not have its final hearing until Nov. 18, 1879. The decision in that case did not, for Scofield, accord with the role and values of a new convert. And we are left with a very few days in November in which we might reasonably place the experience, if it occurred when and as related to Trumbull by Scofield.

Writing about an unrelated diary of some historic importance, which appeared in 1879, the reputed year of Scofield's conversion, historian Frank Maloy Anderson (University of Minnesota and Dartmouth College) noted:

Many of their statements cannot be checked upon the evidence of other sources—"controlled" in the language of historical method. If a particular diary contains a good deal that cannot be "controlled"; if there is in it a good deal that other men might well have known and reported but did not; if, in a word, too much of it escapes "control", there then appears reasonable ground for distrust."¹⁰

Anderson was referring to a well-known bit of *Lincolnia*, "The Diary of a Public Man."¹¹ The matter of "control" which he discusses led him to declare that the "Diary" which had generally been accepted as source for a number of anecdotes about Lincoln, was a combination of fact and fabrication. His conclusion was reached because so many entries in the "Diary" failed the test of "control."

In the story of Scofield's conversion, we have a similar situation. Those "details" of the story which can be checked against the "control" of accepted public records do not support Scofield's story. Having applied "control," note Trumbull's comment regarding the incident:

There have been all sorts of inaccurate and misleading stories of the conversion of Dr. Scofield. Passing from mouth to mouth, some of these have gained currency, and as he says himself, he long ago gave up hope of denying or correcting them. But these facts have been given here as they actually occurred, and as Dr. Scofield wishes them to be known.¹²

The principle of "control" does not support Trumbull, nor does it permit confirmation as factual that which Dr. Scofield wished to be known. Thus we still do not know the facts of the conversion of a man who had profound influence in an important segment of the church.

But we must give proper weight to a statement that John J. Ingalls (often referred to as sarcastic Mr. Ingalls) made in 1899:

No man can doubt the efficacy of the scheme of Christian salvation with the record of Scofield in view.¹³

Speaking of the phenomenon of conversion, J. Gresham Machen said:

They know that when on such and such a day they kneeled in prayer they were still in their sins, and when they rose from their knees they were children of God never to be separated from Him. Such experience is a very holy thing. But on the other hand it is a mistake to demand that it should be universal. There are Christians who can give day and hour of their conversion, but the great majority do not know exactly at what moment they were saved. The effects of the act are plain, but the act itself was done in the quietness of God.¹⁴

But to avoid bogging down on one incident, let us note: "The Lord knoweth them that are His. And, let everyone that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity" (*II Tim. 2:19*).

The unseemly haste to get Scofield's forgery cases off the court dockets without fair adjudication was a prelude to his entry into this new role as a Christian worker. For the next several years, his life in Christian service was under the aegis of Rev. James H. Brookes, pastor of the Walnut Street Presbyterian Church.

Brookes had accepted a prophetic view remarkably close to that of the Plymouth Brethren and Brethern leader John Darby. It has been claimed that Brookes and Darby had been in personal contact when Darby passed through St. Louis either in 1877 or on earlier trips.¹⁵ Scofield always claimed Brookes as a "Father in the Faith." Brookes was one of the group instrumental in bringing D. L. Moody to St. Louis for the 1879-1880 campaign.

Scofield's acceptance as a worker in the campaign and his alleged move to a position close to D. L. Moody are a bit inexplicable. There

had been enough in the press, that, had Brookes any interest in integrity, he would have held a counseling session-in-depth with Cyrus.

No matter what Cyrus would have told Brookes, if Brookes had been reading anything in the newspapers except those items which confirmed his view of Matthew 24, he would have made a few inquiries about Scofield. A check as superficial as that made by a neighborhood grocer or butcher investigating a new charge account applicant would have produced evidence demonstrating Scofield's unfitness for Christian work until some matters had been cleared up, some restitution made.

From the Trumbull relation, we note that Scofield was, up to 1879, close to illiterate in things Christian.¹⁶ Present research confirms Trumbull. Hence, it is not possible to establish exactly what service Scofield could have rendered to the Moody campaign which began in November 1879.

Writing in 1945, Oswald Allis indicated that he felt James H. Brookes was guilty of coverup in regard to the source of his prophetic ideas.¹⁷ We submit that Brookes' coverup went a lot farther. He covered up the reason for the initiative which led him to accept and push Scofield, but probably the initiative did not start with Brookes.

Moody remained in St. Louis through April 1880. During that time Scofield's activities in the campaign made it possible for him to largely avoid facing the reality of securing an income for himself and for the support of his family left behind in Atchison in another faith.

BeVier seemed convinced that Scofield's time was divided between law practice and Christian work.¹⁸ But even if Scofield's reputation had been clean, most of his law work would have had to have been limited to drafting of simple documents, wills and similar instruments. But such could produce little more than a pittance of an income. The description of the Christian work, outside the Moody campaign, suggests that originally it was something of a freelance variety without assured income.

Somehow or other, Scofield paid the rent on the room he occupied at 1000 Locust Street, St. Louis.¹⁹ But there is no evidence that he was concerned about his legal or moral obligation for the support of Leontine, Abigail or Marie Helene. In fact, in 1881, the *Atchison Patriot* story reported that occasional amounts of money sent irregularly from St. Louis were minimal.²⁰ Mrs. Scofield's financial need in this period has been confirmed in conversation with those who knew her.

It was in this period that Scofield's ideas on prophecy began to take shape. Scofield credits Brookes for those ideas. We must note that the basic seed material planted by Brookes could only have grown into young plants by Scofield utilizing idle evenings in his rented room. And those evenings were available because Leontine was working hard and long hours at De Gignac's Millinery Trimmings store in Atchison to support the girls.²¹

A departure from the Scofield story is made here to note that Brookes' view of prophecy was not universally held at that time. His insistence, imparted to Scofield, on a failing, irrelevant church and a decaying world was influenced by selective consideration of the literary output of special interests who wanted a certain prophetic view disseminated and accepted. Brookes' prophetic direction was one result. But despite Darby's indefatigable labors, his views were not the only expression of Biblical Christianity.

Brookes' pastorate in St. Louis overlapped in time with the ministry of Friedrich A. Tholluck at the University of Halle, Germany. Tholluck, whose depth differs from the "prophecy buffs," taught something very different. In his study "Light from the Cross," he is quite explicit in his belief in a triumphant church prevailing on earth against Satan.²² He is quite specific in placing the "Great Tribulation" in A.D. 70, rather than at a time when the expressways are to be littered with driverless autos. Now the failure of Tholluck's views to remain prevalent in the world-wide exchange of Christian truth, is due in large measure to the activities of prophecy buffs like Brookes, Darby and Scofield.

But back to Brookes' role in starting Scofield on the path to prominence in the milieu of the failing church. It seems that no one, Brookes, Scofield, or anyone else gave any consideration to the relevance of I Corinthians 7:14 in the Scofield marital tangle. Was Leontine sloughed off; were the girls sloughed off as predestined to be forever outside the Evangelical faith? The treatment would make a hyper-Calvinist shudder. Or did Brookes get a view of Leontine that suggested she was already beyond hope?

Following his role as a volunteer worker in the Moody campaign, Scofield became involved in the work of the YMCA, then a basically Fundamental organization. He became acting secretary of the YMCA, St. Louis, in August 1880.²³ If the law practice existed, it was not sufficiently pressing to intrude on the YMCA duties.

In July 1880, Scofield joined the Pilgrim Congregational Church of St. Louis. Dr. C. C. Goodell, the pastor, was a personal friend of Brookes and appears from this distance to have been agreeable to Brookes' views on prophecy. Scofield thus resumed for another 30 years an association with the Congregational denomination. This had been the family religious connection from the arrival in Connecticut in the 1630's until the move to Michigan.

Not long after joining the church, Scofield engaged in a bit of public activity on its behalf. And here we have a case of stories, in later years, being told differently to different listeners. Trumbull notes a request from Goodell himself.²⁴ Luther Rees was told that the request came from Walter Douglas of the congregation.²⁵ Whatever the source, Scofield complied. He carried a sign (or transparency) through the

streets of downtown St. Louis advertising the evening service at Pilgrim. Scofield claimed that on that jaunt he never at one time saw so many of his society friends and "drinking companions." Those who knew of his relationship with the lack of concern for Leontine were probably not impressed.

Scofield's sister, Laura Marie Eames, and her husband were prominent residents of St. Louis. Emeline Papin and the third sister, Victorine Annan, were also living in St. Louis. Two of the three were never mentioned by Scofield as he related his life story to the Fundamentalist community. We have no inkling of what they thought of the new role of their brother who had had such a chequered career.

Unless Scofield had built up a cache of cash from adventures in forgery which never showed up on court dockets, in this period he must have lived on the generosity of Christians who were sympathizers with Moody's evangelism and Brookes' prophecy.

Shortly after the transparency incident, Walter Douglas introduced Scofield to the president of a railroad reaching the St. Louis area on the east side of the Mississippi. Douglas and Scofield suggested to the president (not identified) that Scofield be allowed to conduct services for the crews of that railroad's trains laying over between runs in East St. Louis, St. Clair County, Illinois. St. Clair County was then, as it is now, notorious for iniquity.

A bit of railroad history must be inserted at this point. James B. Eads, of St. Louis, almost single-handedly, constructed the first bridge crossing the Mississippi at St. Louis. When the bridge was completed in 1874, the Eastern Roads (known to the trade as "Official Territory" lines) refused to use the bridge. Goods and passengers continued to be dumped on the Illinois side to be ferried across the river in the primitive manner which had prevailed for years. It was uncomfortable for the passengers, it was costly, it was damaging to the goods. It was not even in the stockholders' interest as the tolls on Eads' bridge were about half the cost of operating the ferries. The obstinacy of the Official Territory Lines drove Eads into bankruptcy. Only then did the railroads evince any interest in the Eads bridge. By then, Eads had lost what he had dreamed of and worked for.²⁶

The stubbornness of the Official Territory executives and their backers meant that the trainmen had to spend time between runs in a sinkhole of iniquity: East St. Louis. While St. Louis near the railroad terminals was not quite like what was later to be found in Ocean Grove, New Jersey, or Winona Lake, Indiana, it was far better than East St. Louis. The railroads for many reasons would have been wise to get the trains into St. Louis at the earliest opportunity. And, of course, Eads would not have lost his bridge.²⁷ Commendable as the unidentified president's agreement was to utilize Scofield's services, it was hardly

a responsible way to alleviate a basically unnecessary problem. The president's alleged compassion for his crews is in marked contrast to his complacency about bankrupting James B. Eads.²⁸ Yet, this was a harbinger of the kind of social action which was to prevail in churches where Scofield's "leaven" was later to spread.

The results: little that was positive until Scofield befriended a sick conductor. That provided an opening and some "brands were snatched from the burning." But, as usual, with Scofieldian service, impact on society and on the particular problem was a bit less than minimal; a far cry from Pentecost.

About this same time, the St. Louis Association of the Congregational Church issued a "License to Preach" to Scofield.²⁹ So equipped, he organized and pastored the Hyde Park Congregational Church of St. Louis. He continued in that post until the summer of 1882. It was then that associates in the denomination suggested that Scofield might be the man for a vacancy in a Congregational work in Dallas, Texas. Dallas was, of course, farther from Atchison than St. Louis was.

CHAPTER 12 NOTES

1. "Who's Who in America, 1912," *loc. cit.*
2. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 28.
3. See Chapter 11.
4. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 27.
5. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
6. Our evaluation of McPheeters is based on material in *St. Louis, the Fourth City, Pictorial and Biographical Supplement*, Vol. 1, (1912) made available by the Missouri Historical Society.
7. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 25, footnote 61. BeVier relies on Trumbull, p. 27–28. BeVier makes the flat statement that the conversion took place in September 1879, although Trumbull is less specific, stating that it occurred sometime in 1879.
8. From contemporary newspapers as checked by the Missouri Historical Society.
9. *St. Louis Republican*, November 7, 1879.
10. Frank Maloy Anderson, *The Mystery of "A Public Man", A Historical Detective Story*, University of Minnesota Press, 1948, p. 72.
11. Anderson in his work reproduces the "Diary" with the following note: "The Diary is reprinted in the following pages exactly as it originally appeared in the *North American Review*. The First Installment was printed in the August issue, 1879, Vol. 129, pp. 125–140. We have noted that *North American Review* was utilized by Ingalls to sustain the John Brown legend. More to our point, Anderson's detective work suggests that the "Diary" was a combination of fiction by and experiences of Sam Ward, often impecunious brother-in-law of Samuel Gridley Howe, one of The Secret Six. The fictional parts of the "Diary" have helped to cement in the public mind images which fit the picture desired by The Secret Six from the time they started their conspiratorial plans.
12. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 29–30.
13. *Kansas Topics, The Kansas City (MO) Journal*, December 28, 1899, p. 4.
14. J. Gresham Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism*, p. 140.
15. Sandeen, *op. cit.*, p. 74, notes that Darby made five trips to St. Louis including visits in 1872 and 1877. Darby carefully avoids being specific about his contacts in that

city and it is only by an inference made by Harry Ironside that the story of definite contact with Brookes gained circulation. Entirely typical of the mysterious way in which the Failing Church syndrome was spread.

16. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 34-35.
17. Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and The Church*, p. 13, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1945.
18. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 33.
19. *St. Louis City Directory*, 1881.
20. More in Chapters 13 and 14.
21. DeGignac was a dealer in millinery trimmings in Atchison, Kansas, where Leontine first found employment when she became aware that Cyrus would no longer support her.
22. *Light from the Cross, Part II, The Sufferings and Death of Christ*, Sermon VII, "The Command of Jesus 'Weep Not for Me, But for Yourselves,'" p. 189ff. Moody Press, Chicago, 1952. The writer's copy from Moody Press is a volume in "The Wycliffe Series of Christian Classics" and bears the names in the imprint of Wilbur M. Smith, S. Maxwell Coder and J. C. McCaulay. None of them appeared to have noted the extent to which Tholluck's Lecture is in conflict with significant portions of the Doctrinal Statement of Moody Bible Institute.
23. Material supplied by the Missouri Historical Society. Records of the YMCA itself do not go back that far.
24. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
25. *Central American Bulletin*, September 1921, p. 3.
26. The writer's attention was first called to this detail of St. Louis history in Chapter XIII of *Road to the Sea, the Story of James B. Eads and the Mississippi River*, by Florence Dorsey, Rinehart and Company, New York, 1947. The matter is discussed in more detail in "Municipal Reference Bulletin," St. Louis, March 1927, and "Fifty Years of Transportation," Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis. Also in Sharf, *History of St. Louis*.
27. Note that with the development of modern railroading, the lines did return to terminals on the Illinois side. Today yards such as Rose Lake, Gateway, Dupo and Ackerman are important links in the national transportation system. However, in the 1870's there was no excuse to refuse to use the bridge and drive Eads into bankruptcy.
28. See Dorsey, *op. cit.*
29. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

CHAPTER 13

The Heir of the Plymouth Brethren or “Meet Me in St. Louis”

“But ye, brethren, be not weary in well-doing.”

II Thess 3:13

When convert Scofield in 1879 moved from forgery to Christian work, he found a niche in Christendom off the mainstream of recognized denominations. Scofield credits Presbyterian James H. Brookes with being his spiritual father. But he affiliated with the Pilgrim Congregational Church, pastor, Charles H. Goodell. That crossing of denominational lines was to occur at an accelerated rate in the years to come, much of it due to the influence of Scofield.

Convert Scofield “happened to be in the one city in North America which had been singled out by John Nelson Darby for concentrated ‘planting the seed’ of Darby’s special brand of Bible teaching. Oswald Allis notes that the “Brookes” Dispensational beliefs so closely resembled

... those of the Brethren that it seems clear that they were largely derived from them, Brookes gave no credit for them to Darby or any of the Brethren. This may be due to the fact that there were associations with the name of Darby which Brookes wished to avoid.¹

During the summer of 1872, Darby wrote of the situation in St. Louis: “. . . had good opportunities and I am in pretty full intercourse with those exercised, among whom are more than one official minister.”² Harry Ironside claims that Darby preached in Brookes’ pulpit. His statement is the only testimony we have of a link between Darby and Brookes.³ That link, however, has been accepted as official by all concerned with the history of the movement.

The fact that Darby visited America went largely unnoticed in Dispensational circles for many years. Even today we cannot really trace Darby’s movements on this side of the Atlantic. An attempt to use the datelines of his published letters to build an itinerary was inconclusive and produced nothing definitive. Note that it is evident that between the time the Gold Spike was driven at Promontory Point, Utah, in May of 1869 and Darby’s last visit in 1877, he made more trips across the Great Plains on the new Union Pacific Railway than most Americans. The unusual nature of Darby’s movements has been noticed by others. For instance, Robert L. Pierce in *The Rapture Cult*

comments on "... Darby's unusual mobility, for his day and time, and his seeming lack of financial problems."⁴ All of which is most strange.

This has had some notice in Brethren circles. A Brethren writer, using in British manner the pen name of "Touchstone" commented:

What strikes us as amazing is the swiftness in which doctrines unknown previous to Darby became so widely accepted as to be regarded as almost fundamental to the Christian faith.⁵

The more investigation, the more the mystery.

If one accepts official stories, and assumes only religious influences, the Brethren movement appears strongly British in origin. Actually it grew out of the intellectual ferment spun off by the French Revolution.⁶ Among the names, we note Lacunza, Maitland, Newman (John Henry and Francis), Froude, Irving, Carlyle, Lady Powerscourt, Henry Drummond (the eccentric banker), the Frere Brothers (J. Hatley and J. Hookham) and Joseph Wolff.

A number of the figures (Darby and Banker Drummond, especially) had contacts on the Continent which are not fully explained even today. It was on the Continent that Brethrenism was spawned.

As Otto J. Scott and Ralph L. Rusk have noted, aiders and abettors of "The Secret Six" (*Chapter 8*) visited several of those listed.⁷ All were very secret and kept so for contemporaries.

Thus we have the mystery of Brethren origination, the mystery of Darby and Brookes in St. Louis. There are other strange coincidences. Darby concentrated on an area in the United States which had strong connections with the Continent which had hatched ungodly ideas. It was in that city that he profusely scattered the seed which flowered into Dispensationalism. Is it another coincidence that the blossoming of Darby's movement in its American form was entrusted to a man based in St. Louis who had a "French Connection?" That man was C. I. Scofield.

Scofield spoke of Darby as "... the most profound Bible student of modern times. . . ."⁸ Scofield could have studied Darby's voluminous writings. There is room for the possibility that they may have met. Dave MacPherson in *The Great Rapture Hoax* is quite sure that they did.⁹ There was a period between the resignation and the career in forgery when they could have. Darby's last letter from North America on his last visit was written from Montreal just before he boarded ship for the final return to England. The date was just a few days after Scofield had "taken" Frank Vollmer with the forged note. A meeting during the 1877 visit would have occurred during the time Scofield was "using" the Boatmen's Bank to pass his "carefully made" notes. Such a meeting would indicate a dimension to Darby never before considered. The meeting may never have occurred.

But what were the beliefs, the distinctives which Brookes appears to have appropriated from Darby and which Scofield learned either by direct contact or from Brookes.

First, that the "Church is in ruins." To Darby, the Church had failed and was beyond hope. Darby further held that every previous system set up by God had failed and that the Church would go the same way.¹⁰ This view just happens to impugn the character of God, suggesting that He is incapable of getting men to obey Him and to carry out His will. In this light the wonderful devotional writings of Darby seem like mere words. Darby's vision is not Christian but a westernizing of the Manichean heresy which flows out of the Orient.

Just as Darby's teaching divided the Church, so it divided the Scripture and its application. Darby divided Scripture and time into periods called "Dispensations" in which he claimed God dealt differently with man that He did in the period before or after. He made a rigid division between the Old and New Testament except when he needed the Old Testament for purposes of his eschatology. Today followers of Darby's system tend to neglect the Old Testament and even parts of the New.

There was another dichotomy between law (Old Testament) and grace (New Testament). The effect of this dichotomy was to shift the moral scale in the direction of antinomianism. Darby called for a separation from the "world" in any form. Included was dress, pleasure, education and association. But his stricture against law has made conformity to the "world" easier, even quite normal.

Howard Rowdon in his *Origins of The Brethren* notes the Brethren view of separation as applied to the political realm. (This was never adopted in America to quite the degree it was in Britain):

In fact, politically the Brethren attitude was negative. Newton argued that since the principles of national life were "essentially opposed to those of Christ" there was no alternative for the Christian to "protestation against evil and separation from it." No middle course is possible since "we cannot give ourselves two personalities" by acting in a Christian way as private individuals, and in an unchristian way as citizens.¹¹ Again, the study of prophecy demanded a course of separation from a world which was hastening to destruction.¹² "Is it fitting," asked J. L. Harris, "for heaven-born men to be worldly legislators and politicians?"¹² It was, of course, agreed that subjection to "the powers that be" is mandatory; but it was held that there was Scriptural warrant for a Christian attempting to secure privilege by political means, or administering political authority.¹³ Scripture authorized Christians to exercise authority "in three special relations of Father, Husband, Master . . . but never as kings, magistrates, or as holding any authority in the world."¹⁴ The resignations of positions already held which were inconsistent with those confictions was both enjoined and practiced. Further, it became customary for Brethren to decline the right to vote.¹⁵ As for the obligation to submit to "the powers

that be," this was enjoined "entirely independent of their character and of circumstances."¹⁶

Darby's eschatology focused on the "Imminent Return," disregarding the implications of the Lord's words in Mark 13:31: "But of the day and that hour knoweth no man, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Darby and followers expected the end of the age in the 19th Century. Writing in 1901, Blair Neatby in his *History of The Plymouth Brethren* said:

If any one had told the first Brethren that three quarters of a century might elapse and the Church be on earth, the answer would probably have been a smile, partly of pity, partly of disapproval, wholly of incredulity. Yet so it has proved. It is impossible not to respect hopes so congenial to an ardent devotion; yet it is clear now that Brethrenism took shape under the influence of a delusion, and that delusion was a decisive element in all of its distinctive features.¹⁷

That includes features circulated in meetings in St. Louis.

Several writers, including Ernest Sandeen, have suggested that Darby did not understand the social position of the church and the nature of denominations in America.¹⁸ Sandeen also suggests that Darby was concerned because those who accepted his teaching did not "come out" as those who accepted did in Britain. But the situation in America was different, and Darby's program as carried out by the English Brethren could not have produced in America the results Darby wanted. Darby was not stupid.

Duncan McDougall suggests that a primary purpose of Darby's program was to detach spiritual, devoted people from the mainstream of Christendom.¹⁹ The results have been disastrous for church, society and government in Britain. But 1877 was not quite the time for this in America.

The beliefs which Scofield overtly embraced were neither a return to First Century Christianity nor a development of the faith for which the Reformers and Puritans fought and gave their lives. It was a new thing of most strange origin.

CHAPTER 13 NOTES

1. Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and The Church*, P & R Publishing, 1945, p. 133. Allis, in turn quotes from Harry A. Ironside, *A History of The Plymouth Brethren*, Zondervan, p. 196. Allis notes that Ironside was in contact with the Brethren and seems to have had some access to facts not generally circulated. Ironside's claim is probably correct, but we find no justification for all the secrecy.
2. Letters of J. N. Darby, Morish Co., Vol. 2, p. 180.
3. As noted in Ernest Sandeen, *Roots of Fundamentalism*, p. 75.
4. Robert L. Pierce, *The Rapture Cult*, Signal Mountain, Tenn., 1978, p. 49.
5. *The Witness* (London), issue of July 1972, p. 261, from an article, "A Short-Lived Journal." G. D. C. Howley, then editor, has admitted to the article, using in typical British fashion, pen name "Touchstone."

6. Otto J. Scott, *The Secret Six*, Times Books, 1978, p. 99, and Ralph J. Rusk, *Life of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, p. 191–193. Emerson visited Irving and Carlyle. The role of “Sage of Concord,” as Emerson is often called, should be corrected by some real debunking.
7. *Dr. C. I. Scofield's Question Box*, BICA, Chicago.
8. Dave MacPherson, *The Great Rapture Hoax*, New Puritan Library, Fletcher, N.C., 1983, p. 79.
9. A good analysis of “The Church in Ruins” is in *Backgrounds to Dispensationalism* by Clarence Bass, Eerdmanns, 1960, Chapter IV.
10. Harold Rowdon, *The Origins of The Brethren*, Pickering & Inglis, London, 1967, p. 304.
11. Rowdon is quoting *Christian Witness* IV, p. 265.
12. Rowdon quotes B. W. Newton, *Day of the Lord*, p. 21. The lecture which was published in that pamphlet was given soon after 1840.
13. J. L. Harris, in *Christian Witness*, Vol. I, pp. 458, 459.
14. Rowdon quotes P. F. Hall, *Discipleship*, p. 29.
15. A. Miller, *The Brethren (Commonly so-called)*, London, n. d.
16. J. L. Harris, in *Christian Witness*, I, 459, quoting Hall who deplored “the evil spirit of insubordination now so prevalent on all sides.”
17. W. Blair Neatby, *A History of the Plymouth Brethren*, London, 1901, p. 3.
18. Sandeen, *op. cit.*, p. 79.
19. Rev. Duncan McDougall, *The Rapture of The Saints*, reprint by O. F. P. M. Publishers, Blackwood, N.J., 1970, pp. 44, 47.

CHAPTER 14

The Press and the Minister

"Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon."

II Sam. 1:20a

Scofield had received a fair amount of attention from the press during his short political life in Kansas. His sudden disappearance from the scene at the beginning of 1874 must have left editors wondering. Some may have known stories that discretion made it inadvisable to print. But the contrast between the politician of 1873, the "scalawag" of 1874 and the minister of 1881 was entirely too good for the press to ignore. A reporter from Atchison, working on a "Scofield story" made his way to St. Louis in the summer of 1881. On whose instigation?

His story, originally printed in the *Atchison Patriot* was picked up by the Topeka paper, *The Daily Capital*, on August 27, 1881, is as follows:

CYRUS I. SCHOFIELD IN THE ROLE OF A CONGREGATIONAL MINISTER

Cyrus I. Schofield, formerly of Kansas, late lawyer, politician and shyster generally, has come to the surface again, and promises once more to gather around himself that halo of notoriety that has made him so prominent in the past. The last personal knowledge that Kansans have had of this peer among scalawags, was when about four years ago, after a series of forgeries and confidence games he left the state and a destitute family and took refuge in Canada. For a time he kept undercover, nothing being heard of him until within the past two years when he turned up in St. Louis, where he had a wealthy widowed sister living who has generally come to the front and squared up Cyrus' little follies and foibles by paying good round sums of money. Within the past year, however, Cyrus committed a series of St. Louis forgeries that could not be settled so easily, and the erratic young gentleman was compelled to linger in the St. Louis jail for a period of six months.

Among the many malicious acts that characterized his career, was one peculiarly atrocious, that has come under our personal notice. Shortly after he left Kansas, leaving his wife and two children dependent upon the bounty of his wife's mother, he wrote his wife that he could invest some \$1,300 of her mother's money, all she had, in a manner that would

return big interest. After some correspondence he forwarded them a mortgage, signed and executed by one Chas. Best, purporting to convey valuable property in St. Louis. Upon this the money was sent to him. Afterwards the mortgages were found to be base forgeries, no such person as Charles Best being in existence, and the property conveyed in the mortgage fictitious. While Cyrus I. Scofield lay in the St. Louis jail, charged and convicted of forgery, he came under the notice of the St. Louis Flower Mission, and a young and beautiful girl, the only daughter of a wealthy St. Louisian, was in the habit of visiting the jail every day, or nearly so, in the interest of the mission, and giving Cyrus a bouquet. The acquaintance thus made behind the bars soon ripened into love, and the girl became madly infatuated with the object of her missionary work.

In the latter part of his confinement, Schofield, under the administration of certain influences, became converted, or professedly so. After this change of heart his wealthy sister came forward and paid his way out by settling the forgeries, and the next we hear of him he is ordained as a minister of the Congregational church, and under the chaperonage of Rev. Goodell, one of the most celebrated divines of St. Louis, he causes a most decided sensation. In the meantime the courtship between himself and the pretty young representative of the Flower Mission continued, Schofield representing first that his wife had obtained a decree of divorce. When the falsity of this story was ascertained by inquiries of our district clerk, he started on another that a divorce would be obtained, that he loved his children better than his life, but that the incompatibility of his wife's temper and her religious zeal in the Catholic church was such that he could not possibly live with her.

A representative of the Patriot met Mrs. Schofield today, and that little lady denies, as absurd, such stories. There was never any domestic clouds in their homes. They always lived harmoniously and pleasant. As to her religion, she was no more zealous than any other church member. She attended service on the sabbath, and tried to live as becomes a christian woman and mother. It was the first time she had ever heard the objection raised by him. As to supporting herself and the children, he has done nothing, said the little woman. Once in a great while, say every few months, he sends the children about \$5, never more. "I am employed with A. L. de Gignac & Co., and work for their support and mine. As soon as Mr. Schofield settles something on the children to aid me in supporting them and giving them an education, I will gladly give him the matrimonial liberty he desires. I care not who he marries, or when, but I do want him to aid me in giving our little daughters the support and education they should have."¹

(Note that the reporter committed an error frequently made, even today, placing an "h" in the name. There is, however, no question about

the identity of the subject.) It looks as though the reporter felt that he could not write a story about "clerical errors" without including an attempted or actual violation of the Commandment. Inaccuracy in media is not a late 20th Century phenomenon,. *The Atchison Patriot's* reporter's attempt on Scofield did not quite succeed.

On September 9, 1881, *The Atchison Patriot* published this letter from Mrs. J. H. Barnard, president of the St. Louis Flower Mission:

Sirs:

In your August 26th paper I found an account of the exploits on one Cyrus I. Schofield, and a little romancing in which one of the young ladies of our St. Louis Flower Mission is implicated. Usually I think it better to let those things rest, but thought it best to make a correction in your paper. For four years our Mission has not visited any of the penal institutions of our city, though we have entree to all of them. About four years ago some women visited prisoners under the guise of the Flower Mission and introduced saws, files and the like in the bouquets of flowers; fortunately the plot was discovered, we of course being fully exonerated and a request to continue our work extended to us.

Having our hands full in the hospitals we relinquished the jail and hence could not have had one of our ladies there within the past year.

I am assured, sir, you will be happy to make this explanation quite as publically as you have made the objectionable statement. On some of your visits to our city we shall be happy to meet you at our rooms, and you will judge for yourselves whether or not our ladies could be so frivolous. Be so good as to send me the number of your paper making this correction, and greatly oblige,

Yours respectfully,
Mrs. J. H. Barnard
President Flower Mission
1819 Washington Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri²

BeVier, in his 1960 thesis, noted the first *Atchison Patriot* story but dismissed it as largely fabrication with intent to slander.³ Mrs. Barnard's letter did not come to light until late 1984. While it does not affect the main thrust of the story it does invalidate the "juiciest" item in the sordid tale. For this we can be thankful, for it precludes gossip-minded Fundamentalists from dwelling on a common error (especially in the late 1980's), not the more sophisticated Scofield deviations.⁴ But it still leaves an impression that Scofield's lifestyle was hardly that of a consecrated servant of the Most High God.

It is evident that *The Atchison Patriot* story circulated in St. Louis, more widely than just among the exchanges of the newspapers. This heightens the probability that Brookes and Goodell read the story, even if Scofield had enough clout to keep it out of the St. Louis papers. Since both ministers would have been in a position to know the facts, we feel that a published denial of the story from either a Presbyterian or Congregational source would have been considered inadvisable for the future of Dispensationalism.

One error of the *Patriot* reporter may have been a serious one for Scofield research. The "Chas. Best" who the reporter declared nonexistent was undoubtedly an incorrect reference to Charles F. Betts, who drove the buggy out to Webster Grove. Too bad, the reporter was looking for "Best" and not "Betts." We somehow feel that any typical reporter would have had real rapport with Betts. There might have been a longer story in the *Patriot*.

Leontine was such a lady that she never mentioned embezzlement from Mrs. Cerré. Of course, the fictional Chas. Best could have been part of such an embezzlement scheme. The similarity in name to the real estate agent from 8th Street could have been a ploy to ease negotiation of fraudulent instruments.

When the story of D. L. Moody's funeral and the clergymen who officiated was circulated in 1899, it brought stories about Scofield to the surface again. On December 28, 1899, *The Kansas City Journal* published the following item on its page 4:

The pastor who delivered the sermon and presided at the funeral of Dwight L. Moody, the famous evangelist, was Rev. C. I. Scofield. Some of the readers of The Journal may have recognized this name, but probably few will recall that Scofield was formerly of Kansas and figured prominently in politics. Originally he came from Tennessee, and during the war of the rebellion, he served with the Confederate forces, being a member of the Seventh regiment of Tennessee volunteers. He was drawn to Kansas by reason of the fact that his wife was one of the heirs of Regis Loisel, the intrepid Frenchman whose descendants were permitted to select 38,000 acres of land in Nemaha and other Kansas counties in lieu of a grant of which Loisel had held the title at the date of his death. Hon. John J. Ingalls was attorney for Mrs. Scofield, who was a native of St. Louis and a direct heir of the dead Frenchman, and, in turn, Mr. Scofield became a warm admirer of the brilliant Kansas senator.

Scofield landed in Nemaha County in 1872, just in time to be nominated on the Republican ticket for member of the legislature. He was elected, and, though ostensibly a supporter of Senator Pomeroy, he became largely instrumental in causing the election of Ingalls. Indeed, he was recognized as one of the foremost leaders in the Ingalls camp and by some as Ingall's personal representative, and in reward for his services he was made United States district attorney for the state. But he did not hold this office long. He was ousted in disgrace on account of some shady financial transactions which left him indebted in a number of thousands to a score of prominent Republicans. One of his victims once said to Topics:"

The way Scofield got our money—and he plucked \$2,000 of mine—was by intimating that it was needed by Senator Ingalls, who would see

that it was paid. We knew that Ingalls was good, and we supposed that on account of his official position he did not care to be known in a money-borrowing transaction and was doing the business through a friend.

In due time, however, the shady nature of Scofield's financial transactions became known to Ingalls and the money lenders and then followed an explosion which compelled Scofield to resign his federal office and leave the state. From Kansas he went to St. Louis, and, shortly after his arrival there, he was lodged in jail on a charge of forgery, preferred by his own sister. At this point in his checkered life began his religious career, for when he emerged from confinement he was an enthusiastic Salvationist. While in jail he had been visited by a band of Christian women who prayed with him and worked his conversion, and upon his release he entered the Congregational ministry. His first pastorate was at Dallas, Tex., where he built up one of the wealthiest and most aristocratic church organizations in the state. In the meantime his Kansas wife had secured a divorce (she still lives in Atchison) and he married a fine woman in Texas who was prominent in his church.

Almost at once Scofield became a noted expositor of the Bible, and, after he had attracted the attention of Evangelist Moody, he was given the chair of Bible history in Moody's Northfield Bible school, as well as the pastorate of the Northfield Congregational church. He became the author of a number of tracts and volumes of sermons, and under his name are now printed regular issues of Bible lessons and studies.

When approached by his Kansas creditors Parson Scofield declares that he is poor and unable to pay, but he has never failed to do the right and easy thing by renewing his notes. So far as those who know him best are able to judge, his conversion is of an enduring nature, and, as once remarked by his old friend and supporter, the sarcastic Mr. Ingalls, "No man can doubt the efficacy of the scheme of Christian salvation with the record of Scofield in view."⁵

The 1899 story may help clear up the mystery surrounding events in Kansas at the end of 1873. If Scofield had defrauded the leading Republican politicians of Kansas, obviously, he "had to go." But these same Republican leaders could not afford to have it known publicly that they had been involved. This being so, the only course was to have Scofield "disappear," allowing the scandal to blow over. There is nothing recorded which makes that scenario impossible.

The "prominent Republican" and the reporter from Kansas City were neither more nor less accurate than their present day counterparts. The "prominent Republican" could at least be excused on the grounds of memory—a quarter of a century had passed since the events he was relating had occurred.

The "prominent Republican" of 1899 accepts the "juicy" item from the original story. Either Mrs. Barnard's denial was not widely noted

(somehow denials always have poorer circulation than original stories) or else there were other instances of irregularities. Mrs. Barnard properly wanted her mission cleared. But both stories refer to a jail term which would have been *after* the close of the 1879-1880 Moody St. Louis campaign. The official prison record has not been located, but it could have happened. It would not be out of keeping with the character of our subject.

The *Atchison Patriot* reporter has given us a story which the "prominent Republican" accepted, suggesting that it had a somewhat more than limited acceptance in the 1880's. The story is that of the girl from the Flower Mission. The continued acceptance of the Flower girl incident does suggest the possibility of things just below the surface. We would leave them there until we can get the eschatology straightened out.

The story of Scofield's rather casual extension of notes, which had ostensibly been made to repay funds embezzled, does not surprise. It is entirely congruent with the antinomian nature of Dispensationalism which Scofield inherited from J. N. Darby. Instead of allowing the legal obligation to expire with the statute of limitations, Scofield tolled the statute with the notes even though he could not have any intention of repayment. He was always quite casual about legal documents. The contact with McPheeters appears to have made no change.

In answer to any charge that we give too much credence to unsupported newspaper reports, we ask the Dispensational community if the story of Tom McPheeters in the law office is any less unsubstantiated than the Flower Mission girl story.

It is not entirely clear what the reporters of 1881 or 1899 hoped to accomplish by publishing the Scofield stories. If they had any hopes of awakening the church, they were sadly mistaken. The matter had been taken out of their hands years before by the inherent nature of the religious system of James H. Brookes and C. I. Scofield.

Typical of the phenomenon, John Cumming, a British pastor who shared Scofield's views, said in the 1850's regarding news and newspapers:

... but I think that the newspaper of the nineteenth century is man unconsciously recording "It is done." God writes the prophecy; the journalist steps in, and without thinking of the prophecy, testifies its complete and magnificent fulfilment.⁶

In effect, Cumming suggests that the news is to be interpreted with J. N. Darby's view of Matthew 24 as the overriding standard, with events at the Eastern end of the Mediterranean as the only important items. In such a situation, facts are irrelevant, values passé and fable rampant. No one in the churches supporting Scofield paid any attention to newspaper reports.

No record of the appearance of the *Atchison Patriot* story in the St. Louis newspapers has been turned up, but St. Louis editors must have noted the story as Kansas papers crossed the exchange desk. Possibly that special providence which is alleged to watch over drunks, children and idiots kept the story out of the St. Louis papers. Or more prosaically, whoever was nurturing the career of C. I. Scofield may have had enough clout to let the St. Louis editors know that publication of the *Atchison Patriot* story was inadvisable.

In the fundamentalist story of the conversion, referred to in the last chapter, there is one recurring reference to the "old" Scofield which the press never picked up. Trumbull very carefully developed the story that the Scofield who entered the Moody Campaign in late 1879 was a just-dried-out drunk who straightened out under the influence of Tom McPheeters. The careful development by Trumbull is so reasonable to those who know the history of the mores of the Old Frontier. To place Scofield in the 1870's, Trumbull said:

The moderate use of liquor was a commonplace in the life in which he moved and had been reared. He drank as he pleased, and, like most men who drink "in moderation," he soon drank too much.⁷

Before world grain markets developed, distilling was a most efficient way to prepare grain for transportation—and some was duly transported down throats. We can be sure that the men who participated in the Pomeroy-Ingalls battle for the Senate seat in January 1873 consumed great quantities of alcoholic beverages made from Kansas grain—and Scofield was among them. But even this does not inevitably make a man an alcoholic.

Trumbull took a bit on himself to make Scofield both a drunk and a successful lawyer acceptable to a businessman like Tom McPheeters. It is here that we detect a thread of fable.⁸ Scofield was probably well-known in saloons in the vicinity of Betts' real estate office on 8th Street, but his forgeries suggest a rather clear head.

Reporters, especially in the 1879's, were quite proud of their ability to handle their liquor, but they were ruthless when someone fell under the "influence," especially when there was something else to use against a prominent figure. And a story of drunkenness is the second-best thing a reporter can use to run down a cleric. The rather weak pass at the "first" thing suggests that our Scofield was a bit abstemious where failings of the flesh here concerned.

The story of Scofield's drunkenness may have been part of the package of merchandising that elevated Scofield to such prominence in Fundamental circles. After 1879, Scofield's associations were almost entirely in groups where beverage alcohol was taboo and where a man was considered a hopeless drunk after the second drink. In such a

setting the value of a victory over "demon rum" would be tremendous. Important circulation of the story of the "victory" over drunkenness came as the Premillennial portion of the church was accelerating its retreat from social responsibility. This retreat included a breathless wait for "The Rapture."

There was another value to the story. Just in case rumors of a past life which did not meet Fundamentalist standards should surface, the "drunkenness story" was ready. It was tailor-made to preserve Scofield's image as "Mr. Clean" or more properly "Mr. Cleaned-up" to his Dispensational following.

CHAPTER 14 NOTES

1. From the files of the Kansas State Historical Society.
2. From the Atchison Public Library.
3. BeVier, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-30.
4. The writer has known devout Evangelical matrons, who, hearing of a marital deviation, have, with seeming innocence, asked, "Please tell me more so that I can pray more intelligently!"
5. Newspaper from the files of the Kansas City (Mo.) Public Library.
6. Rev. John Cumming, D. D., *The End, or the Proximate Signs of The Close of This Dispensation*, John P. Jewett & Company, Boston, 1855, p. 15. (This American edition followed shortly the original British printing.)
7. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
8. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 29 noted: "There have been all sorts of inaccuracies and misleading stories of the conversion of Dr(*sic*) Scofield."

CHAPTER 15

A Bill of Divorcement

"Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so."

Matt. 19:8

To fully appreciate the portion of the Scofield story related in this chapter, the reader should try to think in terms of the values of a century ago. This means thinking of things as they were accepted before the media were the arbiters of moral values. The breaking up of a marriage would hardly cause raised eyebrows today in the most strict Evangelical circles, but Scofield's position must be judged in the light of the values of the Victorian predecessors of the Fundamentalists.¹ The War Between the States had produced some shift in the views of society and of church people on the matter of divorce, but in most churches, especially those which Scofield served and was to serve, the view was essentially a simplistic, literal application of the words of Jesus Christ Himself, as recorded in Matthew 19, *viz*:

1. Marriage is for life—until death did part (*vss. 4,6*).
2. Necessity for divorce meant the presence of serious emotional, psychological and spiritual problems (*vs. 8*).
3. Remarriage, especially for the legal defendant, was forbidden (*vs. 9*).

Even nearly a century later, we can find pertinent comments from a columnist in the British magazine *Observer*. One especially has particular application to C. I. Scofield. Katharine Whitehorn, in her column of December 11, 1966, wrote:

I cannot help feeling it odd that divorce is talked of in enlightened circles as if it were a benefit that should be available to all, rather than a tragedy that it is worth almost anything to avoid.²

Ten months later, on October 1, 1967, she wrote:

... I would like, just once, to hear someone say of a man who has left his wife and four fat babies right in the middle of the kitchen floor, *not* that he's been through a hard time lately ... ; but simply "You louse!"³

The *Atchison Patriot* reporter noted that Scofield said: "... he loved his children better than his live, but that the incompatibility of his wife's temper and her religious zeal in the Catholic Church was such that he could not possibly live with her. ..."⁴ If the reporter correctly repeated Scofield's comments on the marital situation, we are led to wonder how diligent Scofield had been in really digging into the

Scriptures. His statement is in conflict with what the Holy Spirit had Paul write in I Corinthians 7:14b: "... and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." Possibly Scofield's Bible study had not included the Letter to the Corinthians. Or could it be that Scofield found a Catholic wife an encumbrance in his new role as a Protestant cleric "free from the law?" He was to give much credit for his theology to the Plymouth Brethren. Maybe in the matter of Leontine, he felt that he was quite literally acting according to one of the Brethren's favorite verses which reads: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?" (*II Cor. 6.:14*)

Cyrus' ability (and possibly intent) to make regular provisions for his family virtually ended with the spending of the money from his last salary check for the district attorney post in January 1874. (We are now in the early 1880's.) Apparently Leontine had to call on Cerré family resources. Eventually she went out and worked to support herself and her daughters. Her mother was by this time living in Atchison.

In those Victorian days, opportunity for a respectable woman in need to earn a living was limited. A. L. de Gignac & Company dealt in millinery trimmings, materials with which women were familiar.⁵ Leontine was employed there at the time the reporter from the *Patriot* was working on the important story. His interview with Leontine produced nothing which would flatter Cyrus' image.

Store hours in those days were long. After a day on her feet Leontine must often have returned in complete exhaustion. Then she must have been extremely grateful for Mrs. Cerré's presence in her home. But remember that on those same evenings when Leontine was so exhausted from carrying the responsibilities dropped by Cyrus, Cyrus had either been basking in the public eye, sharing a platform with D. L. Moody, or digging into his Bible to prove that the world was getting worse and would soon end. As Cyrus was revelling in his first steps in the "failing Church" syndrome, he may not have realized how aptly one of his favorite passages described him. Paul in II Timothy 3:2, 3 says that: "... men shall be lovers of their own selves ... without natural affection ... boasting."

Leontine must have become pretty well disgusted with Cyrus by mid-1881, just about the time he was licensed to preach. She defied custom and had divorce papers drawn up. The original pleading, Atchison County divorce case No. 2181, was sworn to by Leontine Scofield on 23 July 1881. It seems likely that the reporter from the *Patriot* talked to Leontine sometime in August, after he had been to St. Louis. Even making allowance for reportorial license, what he reported was not conventional for a man who had just been "set aside" as having a special calling to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

According to the entry on the jacket of the docket, the papers in case No. 2161 were not filed until December 9, 1881. In the papers, Leontine charged that Cyrus had ". . . absented himself from his said wife and children, and had not been with them but abandoned them with the intention of not returning to them again."⁶ And she further charged that he:

. . . has been guilty of gross neglect of duty and has failed to support this plaintiff or her said children, or to contribute thereto, and has made *no* provision for them for food, clothing or a home, or in any manner performed his duty in the support of said family although he was able to do so.⁶

Trumbull ignores, or was unaware of this part of the story. BeVier tends to pooh-pooh the story that Leontine's financial state was quite desperate at the time⁷ The *Atchison Patriot* story is definite on that point, taking a position quite different from BeVier. Those who were close to the family have been definite in telling the writer that Leontine was quite poor at the time she accepted the finality of separate existence and the permanent role of the sole support of her daughters. Leontine was such a lady that except for the statement in her petitions and the comments just noted, little has come down about all she endured during this trying time.

In response to Leontine's petition, a reply was filed for Cyrus by Attorney Thomas Metcalfe. It read:

Now comes Defendant C. I. Scofield and enters his appearance and for answer to Plaintiff's petition herein denies each and every allegation and averment made and contained therein and prays to be hence dismissed with Judgment for costs.

C. I. Scofield
by Thos. Metcalfe, his Atty.⁸

The court agreed with Leontine and issued a decree of divorce, noting that Cyrus was: ". . . not a fit person to have custody of the children."⁹ But it did permit the granting of visitation privileges to Cyrus, besides ordering payment of alimony and support.

For reasons not made clear in surviving documents, that decree never became final. On March 4, 1882, on a postcard size bit of paper, Attorney Metcalfe on Cyrus' behalf sent the following request from St. Louis to the Atchison County Court:

In case of Scofield vs. Scofield for divorce, Mr. Scofield withdraws his appearance and answer and desires the case dismissed as to him. Please withdraw answer and appearance and oblige.

Yours truly
Thos. Metcalfe
Atty. for Deft.¹⁰

The request was granted. Leontine withdrew her petition and *Scofield vs. Scofield* remained, as did the principals, in a state of limbo. There

are rumors of a reconciliation between Cyrus and Leontine. However, such a reconciliation would have exposed Catholic Leontine to the Protestant groups to whom Cyrus was ministering. The events narrated in Chapters 12 and 17 indicate that she remained hidden as far as Cyrus' congregations were concerned.

It is possible that the progress of legal proceedings was influenced by major events in Cyrus' life. Cyrus made a change in his field of ministry in 1882, locating in Dallas, Texas.

In 1883 the post of librarian, Atchison Public Library, became vacant. Leontine obtained the position, ending her connection with de Gignac store. She retained the post of librarian until she retired in 1917.

Possibly Leontine felt that she should now regularize her situation. For whatever reason, on October 1, 1883, she filed a second petition for divorce. Docketed as case No. 2681, the working of her petition was substantially the same as the one of two years earlier. The action means that Cyrus Ingerson Scofield was ordained to the Christian ministry while he was the defendant in a divorce action. The matter of the ordination is related in Chapter 17.

Case No. 2681 was decided on the 8th day of December 1883. The divorce was granted. The original decree has been preserved with the docket. The copy contains the phraseology that Cyrus "was not a fit person to have custody of the children" and forbade him to interfere with their rearing. The papers make no mention of alimony or support payments. Leontine may have decided that fighting Cyrus over this was not worth the effort. Of course, Cyrus' position in the areas of Christian service would have made such payments socially awkward as well as economically unlikely.

The reader must remember that here we are relating actions and omissions on the part of a man supposedly four-years-old in the Christian life, considered by some of his peers of sufficient spiritual maturity to stand for ordination to the Christian ministry. Yet he was giving no sign of willingness to accept his legal and moral responsibilities to his wife and daughters.

Paul writing to Timothy said: "But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel" (*I Tim.* 5:8).

Yet, this was exactly what Scofield was doing and continued to do as far as Leontine, Abigail and Marie Helene were concerned. Note also that it is most likely that Scofield had to engage in calculated deception to be accepted as a "Shepherd of the Flock."¹¹ Whether the professional "prophecy buffs" who pushed Scofield along were as unknowing as the folks in the pews cannot readily be determined a century later.

Scofield did manage to keep Leontine hidden from the purchasers of his Bible. The facts have gradually leaked out and have caused, as intimated in the beginning of this chapter, no concern among his following. To some extent this is a fruit of Scofield's teaching of a failing church and decaying world. That teaching has sapped the moral fibre of the church.

The severance of the relationship between Cyrus and Leontine was for Cyrus just another step on the road to bigger and better things. We have found no evidence that Scofield had the slightest twinge of remorse except possibly in the very last months of his life.

CHAPTER 15 NOTES

1. The term "Fundamentalist" was not coined until about 1910. Scofield and his close supporters held views which were similar to those later shaped into that movement. Scofield himself helped bring the term into Christendom. "Fundamentalism" has claimed to be orthodox Christianity, but its shape was determined by entry into Biblical Protestantism of certain elements, that entry being aided by highly questionable characters, including the subject of this study.
2. *The Observer*, London, 11 December 1966, quoted in *Christian Counterattack* by Lunn and Lean, Blandford Press, Ltd., London, 1969, p. 28.
3. *The Observer*, London, 1 October 1967, quoted in Lunn and Lean, *op. cit.*, p. 28.
4. The *Atchison Patriot* story reproduced in full in previous chapter.
5. Information on de Gignacs supplied by Mr. Art. Metz, Atchison, Kan.
6. Quoted from the papers in case No. 2161, supplied by the Atchison County Court.
7. In Trumbull, *op. cit.*, the impression is given that Cyrus was a bachelor during those years although that term is never used. For BeVier's comment on Leontine's financial state, see BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
8. Records in case No. 2161.
9. *Ibid.*
10. Copies of papers making up Docket in case No. 2681 supplied by The Atchison County Court.
11. A newspaper report, published in *The Daily Times Herald*, Dallas, Texas, May 30, 1926, five years after Scofield's death claimed that he revealed his entire life to the ordination council. As the matter is discussed in Chapter 17, we consider this highly unlikely; in fact, we hold that statements made at the council as well as his Confession of Faith were masterpieces of cover-up.