

Contents



Foreword
Peter Smith
ix

Surveys

The Bahá'í Faith in the West: A Survey
Peter Smith
3

Esslemont's Survey of the Bahá'í World, 1919-1920
Moojan Momen
63

Episodes

'Abdu'l-Bahá in Budapest
György Lederer
109

"A Bit of Extraneous Matter":
The 1910 Bahai Temple Unity Convention
and the Downfall of Henry Clayton Thompson
Jackson Armstrong-Ingram
129

The Plans of Unified Action
Loni Bramson
155

Beginnings

Outpost of a World Religion:
The Bahá'í Faith in Australia, 1920-1947
Graham Hassall
201

The Circle, the Brotherhood, and the Ecclesiastical Body:
The Bahá'í Faith in Denmark, 1925-1987
Margit Warburg
229

The Bahá'í Community in Edinburgh, 1946-1950
Ismael Valesco
265

Foreword

ALL RELIGIOUS MOVEMENTS emerge within a particular socio-cultural context. For the most part, they remain within the social environment of their birth. They grow or decline in proportion to their success in articulating the cultural concerns of the society in which they are situated and in creating and channeling the enthusiasm of their adherents. Some religious movements, however, transcend their culture of origin, attracting followers from a variety of cultural backgrounds and perhaps eventually establishing firm roots in a number of societies. The resulting diversity entails a double existence for the religion in question. If it is truly multicultural, it exists in a number of distinct local cultural forms. At the same time, insofar as it retains its unity, it remains a single transcultural movement.

The Bahá'í Faith illustrates this multiple existence. Originating within the context of nineteenth-century Iranian Shí'ism, it has long since succeeded in transcending its culture of origin. Not only has it gained a worldwide following, but it has developed in culturally diverse forms. Thus, in the most general terms, we may refer to Bahá'í expansion as having taken place in three cultural-historical "worlds": the predominantly Iranian Shí'í world of the religion's origin; the Western world (the subject of the present volume); and the Bahá'í "Third World," from which most of its contemporary adherents are drawn. Each of these three worlds has had its own distinctive forms and chronologies of Bahá'í expansion.

II

THERE IS GOOD REASON to see the multiform development of the Bahá'í Faith in the West as a single process. The West, here defined as Europe and the culturally cognate territories of North America and the Pacific, is an area of considerable cultural and historical unity. This is grounded in part on the common inheritance of Judeo-Christian and Greco-Roman culture and in part on more recent historical developments, such as European imperialism, industrial capitalism, and consumer culture. Within this area, Bahá'í expansion has followed its own distinctive pattern. Western Bahá'í communities have come to share many cultural characteristics with each other, both by dint of shared patterns of Bahá'í activity and by their common participation in the Western-dominated culture of modernity.

III

RECENT YEARS HAVE SEEN an impressive development in the academic study of the Bábí and Bahá'í religions. As much of this work has been by Western Bahá'ís, academic study itself represents an important aspect of Western Bahá'í development. Important though this work has been, there is still evidently much to be done in relation to the West. We now have several excellent studies of the early American Bahá'í community. Apart from these studies, the period of 'Abdu'l-Bahá's visits to the West, and some very specific topics—such as the cultural aspects of recent Bahá'í conversions in the southern United States, there is very little material on the history and culture of the Bahá'í Faith in America. There are now detailed studies of only five other countries: Australia, Britain, Canada, Denmark, and New Zealand. As with the American studies, much of this work remains unpublished. There is next to nothing written about any other Western country. In addition to general historical studies, there are a number of biographies of prominent Western Bahá'ís, but only a few of these are scholarly in tone, and only a few leading Western Bahá'ís have received serious attention.

One general tendency in much of the work that has been produced so far has been a concentration on Western Bahá'í history and culture in its own context. This leaves a double lacunae. First, there is as yet

little research on the relationship between the Bahá'í movement in the West and its environing societies and cultures. Nor is there any systematic study comparing Bahá'í formation with other religious developments in the West. Second, the relationship between the Bahá'ís in the West and the Bahá'í Faith as a whole has yet to be adequately studied. Clearly, Western Bahá'ís have played a major role in the diffusion of the Faith outside the West, in the development of Bahá'í administration, and in the formulation of frameworks of belief and practice, but the details of this role have yet to be delineated.

IV

GOOD SCHOLARSHIP INVOLVES both individual effort and a collective endeavor. The progress of any scholarly field depends upon these two elements. We are fortunate, then, that both within the Bahá'í community (through the activities of the Association of Bahá'í Studies, originally the Canadian Association for Studies on the Bahá'í Faith [1974-1981]) and independently (through the work of those associated with the Lancaster [1977-1980], Cambridge [1978-1979], and Los Angeles [1983-1985] Bahá'í Studies seminars and their successors), a growing network of scholarly communication and debate has developed. The appearance of publications such as the *Studies in the Bábí and Bahá'í Religions* series reflects this growth. This present volume is a further contribution to the ongoing process of communication and debate.

As to the papers themselves, the first essay provides a general survey of Western Bahá'í history as a whole (Peter Smith), and the second essay studies the Bahá'í world from 1919-1920 (J. E. Esslemont's survey, edited by Moojan Momen). Studies of particular episodes in the history of the Bahá'í Faith in the West follow: György Lederer examines the newspaper reports of 'Abdu'l-Bahá's visit to Budapest in 1913; Jackson Armstrong-Ingram looks at the Henry Clayton Thompson episode of 1910; and Loni Bramson studies the development of the American "Plans of Unified Action." The final essays in the volume investigate the beginnings of three national Bahá'í communities: in Denmark (Margit Warburg), in Australia (Graham Hassell), and in Scotland (Ismael Valesco).

V

THE GESTATION PERIOD of this book has been unduly long. Most of the essays in this book were prepared for publication in 1988, but the project was delayed. A few editorial changes have been made to the original essays, but they remain essentially unchanged. I hope that readers will find them relevant even after this lengthy passage of time. I would like to thank the authors for their patience and cooperation in the preparation of this work. My thanks are also due to the organizers of the Los Angeles Bahá'í History Conferences, at which several of the following papers were first presented, and to Kalimát Press for its hard work on the production of this volume. My thanks to Anthony A. Lee for all his encouragement and perseverance during these years of waiting, and most particularly to Ismael Velasco for his help in preparing the book for final publication.

PETER SMITH
Bangkok
January 2004

PETER SMITH, PH.D. is chairman of the Social Science Division and former Deputy-Director for Academic Affairs at Mahidol University International College. He teaches courses in World History, Social Theory, and Anthropology. His publications include: *The Babi and Baha'i Religions: From Messianic Shi'ism to a World Religion* (Cambridge University Press, 1987) and *A Concise Encyclopedia of the Bahá'í Faith* (Oneworld, 2000).

Surveys





BAHÁ'ÍS IN NEW YORK, 1900

'Abdu'l-Karím-i Tihrání (seated, in turban) was the first Persian teacher sent to the United States by 'Abdu'l-Bahá. Front row: Unknown, Thornton Chase, Tihrání, Lua Getsinger. Back row (l. to r.): Anton Haddad, Unknown, Mirza Sinore Raffie (Tihrání's interpreter), Arthur Pillsbury Dodge, and Edward Getsinger.

The Bahá'í Faith in the West

by Peter Smith

THE DEVELOPMENT of the Bahá'í Faith in the West forms an important part of the history of Bahá'í expansion.¹ This essay attempts to provide a general account of this development, as well as to locate it within the overall context of Bahá'í history. Some account of the distribution and social composition of the present Western Bahá'í communities is also offered.

Western Bahá'í history forms part of the overall history of the Bahá'í Faith, but also has its own separate patterns and themes. For convenience, we may divide it into four general phases: the early establishment of the Bahá'í Faith in the West; its transformation into more exclusive and organizationally structured forms; its systematic expansion; and its entry into a period of more rapid numerical increase and greater public visibility. Despite the considerable diversity of the Bahá'í communities involved (North America, Europe, Australia, New Zealand, and Hawaii), this pattern has general validity for the West as a whole.

The First Phase: Early Establishment, c. 1894-1921

The Kheiralla Period, 1894-1900. The initial establishment of the Bahá'í Faith in the West was primarily the work of one man, Ibrahim George Kheiralla (Khayru'lláh) (1849-1929).² Kheiralla was a Syrian Christian who had only recently become a Bahá'í when he migrated to the United States in 1892. Establishing himself in Chicago, he began to organize classes on the Bahá'í religion in 1894. These classes presented Kheiralla's own highly syncretic version of the Bahá'í teach-



IBRAHIM GEORGE KHEIRALLA, 1899

ings. The classes were pervaded by an aura of mystery, and the name of the new religion was not made public. Only after attending a series of graduated lectures were students told the secret “pith” of Kheiralla’s teachings: that God had appeared in the person of Bahá’u’lláh and that his son ‘Abdu’l-Bahá, was the return of Jesus Christ, and was now living in ‘Akká in the Holy Land. Converts were required to write a confession of faith to ‘Abdu’l-Bahá and were told God’s “greatest name”

(a form of the Arabic word *Bahá*, meaning *glory*) as a means by which they could enter into a special relationship with the divine.

This mixture of adventist and esoteric ideas, combined with Kheiralla's own forceful personality, was sufficient to attract a growing number of followers, and by 1900, there were perhaps 1,500 or more American Bahá'ís. Given the extreme geographic mobility of Americans at this time, these early Bahá'ís were scattered across sixty localities in twenty-five States.³ There were also a few converts in Canada, Britain, and France. The three largest groups were in Chicago, New York City, and Kenosha, Wisconsin. The Bahá'í "community" was socially and religiously diverse, but the majority were native English-speaking, middle-class, white Protestants. Women outnumbered men.

Kheiralla occupied a pivotal role in the network of early American Bahá'ís. He was the movement's "beloved teacher," and despite the emergence of secondary leaders and a limited organization, Kheiralla's overall leadership remained unchallenged. This situation changed radically following Kheiralla's protracted pilgrimage to 'Akká in 1898-99. Accounts vary, but it seems likely that Kheiralla was reluctant to accept 'Abdu'l-Bahá's absolute authority. There were important doctrinal differences between the two men, and Kheiralla appears to have wished to maintain his dominant position among the American Bahá'ís.

Whatever the exact motivation involved, Kheiralla found his leadership challenged by some of his fellow pilgrims after his return to the United States in May 1899. A dispute gradually developed, and in March 1900, Kheiralla publicly declared his doubts about 'Abdu'l-Bahá's authority as Bahá'u'lláh's successor. A distinguished Iranian Bahá'í teacher, 'Abdu'l-Karím Tihrání, was sent by 'Abdu'l-Bahá to ensure the loyalty of the American Bahá'ís. An open breach ensued, Kheiralla denouncing 'Abdu'l-Bahá in favor of his dissident, disaffected half-brother, Mírzá Muhammad-'Alí. Dismayed or confused by the bitter dispute, many adherents abandoned the movement. The remainder split into two separate and mutually hostile organizations: a Bahá'í majority, loyal to 'Abdu'l-Bahá; and a "Bahaist" minority, who followed Kheiralla and Muhammad-'Alí. Some individuals fluctuated between the two groups.



THE KENOSHA BAHÁ'Í COMMUNITY
Kenosha, Wisconsin, Easter Sunday 1898

The Bahaists. After this schism, the Bahaist group fared poorly, rapidly declining in numbers, so that by 1906, they were reduced to a congregation of forty persons in Kenosha, a small group in Chicago, and a scattering of individuals elsewhere.⁴ There were subsequent attempts to expand the movement, but these were unsuccessful. The Kenosha group continued activities until the early 1950s, but the Bahaists evidently lacked the dynamism of the mainstream Bahá'ís. Despite Kheiralla's undoubted charm and personal attraction, it seems likely that his denial of 'Abdu'l-Bahá removed a key element from the appeal of his teachings. Kheiralla had taught that 'Abdu'l-Bahá was the return of Christ—a status which 'Abdu'l-Bahá emphatically denied—and it was to 'Abdu'l-Bahá, "the Master," that the majority of the American Bahá'ís had given their allegiance. Subsequent changes in their theological understanding of his "station" did not alter that basic allegiance.

'Abdu'l-Bahá's Leadership. The stabilization of the American Bahá'í movement after the shock of Kheiralla's defection was an impressive achievement on the part of 'Abdu'l-Bahá and those loyal to him.⁵ The American Bahá'ís had been thrown into confusion by the dispute. Their former mentor and his teachings had been discredited. Their "Lord" lived thousands of miles away in a remote part of the Turkish Empire. They had only a few typewritten copies of extracts from the Bahá'í writings. They had newly become members of a religion that was rooted in the alien culture and languages of the Middle East, but they now had little to guide them as to the doctrines and practices that they should follow. Stabilization was accomplished by a variety of means: 'Abdu'l-Bahá's dispatch of a succession of four Iranian Bahá'í teachers to provide the American Bahá'ís with a focus and source of orthodox Bahá'í belief (1900-1905); a vast interchange of correspondence between 'Abdu'l-Bahá and his American followers; the pilgrimage journeys to 'Akká of a small but influential minority of Bahá'ís; the publication of a substantial body of Bahá'í literature in English (such that by 1912, at least seventy books and pamphlets had been produced, including translations of scripture, pilgrimage accounts, and expositions of the Bahá'í teachings); and the emergence of a body of native American Bahá'í teachers and leaders.

As the Bahá'í movement recovered from the shock of 1900, it experienced a revival in numbers as disaffected members returned and new converts were made. Growth was much slower than it had been during the period of Kheiralla's leadership, however, and by 1906, the Bahá'ís were still only able to report a membership of 1,280 to the national census.⁶ It is not yet clear why growth was so slow after 1900. Perhaps the more "orthodox" version of the Bahá'í teachings was less appealing than Kheiralla's synthesis. Or perhaps the American Bahá'ís' efforts at propagating their beliefs were hindered by their lack of effective organization, or by the factionalism and petty disputes that often dogged the movement. Certainly, the American Bahá'ís initially lacked a common focus apart from the distant figure of 'Abdu'l-Bahá, the Bahá'í writings being subject to a variety of individualistic interpretations.

The question of organization was in itself a source of disagreement among the early American Bahá'ís. Nevertheless, limited forms of organization gradually emerged, both in the various local groups and nationally. Many of the local groups began to hold regular business meetings and to elect executive boards to manage their activities. Nationally, the most significant developments were the formation in 1909, of an annual delegate assembly—the Bahai Temple Unity—which took responsibility for the construction of a Bahá'í House of Worship (Mashriqu'l-Adhkár) near Chicago,⁷ and the initiation of a regular national Bahá'í periodical, the *Bahai News* or *Star of the West* (1910). The leading role in both of these developments was played by the Bahá'ís of Chicago, for many years the largest local group. Bahá'í publishing activity also came to be centered in Chicago.

These organizational developments may be assumed to have fostered a growing sense of cohesion as a religious group both locally and nationally. The conception of a distinctive "Bahá'í community" gradually emerged.⁸ Organization also provided a new basis for campaigns of activity, such as that of propagating the Bahá'í teachings, hitherto largely regarded as a matter of individual initiative. Under 'Abdu'l-Bahá's guidance, and in contrast to the secrecy of the Kheiralla period, the propagation of the Bahá'í Faith—"teaching"—came to be a major focus of activity. This included regular discussion groups in believers' homes and more formal public meetings. Initially, there were also

many contacts with sympathetic metaphysical groups (New Thought, Theosophy, Divine Science) and later, as the Bahá'ís became better known and the basis of their appeal broadened, increasing contacts with liberal Christian churches and with movements concerned with social issues, such as peace and the advancement of women and of African-Americans.

In 1912, 'Abdu'l-Bahá came to North America.⁹ He stayed for eight months (April-December) and visited Bahá'í communities in various parts of the United States and Canada. This visit was of incomparable significance to the Bahá'ís. Here was their Master, the living exemplar of their religion. He enthused his followers, reiterated over and over again the fundamentals of the Bahá'í Faith, renewed the sense of Bahá'í community, and instilled a tremendous sense of urgency to spread the Bahá'í teachings. He also established new links with "progressive" religious and social groups and attracted widespread and generally sympathetic public attention.

With 'Abdu'l-Bahá's visit, the number of Bahá'ís increased. After his departure, the level of enthusiasm and activity remained high. Some systematic plans for missionary expansion were made, and a scheme for communal funding of itinerant missionary teachers was initiated. By 1916, the Bahá'ís were able to report a membership of 2,884, this figure seemingly both including and excluding large numbers of sympathizers and peripheral members.¹⁰

'Abdu'l-Bahá had predicted war, and the commencement of the European war in 1914 gave the American Bahá'ís new impetus to their activities. The urgent need for the Bahá'í teachings was clearly demonstrated. For many of the Bahá'ís, the war also assumed apocalyptic importance.¹¹ Kheiralla had predicted that the promised Bahá'í millennium, the "Most Great Peace," would be established in 1917, and this remained an apocryphal Bahá'í belief. American entry into the war (in 1917) was therefore seen as being filled with eschatological import. It also acted as a catalyst for two major dissensions within the community: between Bahá'í pacifists and those who felt it their patriotic duty to support the war effort¹²; and between the supporters and opponents of the "Chicago Bahá'í Reading Room."

These divisions were partly healed and largely overshadowed by the renewal of correspondence with 'Abdu'l-Bahá after the war. Call-

ing the Bahá'ís to work for communal unity, 'Abdu'l-Bahá also gave them a new vision of worldwide missionary activity. A new campaign of teaching began within North America, and several individuals migrated overseas to further their religion. There was a sense of a new beginning, which continued even after the communal trauma occasioned by 'Abdu'l-Bahá's death in November 1921.

Activities Outside the United States. The early growth of the Bahá'í Faith in the West was almost entirely confined to the United States. Moreover, much of the impetus for activity outside the United States came from Americans, and in most instances, the initial establishment of Bahá'í groups was the work of expatriate Americans who became Bahá'ís (as in Paris and London), or of American Bahá'ís who migrated as missionary teachers of their religion ("pioneers" in modern Bahá'í parlance). Bahá'í groups were thus established in England and France (both prior to 1900), Hawaii (from 1901), Canada (from 1902), Germany (from 1905), Japan (from 1914), and Australia (from 1920).¹³ Only the Bahá'í groups in Germany displayed the dynamism of the American Bahá'í groups, however. There were individual converts of great ability in both England and France, but overall these new Bahá'í groups remained very small and made no significant inroads into their host societies. This was particularly the case with the Paris group, most of whose early members were expatriate Americans. Even 'Abdu'l-Bahá's two visits to Europe (August-December 1911; December 1912-June 1913) did not lead to any expansion comparable to that in the United States.¹⁴ There was little organizational development.

The Second Phase: Organizational Transformation, c. 1922-c. 1934

'ABDU'L-BAHÁ'S DEATH in November 1921, and Shoghi Effendi's succession (January 1922), marked a major turning point in the history of the Bahá'í Faith. In sociological terms, there was a change in the basis of authority of the supreme leadership of the religion: from the personal charismatic authority of 'Abdu'l-Bahá (and before him, of

Bahá'u'lláh) to the institutionalized charisma of the office of the Guardianship. This change in leadership was followed by two successive and overlapping organizational changes that marked the establishment of what Shoghi Effendi termed the "formative age" of the Faith. These were the consolidation of the system of local and national Spiritual Assemblies (c. 1922-c. 1934) and the adoption of systematic planning as the chief strategy in the propagation of the religion (1926/1937-). This second transformation is dealt with in the next section. As in the earlier period, the United States was the dominant Western Bahá'í community.

The Administrative Order. One of Shoghi Effendi's chief concerns when he assumed the office of Guardian was to regularize and consolidate a system of locally and nationally elected Spiritual Assemblies as a means both of providing the Bahá'ís with institutionalized leadership and of preparing the way for the future election of the Universal House of Justice.¹⁵ In April 1922, he issued his first general letter on the Bahá'í "Administrative Order," calling for the urgent establishment of Assemblies wherever this was feasible and for the Assemblies to assume direct authority for all Bahá'í activities within the geographical areas of their jurisdictions. A second general letter, in March 1923, amplified and extended these instructions.¹⁶

In the West, developments on these lines proceeded rapidly. National Spiritual Assemblies were formed in Britain and Germany in 1923, while the Executive Board of the American Bahá'í Temple Unity was transformed from an executive body implementing the decisions of the Temple Unity's Convention delegates into a directive legislative body vested with authority over the entire American Bahá'í community. The process of local Assembly formation also proceeded apace, so that by 1928, there were forty-seven of these bodies in North America, twelve in Europe, and nine in the "Anglo-Pacific" (see Table 2, below). Apart from North America, Germany, and Britain, the only other early Western Bahá'í "community" to be able to form its own National Assembly was that of Australia and New Zealand. Progress toward this goal was slow, however, and it was not achieved until 1934, a date which marks the end of the initial phase of National Spiritual Assembly formation (see Table 3). Elsewhere in the West, Bahá'í

groups were too small to follow suit, and the various European groups (including France) did not form their National Assemblies until the 1950s or later.

The formation of the Assemblies represented a major change in the structure of the Bahá'í communities. There had been organizing bodies before 1922, but they had lacked directive authority. The new Assemblies encouraged a centralization of authority and provided the basis for an assertion of power. This was particularly the case in North America, where the National Spiritual Assembly of the Bahá'ís of the United States and Canada rapidly assumed its new responsibilities and pioneered a series of new administrative arrangements. These included the establishment of a national office, a full-time salaried national secretary with considerable executive authority, a centralized national fund, and appointed committees responsible for the main areas of Bahá'í activity. Everything that was "Bahá'í" came within its purview. A definite legal basis for the administration was also established through formal incorporation, thereby enabling the National Assembly to hold property and receive bequests. At Shoghi Effendi's encouragement, other national Assemblies later followed suit. A related change was in the basis for membership in the Bahá'í Faith.¹⁷ In place of the vague inclusivity that had formerly prevailed, the National Assembly adopted formal criteria of membership. A membership roll was prepared and new Bahá'ís were required to record their confessions of faith on "enrollment cards." Existing memberships were validated through the issuing of individual "credential cards." Again, these innovations were later adopted by other national Assemblies.

Opposition and tension. These administrative changes took place with the approval and often at the express instruction of Shoghi Effendi. As such, they constitute part of his transformation of the Faith. At the same time, however, they initially took place within the context of an American Bahá'í community in which there were existing tensions regarding organization, and these tensions were naturally reflected in the manner in which the administrative changes proceeded.

Central to this tension were two divergent conceptions of the Bahá'í religion and collateral divergent attitudes about the nature of organization. The conceptual tension is partly rooted in the Bahá'í writings (and can still be found in contemporary discourse) in the

claim that the Bahá'í Faith is both: 1) an independent divine revelation, and 2) the fulfillment of prophecies associated with religions of the past, with which it forms a single and integral "religion of God." In the early American Bahá'í community, these claims led to what were essentially rival "exclusivist" and "inclusivist" conceptions of the religion.¹⁸ Those who were "inclusivists" saw the Bahá'í teachings as an all-embracing spiritual philosophy. It was the universal spirit of the age that was also infused through in all progressive religious and social movements—all of whose members, it was thought, should work together to bring about the spiritual transformation of the world. Being a Bahá'í was a matter of sharing this attitude and did not entail membership in a particular religious organization. By contrast, the more exclusivist Bahá'ís viewed their religion as being based on the revelations of Bahá'u'lláh. Being a Bahá'í entailed specific adherence to Bahá'u'lláh's cause and obedience to his teachings. By itself, general adherence to Bahá'í principles was not enough.

These contrasting attitudes tended to be linked to divergent attitudes towards authority, and hence towards organization. Thus, the more inclusivist Bahá'ís were inclined towards an "epistemological individualism" in which the preferred final locus of doctrinal and organizational authority was the individual. Some degree of organization might be necessary, but it should be loosely structured and not curtail individualism. By contrast, the exclusivists were generally inclined towards an "epistemological authoritarianism" in which there were clearly established bases of authority beyond the individual.¹⁹ Correspondingly, they favored the concepts of doctrinal orthodoxy and of regular procedures of organization that should be followed.

There was also a linkage between these divergent attitudes and membership in the "cultic milieu" of the metaphysical movements.²⁰ Many early Bahá'ís were drawn from this background, and "inclusivist" Bahá'ís often retained their links within it, continuing the universalistic and individualistic attitudes that were generally characteristic of that milieu. The Bahá'í "exclusivists," by contrast, tended to be unsympathetic towards this milieu and to Bahá'í linkages with it.

As far as can be discerned, these divergent attitudes coexisted within the American Bahá'í community from 1900 to the early 1930s. The plurality of the community is remarkable and can be largely

attributed to the unusual nature of ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s leadership and appeal—a forceful claim to charismatic authority combined with a highly permissive style of leadership; and, appeal on the basis of Christian millennial fulfillment combined with liberal social and religious teachings of the “new age.” Common devotion to ‘Abdu’l-Bahá was able to unite a highly diverse Bahá’í community.²¹ The implicit tension between these two attitudes was expressed in the opposition of many early Bahá’ís towards the development of any strong form of organization. The flexible and relatively non-directive form of organization that did develop allowed the two attitudes to continue to coexist. However, when the American Bahá’ís were cut off from ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s encouraging guidance during the First World War, the tensions became explicit and an inclusivistic “cultic” group of Bahá’ís—the ‘Ading Room—was expelled from the Bahá’í community by a well-organized group of exclusivists.²²

‘Abdu’l-Bahá sought to reconcile the divergent groups when communications were restored, but a polarization of attitudes seems to have occurred. The establishment of the Administrative Order completed the process of polarization. The changes were welcome to the more exclusivist Bahá’ís, who gave their support to the new administrative institutions and gravitated towards membership in and leadership of them. The inclusivists found themselves increasingly less influential within the Bahá’í community. Many were prepared to accept the changes—concentrating their efforts on “teaching” rather than administration—but others became apathetic and inactive, while a small minority came out in outright opposition. There was a gradual, but far-reaching, transformation of the community. An ethos of what I would term “organizational exclusivism” came to replace the universalistic and individualistic attitudes that had been prevalent earlier.

The opponents of organization were able to attract a fair amount of attention, especially in the late 1920s when the American administration was becoming firmly established. They articulated disaffection, but did not gain a large following. They were a diverse group: Harrison Gray Dyar (1866-1929), the editor of the New York-based Bahá’í magazine *Reality* (1922-29); Ruth White, an active Bahá’í teacher; and Ahmad Sohrab (1893-1958), ‘Abdu’l-Bahá’s former secretary and interpreter.²³ Dyar and White publicly attacked the new administration

and derided Shoghi Effendi—hence putting themselves beyond the pale of Bahá'í orthodoxy—but they were not able to offer an attractive and coherent alternative to the Bahá'í mainstream. Sohrab's critique was more sophisticated, and his “liberal” and universalistic “New History Society” (1929-c.1958) remained active for many years after he had been excommunicated from the Bahá'í community as a Covenant-breaker.²⁴

Outside of North America, the only Western Bahá'í community to experience outright opposition to the growing Administrative Order was Germany, where a minority of Bahá'ís under Wilhelm Herrigel formed themselves into a breakaway “Bahai World Union” (c. 1930-1937).²⁵ As in North America, a basic transformation of attitude on the part of the Bahá'í community as a whole eventually occurred, however. Exclusivism and a more directive system of administration came to be the norm. A similar change was experienced in Britain and Australia—the only other Western Bahá'í communities of any size—but without any movements of opposition developing. Symbolic of the change was the gradual abandonment of the term “Bahá'í Movement,” widely used to describe the religion up to the 1920s, and its replacement with the term “the Bahá'í Faith.”

The Third Phase: Systematic Planning, 1926/1937-c. 1968

BEFORE THE GENERAL ACCEPTANCE of the new system of directive Assemblies, most Bahá'í activities in the West occurred as a result of individual initiatives and enthusiasms. The slow-moving Temple construction project at Wilmette, near Chicago, was one of the few sustained communal efforts. Individual initiative was effective in establishing a widespread network of Bahá'í groups, in organizing Bahá'í meetings, and in securing the publication of a considerable quantity of Bahá'í literature (mostly in English, but also in German). It was relatively unsystematic and uncoordinated, however, and in some areas (notably France, Britain, and Australia) led to little actual growth.

The idea of a more coordinated approach to Bahá'í activities—particularly that of “teaching the Cause”—was highly attractive to a number of Bahá'ís. As early as 1915, American Bahá'ís had made

some moves to implement a systematic national teaching campaign. Support for this idea was increased in 1916, by the receipt of the first of 'Abdu'l-Bahá's general letters on teaching, the Tablets of the Divine Plan, and again in 1919/1920, when the rest of the letters were received and widely discussed.²⁶ Even so, it was only in 1925—after the transition to a more directive form of organization—that a systematic “Plan of Unified Action” (1926-1928) was adopted by the American National Assembly.²⁷ This plan, which received the full backing of Shoghi Effendi, aimed to increase Bahá'í teaching endeavors and administrative coordination and to raise sufficient funds to complete the superstructure of the Wilmette Temple. The success of the Plan appears to have been considerably impeded by a general lack of confidence in the National Assembly. It was only after the official end of the plan in 1928, that there was a marked improvement in contributions. However, the more organized approach to teaching seems to have been successful and an increasing number of new converts were gained.

Growth in numbers continued during a second plan (1931-1934), but again, the financial response was disappointing, doubtless in large part because of the Depression. The increase in numbers was a significant element in the transformation of the American Bahá'í community. The official United States census figures record a fall between 1916 (2,884 Bahá'ís) and 1926 (to 1,247), and then an increase by 1936 (to 2,584).²⁸ These figures have yet to be properly evaluated, but they indicate what was probably the general trend: a loss of numbers during the period in which the transition from “universalistic individualism” began, and an increase during the period when greater organization was gaining general acceptance among the Bahá'ís and a more systematic approach to teaching had been adopted. (On the two Plans of Unified Action, see Loni Bramson's article in this volume.)

As the Administrative Order became an important element in what the new Bahá'ís were taught before they entered the faith, their conversion strengthened the more exclusivistic approach within the Bahá'í community. By the mid-1930s, some thirty to forty percent of the American community had become Bahá'ís since 1925.²⁹ The two Plans of Unified Action had only limited success in terms of the completion of their stated goals, but they consolidated a general acceptance of “planification” as a normal part of Bahá'í activity. Shoghi Effendi

built on this base to launch two American Seven Year Plans (1937-1944; 1946-1953).³⁰ These plans gave the Bahá'ís specific domestic and international teaching goals, the first plan calling for Bahá'ís to settle permanently in all American states, Canadian provinces, and Latin American republics; the second requiring further expansion of the movement throughout the Americas, the establishment of new National Assemblies for Canada and for the South and Central American regions, and the launching of a systematic teaching campaign in Europe. There was also a call for staged work on the Wilmette Temple (finally completed in 1953). As a consequence, Bahá'í groups were established throughout North America, even in the southern United States where progress was difficult to accomplish (in part because of the Bahá'í teaching of racial equality in what was then a context of institutionalized white supremacy). Growth was slow but steady, so that by 1947, there were over 5,000 Bahá'ís.³¹ The goal and attainment of Bahá'í "administrative independence" for Canada—in the form of the establishment of its own National Spiritual Assembly in 1948—led to an increase in Bahá'í activities in that country. By 1961, there were over 1,000 Bahá'ís in Canada.³² Alaska and Hawaii subsequently also became independent communities.

Systematic planning was only adopted in Europe and Australasia in the 1940s, and before that time, the local Bahá'í communities remained very small. In Europe, the rise of Nazi domination also presented a major challenge to the Bahá'ís. In 1937, all Bahá'í activities and institutions were banned in Germany by order of the Gestapo. There was a consequent cessation of Bahá'í activities throughout most of continental Europe until 1945-1946, when the German Bahá'ís and others were able to resume their activities and the American Bahá'ís began their European teaching campaign. The German and Austrian Bahá'ís were subsequently given their own plan in 1948 (-1953). Meanwhile, Bahá'ís were establishing or reestablishing their residence in most of Western Europe. From the 1950s onwards, a widespread network of Bahá'í Assemblies was built up, each Bahá'í national community eventually establishing its own National Spiritual Assembly. Some growth also initially occurred in Eastern Europe, but this came to an end with the establishment of communist regimes in the aftermath of the war. Bahá'í teaching activity in these areas has only re-

cently resumed. In contrast to the rest of Europe, the formerly lethargic British Bahá'í community became increasingly active from the mid-1930s onwards (establishing its own publishing trust and summer school in 1937) and was able to continue its activities throughout the war. In 1944, it adopted its own six-year plan of internal expansion, and in 1951 was given a new plan by Shoghi Effendi, which in addition to internal goals, gave the British Bahá'ís responsibilities for establishing the Bahá'í Faith in Africa. In Australia and New Zealand, concerted national activity was impeded by the great distances between the various local groups. A joint National Assembly was formed in 1934, followed by the establishment of a national news bulletin (1936) and summer school (1938). At Shoghi Effendi's encouragement, a small-scale teaching plan was adopted in 1943, to be followed by a more ambitious national plan in 1947 (-1953). Outside of North America, growth was slow, however. By 1952, there were still fewer than 2,000 Bahá'ís in Europe and Australasia combined. Germany remained the largest community, with about 600 Bahá'ís in 1951; Britain and Australia (with New Zealand) had about 400 each, as did all the other European countries combined.³³

The Western Bahá'í communities grew during the 1950s and 1960s with Shoghi Effendi's promulgation of a ten-year "Global Crusade" (1953-1963), and the subsequent Nine Year Plan of the Universal House of Justice (1964-1973). Both these plans aimed to increase the number of Bahá'ís in the main existing communities and to establish new Bahá'í groups and institutions throughout the world. Each national Bahá'í community had its own plan as a component of the international plan. By 1963, the total number of Western Bahá'ís, including children and youth, had risen to approximately 25,000 (19,000 in North America, 5,000 in Europe, and 1,000 in Australia and New Zealand), and by 1968, there were over 40,000 Bahá'ís (out of a world total of 1.2 million; see Table 1). Given the small size of the Western communities in the early 1950s (c. 7,000), this increase is quite marked, but it is not overly impressive.³⁴ In the absence of political constraints, systematic planning provided a basis for sustained growth, but not for any dramatic increase in the number of Bahá'ís.

Table 1. Estimated Bahá'í Populations, 1963-1988 (all figures in '000s)

	1963	1968	1973	1978	1983	1988
North America	19.0	31.0	105.0	130.0	161.0	179.0
Europe	4.9	8.9	17.2	19.8	20.7	24.5
Australia/New Zealand	1.0	1.5	4.3	6.0	7.0	10.0
Total West	24.9	41.4	126.5	155.8	188.7	213.5
% of World total	4.3	3.4	5.2	5.5	5.3	4.8
World Total	583.4	1,202	2,444	2,809	3,585	4,455

Source: Memorandum from the Department of Statistics, Bahá'í World Centre, May 15, 1988.

Note: Cyprus and Hawaii are not included in these figures.

Besides the growth in numbers, the 1950s and 1960s saw a number of other significant achievements as part of the two successive international plans. Despite the fewness of their numbers, Western Bahá'ís attained an impressive geographical diffusion—as indicated by the number of recorded localities in which Bahá'ís resided in the West (Table 2). Before the general adoption of systematic planning, these were very few—141 in 1928, with about half each in North America and Europe—but by 1945, these had risen to 1,000, and by 1968 to 4,000 (two-thirds in North America).

Of these localities, only a minority had the necessary minimum of nine adult Bahá'ís to form a local Spiritual Assembly. The increase in local Assemblies was slower than the increase in localities. In 1928, there were sixty-eight Assemblies, and by 1945, this had only risen to 146, nearly all in North America. Thereafter, growth was more marked, the total number rising to 723 in 1968 (a five-fold increase since 1945). During this same period, there was also a dramatic increase in the number of National Assemblies: from four in 1945 (three in 1928) to twenty-one in 1968. This increase was largely the result of Assembly formation in Europe between 1953 and 1962 (see Table 3).

Table 2: Selected Bahá'í Administrative Statistics, 1928, 1945, 1968, 1987

	North America			Europe			Anglo-Pacific			The West (total)		
	NSAs	LSAs	Localities	NSAs	LSAs	Localities	NSAs	LSAs	Localities	NSAs	LSAs	Localities
1928	1	47	67	2	12	65	0	9	9	3	68	141
1945	1	134	907	2	6	93	1	6	24	4	146	1,024
1968	3	500	2,661	15	178	1,047	3	45	235	21	723	3,943
1987	3	2,110	8,543	20	660	2,907	3	250	591	26	3,020	12,041

Sources: Calculated from *Bahá'í World*, Vol. 2, pp. 181-91; *Bahá'í World*, Vol. 10, pp. 551-82; Universal House of Justice, *The Bahá'í Faith: Statistical Information, 1844-1968* (Haifa: Bahá'í World Centre, 1968); Universal House of Justice, Department of Statistics, *Statistical Summary Tables for Semi-Annual Reports of July 1987* (Bahá'í World Center, February 1988).

Note: For areas, see Footnote 1. The figures for Europe exclude Turkey and the Soviet Caucasian Republics.

Of note was the general pattern of this, with the initial formation of four multi-country, regional Assemblies (one in 1953, and three in 1957), and their subsequent breakdown into their component national units (1962). During this same period, three of the four original bi-national Assemblies (Germany-Austria, United States-Canada, Australia-New Zealand) also dissolved into their component units, and the discontinuous American states of Alaska and Hawaii formed separate "National" Assemblies. The process of forming National Assemblies in Europe continued after 1968, all countries outside of the Communist East, apart from Malta and the various "micro-states" (Andorra, Liechtenstein, Monaco, San Marino, and the Vatican City), having their own National Spiritual Assemblies by 1978. More recently, the Canary Islands and Sicily have formed separate Assemblies, as has the dependency of Greenland.

Other achievements in the West included the construction of Bahá'í Houses of Worship in Australia (1957-1961) and West Germany (1960-1964)—with Wilmette, the West now has three out of a world total of seven; the establishment of administrative headquarters

for each national Bahá'í community; the establishment of Bahá'í publishing trusts for all the major European languages; a massive increase in the range of literature available in the major European languages; and a concerted endeavor to produce literature in the minority languages of Europe and North America.

The Fourth Phase: Mass Teaching, c. 1969 Onwards

BY THE 1960s, active Bahá'í communities had been established throughout Western Europe, North America, and the Anglo-Pacific. Bahá'í communities remained small, however, and the Bahá'ís were frustrated by their inability to discover any way of securing a rapid increase in numbers. The onset of “mass teaching” and large-scale conversions in various parts of Latin America, sub-Saharan Africa, and Asia—which occurred from the 1950s onwards—only highlighted the comparative lack of growth in the West. The change in the West came in the late 1960s and early 1970s, with a series of large influxes of new Bahá'ís.

The primary trigger for this new growth appears to have been the Bahá'í response to changes in the semi-autonomous and transnational youth culture, which by the 1960s, had grown to incorporate or influence significant numbers of young people in nearly all Western countries. These changes in the youth culture led to a sudden and widespread growth of social reformism and experimentation. As a non-traditional religious movement committed to concepts of social change, the Bahá'í Faith was potentially attractive to those influenced by the youth culture. Successful adaptation of Bahá'í teaching methods by some local Bahá'í groups led to relatively large numbers of youth converts. News of these successes was rapidly transmitted to other Western Bahá'í communities, which then sought to emulate them—invariably with a measure of success. Nearly all Western Bahá'í communities gained new converts from the youth culture.

The influx of new young Bahá'ís had a major transformative effect on the existing Bahá'í communities. From being an often neglected minority, young Bahá'ís suddenly became the “spearhead” of growth. Possessing abundant energy and often more discretionary free time than their elders, they were able to make a major contribution to

**Table 3. The Formation of Regional and National Spiritual Assemblies
in the West**

- 1923** *British Isles* (1923-1972)
 United Kingdom (1972-)
 Ireland (1972-)
- Germany and Austria* (1923-1937; 1947-1959)
 Germany (1959-)
 Austria (1959-)
- 1925** *United States and Canada* (1925-1948)
 United States (1948-)
 Alaska* (1957-)
 Hawaii* (1964-)
 Canada (1948-)
- 1934** *Australia and New Zealand* (1934-1957)
 Australia (1957-)
 New Zealand (1957-)
- 1953** *Italy and Switzerland* (1953-1962)
 Italy (1962-)
 Sicily* (1995-)
 Switzerland (1962-)
- 1957** *Benelux Countries* (1957-1962)
 Belgium (1962-)
 Luxembourg (1962-)
 Netherlands (1962-)
- Iberian Peninsula* (1957-1962)
 Spain (1962-)
 Canary Islands* (1984-)
 Portugal (1962-)
- Scandinavia and Finland* (1957-1962)
 Sweden (1962-)
 Denmark (1962-)
 Greenland* (1992-)
 Norway (1962-)
 Finland (1962-)
- 1958** France (1958-)

- 1972** Iceland (1972-)
- 1977** Greece (1977-)
- 1978** Cyprus (1978-)
- 1991** USSR (1991-1992)
Russian Federation, Georgia and Armenia (1992-95)
 Russia (1995-)
 [Georgia (1995-)]
 [Armenia (1995-)]
Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova (1992-1996)
 Belarus (1995-)
 Moldova (1996-)
 Ukraine (1996-)
Baltic States (1992-)
 Czechoslovakia (1991-1998)
 Czech Republic (1998-)
 Slovakia (1998-)
 Romania (1991-)
- 1992** Albania (1992-)
 Bulgaria (1992-)
 Hungary (1992-)
 Poland (1992-)
- 1994** *Slovenia and Croatia* (1994-)

Key: The names of National Spiritual Assemblies representing several countries are italicized (e.g., British Isles). Those representing sub-national units are starred (e.g. Alaska*). The dates of existence of National Assemblies are added in parenthesis.

Sources: The Universal House of Justice, Department of Statistics, "National and Regional Spiritual Assemblies." Mimeographed. Bahá'í World Centre, January 1989. *Bahá'í World* volumes.

Note: Dependent and other territories not here considered part of "Western" Bahá'í developments are excluded, specifically, the Caribbean communities of Puerto Rico (with its own N.S.A. in 1972), French Guiana, Guadeloupe and Martinique (all 1984).

the further expansion of their religion, not just among other youth, but among various sections of the population. This subsidiary expansion was particularly marked in the United States, where teams of mainly young Bahá'ís successfully sought to teach their religion to the hitherto neglected rural black population of the southern states. The results were impressive, with over 20,000 Bahá'í enrollments from these areas being recorded during 1970 and the early months of 1971 alone.³⁵ Conversions of other minority group members were also made. As a result of these gains, the Western Bahá'í population tripled in size between 1968 and 1973—from about 41,000 to about 126,500 (see Table 1). Expansion in North America was greatest in both absolute and proportional terms (74,000 or an increase of 23%). Proportionally, Australia and New Zealand (2,800 or 187%) were more successful than Europe (8,300 or 93%) (see Table 4).

This expansion was difficult to maintain. The youth culture itself was highly volatile, and by the early to mid-1970s it had begun to change again. In common with various other movements of alternative religiosity, the Bahá'ís found that their influx of young converts was

Table 4: Bahá'í Population Growth, 1963-1988
(percentage increase by five-year periods)

	1963-68	1968-73	1973-78	1978-83	1983-88
North America	63	239	24	24	11
Europe	82	93	15	5	18
Australia/ New Zealand	50	187	40	17	43
The West	66	206	23	21	13

Source: Calculated from Table 1.

Note: Cyprus and Hawaii are not included in these figures.

slackening off. There was also the major problem of integrating new Bahá'ís into established Bahá'í communities. There were often considerable cultural differences between the older Bahá'ís—predomi-

nantly white and middle-class, with fairly conservative styles of cultural expression—and a proportion of the new Bahá'ís: youth who were influenced by the anti-establishment elements of the youth culture; and often poor, and poorly educated, rural African Americans. There were also the logistical problems of socializing large numbers of new Bahá'ís into Bahá'í norms and values, when the Bahá'í communities themselves possessed only limited resources in terms of trained and available personnel. These logistical problems were particularly severe in the United States, and there as elsewhere, a proportion of the new converts subsequently ceased to be Bahá'ís or drifted into inactivity.

There were also intense debates within some of the national Bahá'í communities, both about the wisdom of seeking large-scale conversions (and hence relaxing the traditionally strict entrance requirements) and, more implicitly, about the need to maintain the traditional cultural values of those communities. Generally, there was a significant shift in the cultural style of Bahá'í activities—including a greater use of music and the development of a more varied range of meetings—as Bahá'í communities successfully incorporated a significant proportion of new Bahá'ís. There were undoubtedly considerable differences in the rates of success in the various communities.

The combination of these external and internal factors resulted in a dramatic downturn in the rate of Bahá'í expansion from the mid-1970s onwards (see Table 4). This was despite a large-scale influx of Iranian Bahá'ís into many Western Bahá'í communities following the Islamic Revolution of 1979. For the West as a whole, the 206% increase of the 1968-1973 period was followed by increases of only 23% and 21% percent for the two following five-year periods (1973-1978, 1978-1983), while for the 1983-1988 period, the rate fell even lower to 13%. These figures closely follow changes in the North American community (over 80% of the whole Western Bahá'í population for nearly all of this period). Australia and New Zealand, by contrast, maintained a fairly high level of growth—40%, 17%, and 43% respectively for the three successive five-year periods (1973-1978, 1978-1983, 1983-1988)—while European growth (already less marked than the other two regions) fell to 15%, 5%, and 18% for the three periods. By 1988, there were over 200,000 Western Bahá'ís, as

compared to only 126,500 in 1973, but the rate of growth was appreciably lower.

In conjunction with the lower rate of growth, it is likely that the Western Bahá'í communities were more stable in 1988, than they were in 1973. The experience of rapid growth forced them to learn ways of consolidating large numbers of new declarants and subsequently of coordinating appreciably larger Bahá'í communities.³⁶ The apparent trade-off between growth and stability may not always hold, and it may well be that the Western Bahá'í communities are now more able to cope successfully with unexpected rapid growth than they were in the early 1970s. Certainly, they continue to seek rapid growth, and the experience of rapid growth seems to have transformed Western Bahá'ís' understanding of what is achievable.

Apart from the growth in numbers, the period since the late 1960s has been marked by a major change in the public visibility of Western Bahá'í communities. Outside of North America, it seems reasonable to suppose that in the 1960s, the Bahá'í Faith was largely unknown to the general public. This is not the case now, as has been evidenced by the large amount of media coverage the Bahá'ís have attracted throughout the West in recent years, largely as a result of the combination of public interest in the persecution of Bahá'ís in post-revolutionary Iran (1979-) and the Western Bahá'ís' success in mobilizing media attention.³⁷ The persecutions in Iran have also attracted considerable sympathy from public figures and bodies in the West, as have the issuing of the Universal House of Justice's statement, *The Promise of World Peace* (1985) and growing Bahá'í involvement in socio-economic development projects.³⁸

The Former Eastern Bloc. The communist regime in Russia and the various communist governments which were established in Eastern Europe after World War II pursued militantly anti-religious policies which prevented Bahá'í activities from continuing or starting. The situation changed dramatically with the collapse of these regimes from 1989 onwards, and the break-up of the Soviet Union (1991). Whereas previously there had been a number of isolated individual Bahá'ís in several of these countries, organized meetings and proclamation events—such as tours by Western and Third World music groups—very rap-

idly led to the growth of Bahá'í communities in all these countries. By 1992, a total of 112 local Spiritual Assemblies had been established in the region, and a process of National Assembly formation had begun, with 13 new Assemblies formed by 1998 (Table 3). The countries to have shown the most marked response were Albania and Romania, with large numbers of new Bahá'ís. Conditions in the former Yugoslavia proved the most difficult, with National Assembly formation only being possible in Slovenia and Croatia (in 1994, with a joint Assembly).

The Bahá'ís in the West as an Element in the Overall Development of the Bahá'í Faith

THE BAHÁ'Í FAITH is a global religion and the Western Bahá'ís are only one element in the worldwide population of believers. As a proportion of the whole, the number of Western Bahá'ís has always been comparatively limited. Up to the 1950s, the Bahá'í Faith remained overwhelmingly Iranian in its social base. By the early 1950s, there may have been approximately 200,000 Bahá'ís worldwide, but no more than 10,000 were Westerners.³⁹ The rest were almost all Iranians, including a significant proportion of the Arab and Indian Bahá'í communities. The number of "Third World Bahá'ís" outside the Islamic heartland was negligible. This picture changed dramatically when large numbers of Bahá'í converts began to be gained in various parts of the (non-Islamic) Third World from the late-1950s onwards. However, even after the beginnings of large-scale expansion in the West (late-1960s), the number of Western Bahá'ís remained comparatively small. By 1968, there may have been as many as 1.2 million Bahá'ís worldwide. Of these, only 41,000 were in the West, that is, 3.4 percent of the world total. By 1988, world numbers had risen to 4.5 million, but Western numbers had only risen to 214,000, or 4.8 percent of the total.⁴⁰ Despite small numbers, Western Bahá'ís have played a profoundly significant role in the overall development of the Bahá'í religion. This impact has been in terms of its expansion, the development of its administration, and the diversification of its cultural expressions and intellectual life.

Expansion. The importance of the role of Western Bahá'ís in Bahá'í expansion dates from the first establishment of Bahá'í groups in the West in the 1890s. This period marked the decisive socio-cultural breakthrough by which the Bahá'í movement transcended the Islamic milieu of its birth and demonstrated the transcultural nature of its appeal. Earlier converts outside the Iranian milieu or its cultural outliers in Central Asia and India had been few.

The conversion of Westerners brought important new resources to the development of the religion. Unlike their Middle Eastern co-religionists, the new Western Bahá'ís enjoyed religious freedom. They were largely unconstrained by opposition or persecution. They were also comparatively well-educated and affluent, and more subtly, were members of the dominant high-status culture of most of the world. Not only were they able to undertake the task of propagating the Bahá'í Faith within their own societies, but they were able to contribute significantly to the expansion of the religion into new geographical areas. The geographical mobility of some of the Western Bahá'ís was a major factor in the religion's further diffusion. By the 1920s, North American Bahá'ís had already attempted to establish Bahá'í groups in Japan, South Africa, and various parts of Latin America. With the later adoption of systematic planning goals, these efforts were intensified. During the first and second American Seven Year Plans (1937-1944, 1946-1953), a network of American Bahá'í "pioneers" was established throughout much of Latin America and the Caribbean. With the British-coordinated Africa project (1951-1953) and the Ten Year Crusade (1953-1963), Europeans, Canadians, Australians, and New Zealanders also began to play a significant role in the religion's international expansion, particularly in Africa and the Pacific. Western Bahá'ís have continued to play a disproportionate role in international Bahá'í pioneering up to the present time. Thus, during the International Seven-Year Plan of 1979-1986, there were some 3,694 pioneer moves. Of these, the largest single group was made up of Bahá'ís of Iranian background (over 1,900), but there were also some 1,100 Americans and Canadians, while the Anglo-Pacific and many of the European communities were also prominent sources of pioneers.⁴¹

Apart from pioneering, Western Bahá'ís have also acted as itinerant religious teachers—most famously, the much-traveled American

journalist, Martha Root (1872-1939)⁴²—and have visited and encouraged the Bahá'í communities in other parts of the world. Even in the early 1900s, Westerners were visiting the Bahá'ís of Egypt, the Levant, Iran, Central Asia, and India, their very presence demonstrating the unity and universal appeal of the new religion. They also sought to offer practical assistance in the form of appeals to the Iranian authorities for religious tolerance, and the initiation of educational and medical projects among the Iranian Bahá'ís.⁴³ Western Bahá'ís have also acted as an important source of financial resources, both for international Bahá'í projects and in the assistance of many of the poorer Bahá'í communities of the Third World. The importance of this financial role has increased since the Islamic revolution in Iran cut off what was traditionally the major source of international Bahá'í funding.

Administration. The second major area in which Western Bahá'ís have made a significant contribution to the development of the Bahá'í Faith as a whole has been in relationship to the Administrative Order. Bahá'í administrative institutions existed in Iran from an early date, but the modern system of directive Assemblies and their subsidiary institutions, together with the use of systematic planning, was pioneered largely in the West under the guidance of Shoghi Effendi and in consultation with such prominent Western Bahá'ís as Horace Holley (1887-1960), long-time secretary of the American National Assembly.⁴⁴ As described above, many administrative innovations were first made in North America and then extended to other Bahá'í communities.

Some indication of this leading administrative role can be gained from the figures for Assembly formation. In 1928, despite constituting only a tiny minority of the total Bahá'í population, Western Bahá'ís had formed some sixty-seven percent of the world total of local Spiritual Assemblies (68 out of 102).⁴⁵ Even by 1987, they still formed over 16% (3,020 out of 19,273), while they constituted less than five percent of the world Bahá'í population.⁴⁶

Table 5: Level of Administrative Functioning (1987)

	Local Spiritual Assemblies reporting that they regularly organize:				Total # of LSAs
	Nineteen Day Feasts		Assembly Meetings		
	No.	%	No.	%	
North America	1,469	69.6	1,368	64.8	2,110
Europe	601	91.1	570	86.4	660
Anglo-Pacific	229	91.6	212	84.8	250
The West	2,299	76.1	2,150	71.2	3,020
World totals	6,476	33.6	5,771	29.9	19,273

Source: Calculated from Department of Statistics, Summary Tables, July 1987.

Note: For areas, see Footnote 1. The figures for Europe exclude Turkey and Soviet Azerbaijan.

Another important indicator is the high level of administrative functioning in the Western Bahá'í communities (Table 5).⁴⁷ Thus, for the West as a whole, 76% of local Assemblies reported in 1987, that they held the regular Nineteen-Day Feast, which is the religious focus of Bahá'í community life. Some 71% also reported that the Assembly itself held regular business meetings. Considering that the local Bahá'í communities in the West are mostly quite small, and that the Faith itself has very few professional administrators (and no priesthood), and thus must rely on the voluntary endeavors of its rank and file members, these are impressively high figures. They compare with 34% of Assemblies worldwide holding Feasts and 30% holding regular meetings. These more modest figures reflect the greater difficulty in administrative functioning that is experienced by many Third-World Bahá'í communities.

Western prominence in the development of the Administrative Order is partly attributable to the prevailing conditions of religious freedom, which also enabled Bahá'í institutions to gain legal recogni-

tion. A second factor was the resourceful and educated nature of the Western Bahá'í population, a factor that probably accounts for the high level of administrative functioning in the West.

This second factor also enabled Western Bahá'ís to play a prominent role in the development of the Faith's international and Third-World leadership. Western Bahá'ís often acted as the primary agents of diffusion of the Bahá'í administrative system, and they were subsequently prominent among the memberships of both the National Spiritual Assemblies and Auxiliary Boards throughout much of the Third World. Their role has since lessened with the increasing number of indigenous believers in positions of leadership, but Westerners often still occupy leadership positions in many Bahá'í communities of the Third World.

As regards the Bahá'í Faith's international leadership, it is significant that of the thirty-six individuals who were appointed by Shoghi Effendi as Hands of the Cause (1951-1957) or as members of the first International Bahá'í Council (1951-1961), twenty-three (sixty-four percent) were Westerners. Of the rest, twelve were Iranian and one was Ugandan. Similarly, of the twenty individuals elected to the second International Bahá'í Council (1961-1963) or the Universal House of Justice (from 1963 up to 1998), fifteen were Westerners (eleven Americans, two British, one Australian, one Canadian), and five were Iranians (all with strong links outside of Iran). Finally, of the sixty-seven Counsellors appointed in 1980, twenty-six (thirty-nine percent) were Westerners.⁴⁸

Cultural Expressions. The third area in which Western Bahá'ís have played a prominent role in the overall development of the Bahá'í Faith has been in the diversification of its cultural expressions and intellectual life.⁴⁹ Even though the early Western Bahá'í groups were quite small when they were first established, they significantly expanded the range of ways in which the Bahá'í movement found cultural expression. The Western groups were not occidental transplantations of Iranian or Middle Eastern Bahá'í culture. The Western Bahá'ís developed their own cultural expressions of their religion, as for example, in the forms of their meetings and organizations, their use of American Protestant religious styles (such as hymnody), and—most consciously—their development of distinctively Western presentations of

the Bahá'í teachings.⁵⁰ Although some early Western Bahá'ís were given Persian names by 'Abdu'l-Bahá, and there was widespread use of some oriental terms, such as the salutation Alláh-u-Abhá, oriental forms in general were not adopted. Bahá'ís retained their Western personal names, behavioral styles, dress, and appearance. (This contrasts markedly with the behavior of converts to some other "immigrant" religions.)

The development of distinctively Western presentations of the Bahá'í teachings has as yet been little researched. Quite clearly, the Western Bahá'ís lived in a different cultural and intellectual milieu from their co-religionists in the Middle East. In reflecting on their new religion and, more specifically, in attempting to present it to their American, British, French, and German compatriots, the early Western Bahá'ís were necessarily concerned with their own cultural issues. This is quite clearly shown by the types of questions they addressed to 'Abdu'l-Bahá. For example. The early text *Some Answered Questions* (1908) deals with topics such as biblical interpretation, Christian doctrine, evolutionism, reincarnation, spiritual healing, and industrial disputes.⁵¹ It is also shown by the writings of early Western exponents of Bahá'í teachings, such as I. G. Kheiralla, Hippolyte Dreyfus, Charles Mason Remey, Horace Holley, and John E. Esslemont.⁵² 'Abdu'l-Bahá took a very active role in shaping the development of Bahá'í belief in the West, but this development can best be understood as an interactive process between him and his followers. A similar interactive process occurred during the leadership of Shoghi Effendi, with individuals such as Holley and George Townshend making major contributions to the development of Bahá'í thinking. More recently, the enormous expansion of Western Bahá'í secondary literature reflects the continued contribution of Western Bahá'ís in this area. The prominent role of Westerners in the recent development of Bahá'í scholarship should also be noted.

Given the general cultural dominance of the West in the modern world, Western Bahá'í ways of doing things have had a major influence on Bahá'í communities outside the West. The most important single instance of this has been the emergence of English as the principal language of international Bahá'í communication, but it is also expressed in the preeminence of Western Bahá'í secondary literature and the prominence of Western styles in areas such as form of meetings, dress, and music.

Distribution and Social Composition

DETAILED STATISTICS for the number and distribution of Western Bahá'ís are not readily available, but such data as we now have suggest three generalizations: 1) there has been a marked and persistent disparity between expansion in various parts of the West, most notably between North America and Europe; 2) within Europe, success has varied considerably between different parts of the continent; and 3) apart from certain exceptional areas and despite the recent larger number of conversions, the Bahá'í population in the West remains small.

Area Contrasts. The Bahá'í Faith in the West began in the United States, but from there diffused fairly rapidly to Canada and the major states of Europe. Despite this widespread diffusion, the Bahá'í groups in Europe, and later in Australia and New Zealand, remained minute until after the Second World War. The United States remained the only Western Bahá'í community of any size. There was then slow, but sustained expansion in many countries until the 1960s and the start of the period of mass teaching. The overall rates of increase during this period varied between countries, with those for Australia, New Zealand, and North America greatly exceeding that for Europe.

Table 6: Bahá'í Population Densities by Area (1988)

	Estimated Bahá'í population ('000s)	Bahá'ís per million	Estimated Total population (millions)
North America	179.0	658	272
Europe	24.5	68	358
Australia/ New Zealand	10.0	500	20
The West	213.5	328	650

Sources: Calculated from Department of Statistics, 1988 Memorandum. Population figures taken from Population Reference Bureau, *1988 World Population Data Sheet* (Washington, D.C., April 1988).

Note: These figures exclude Cyprus and Hawaii and the population figures for Europe only include those countries in which there were organized Bahá'í communities. All the then Communist states are therefore excluded.

The comparative situation in the three component areas (North America, Europe, and Australia-New Zealand) in 1988 is shown in Table 6. What is of note here is not only that the North American Bahá'ís (c. 179,000) then constituted some eighty-four percent of the Western Bahá'í population (Europeans, 11.5% with c. 24,500; Australians and New Zealanders, 4.7% with c. 10,000), but that within their own area, the North American Bahá'ís had the highest population density, with some 658 Bahá'ís per million, compared with 68 per million in non-communist Europe and 500 per million for Australia and New Zealand. Clearly, there was (and still is) a marked contrast between the fairly high degree of penetration of their societies which the North American, Australian, and New Zealand Bahá'ís have attained, and the low degree attained by their European co-religionists.

Country Comparisons. The degree of penetration a religious group has achieved within a particular society is an important measure of success. In the case of the Bahá'ís, population density figures on a country-by-country basis are not at present available. It is therefore useful to introduce an alternative measure of degree of penetration, namely, the number of Bahá'í local Spiritual Assemblies per million population (see Table 7).⁵³

Table 7: Bahá'í Population and Assembly Densities by Area (1987-1988)

	Bahá'ís per million ^a (1988)	LSAs per million (1987)	Bahá'ís per LSA ^a
North America	658	7.8	85
Europe^b	68	1.8	37
Australia/ New Zealand	500	11.2	45
The West	328	4.6	71

Sources: Calculated from Department of Statistics, 1988 Memorandum; idem, Summary Tables, July 1987; and Population Reference Bureau, *1988 World Population Data Sheet*.

Note: a. These figures exclude Cyprus and Hawaii;
b. "Europe" excludes the Communist states.

These figures again show a clear contrast between the relatively high degree of penetration in North America (7.8 Assemblies per million) and Australia/New Zealand (11.2), and the low degree of penetration in non-communist Europe (1.8). The particularly high figure for Australia/New Zealand is accounted for by the much smaller average size of their local communities (45 Bahá'ís per Assembly as compared to North America's 85 per Assembly).

Table 8: Assembly Densities for North America and the Anglo-Pacific (1987)

	Local Spiritual Assemblies	LSAs per million population	Total population (millions, 1988 est.)
Canada	344	13.2	26.1
United States (contiguous states)	1,698		
Alaska	68		
Hawaii	26		
U.S. total	1,792	7.3	246.1
Australia	164	9.9	16.5
New Zealand	60	18.2	3.3
Totals	2,360	8.1	292.0

Sources: Department of Statistics, Summary Tables, July 1987, and Population Reference Bureau, *1988 World Population Data Sheet*.

In terms of individual differences between countries (Tables 8 and 9), we may note that the highest Assembly densities were in Iceland (60) and Luxembourg (30). These were then followed by the four non-European states: New Zealand, Canada, Australia, and the United States (ranging from 18.2 to 7.3). Of the remaining European states, seven had densities over 3.0: Cyprus, Ireland, Switzerland, Norway, Finland, the United Kingdom, and Sweden; five had densities between 1.8 (the European average) and 2.5: Austria, Malta, Denmark, Portugal, and the Netherlands; and six had densities of 1.5 or less: Spain,

Table 9: Assembly Densities for Europe (1987)*

	Local Spiritual Assemblies	LSAs per million population	Total popula- tion (millions, 1988 est.)	Religion^a
Austria	19	2.5	7.6	C
Belgium	14	1.4	9.9	C
Canary Islands	11			
Cyprus	5	7.1	0.7	O/M
Denmark	12	2.4	5.1	P
Finland	17	3.5	4.9	P
France	30	0.5	55.9	C
Germany				
(Federal Republic)	89	1.5	61.2	P/C
Greece	4	0.4	10.1	O
Iceland	12	60.0	0.2	P
Ireland	19	5.4	3.5	C
Italy	52	0.9	57.3	C
Luxembourg	12	30.0	0.4	C
Malta	1	2.5	0.4	C
Netherlands	27	1.8	14.7	P/C
Norway	15	3.6	4.2	P
Portugal	25	2.4	10.3	C
Spain	46			
Sweden	27	3.2	8.4	P
Switzerland	31	4.7	6.6	P/C
United Kingdom	188	3.3	57.1	P
Other^b	4			C
Total	660	1.8	357.5	
Protestant	418	2.6	162.4	
Catholic/Orthodox	242	1.2	195.1	

Sources: Department of Statistics, Summary Tables, July 1987, and Population Reference Bureau, *1988 World Population Data Sheet*.

Notes: a. Code: C = Predominantly Roman Catholic
 O = Predominantly Eastern Orthodox
 P = Predominantly Protestant
 O/M = Orthodox majority with large Muslim minority
 P/C = Protestant majority with large Catholic minority

b. Andorra, Liechtenstein, Monaco, San Marino.

* Eastern Europe and Russia are not included.

West Germany, Belgium, Italy, France, and Greece. Of note is the complete absence of any local Assemblies in then communist Eastern Europe.

The only clear pattern that emerges from these figures is the higher densities for the non-European states and a general tendency for those European states that are predominantly Protestant to have higher Assembly densities than those that are predominantly Roman Catholic or Eastern Orthodox (2.6 as compared with 1.2). Even here, there are important exceptions, as in the case of Catholic Ireland (5.4) and West Germany (1.5) with its Protestant majority. Further research is evidently needed, but no general theory to account for these differences as yet presents itself. There are, however, a number of factors that may be relevant.

The most evident of these is government opposition to religious missionary activity. Generally speaking, unless a religion is already well established in a society, effective government opposition will prevent or greatly restrict its expansion. Such certainly was the case for the Bahá'ís of Spain, Portugal, Greece, and Eastern Europe until the political liberalization of their countries.

A second factor that appears to be relevant is the Bahá'í emphasis on achieving widespread diffusion of their religion. The establishment of even one local Assembly in a country or territory with a small population will produce a high Assembly density figure (e.g. Malta with one Assembly and a density of 2.5). Generally then, those countries with very small populations tend to have higher density figures, as in the cases of Luxembourg (30) and Iceland (60), both of which have populations of less than one million. There is still a great deal of variation between countries of similar population size, however, as for example, between the United Kingdom (3.3) and Italy (0.9), both with populations of (then) 56 million, or as between Portugal (2.4) and Greece (0.4), both with populations of 10 million.

A third possible factor is the degree to which a particular culture accepts alternative forms of religiosity. Those states in which there is considerable religious diversity (such as those of North America and the Anglo-Pacific) generally have higher densities than those in which there is little diversity and in which conversion to a non-traditional religion is correspondingly a more socially deviant act. This is a difficult relationship to establish with any degree of certainty, however; and

there are notable exceptions such as Catholic-majority Portugal and Ireland. Local factors are also undoubtedly of considerable importance. However, a full consideration of such factors will require more research.

Size. The differences in Assembly densities and the differences in degree of penetration they reflect are important, but they also need to be put in the context of the overall small size of the Western Bahá'í communities, particularly in Europe. Even in North America, the Bahá'í population represents only some 0.066 percent of the total population, and the European Bahá'í population represents less than 0.007 percent of its total population.⁵⁴ Considering that this is after ninety years of Bahá'í activity in the West, these are not high figures—particularly when compared with some parts of the Third World where the historical depth of Bahá'í expansion is much more recent. Thus, in 1986, of thirty-four listed countries or territories with an adult Bahá'í population equal to or in excess of 1% of the total adult population, only one—Alaska, with 1.43%—was in the West, the rest being in Africa (four), Asia (three), Latin America and the Caribbean (twelve), and the Pacific Islands (fourteen).⁵⁵

Social composition. There have been few studies of the social composition of the Western Bahá'ís, but the overall impression is that until comparatively recently, urban, middle-class, white Protestants were the predominant group in most Western Bahá'í communities. The following section provides an overview of five socio-demographic variables: (i) gender, (ii) age, (iii) class and occupation, (iv) race and ethnicity, and (v) religious background.⁵⁶

(I) GENDER

Females have generally outnumbered males. The predominance of females is apparent in a variety of surveys, sample surveys and censuses (Table 10). Approximately two-thirds of the American converts prior to 1900 were female,⁵⁷ and a similar proportion is shown in studies of American Bahá'ís up to the 1950s, as also of Danish Bahá'ís in the late 1950s. More recent data for the 1979-1981 period from Britain, New

Zealand, Denmark, and Los Angeles shows a slight predominance of females over males (54-56%). Only one data set (Austria, 1976) shows a female minority (44%). In the Danish case, this more equal sex ratio is partly due to the incorporation of Iranian Bahá'ís into the community, the native Danish Bahá'ís being 59% female.⁵⁸ It is of note that despite their smaller number, men have tended to be predominant in

Table 10: Gender Composition of Various Bahá'í Populations

Year and Place	Female (%)	N	Source
U.S., 1906	65.8	1280	U.S., 1906 Census
U.S., 1916	66.9	2723 ^a	U.S., 1916 Census
U.S., 1936	67.4	525 ^a	U.S., 1936 Census
New York, 1953	61.1	90	Berger
Denmark, 1959	66.0	50	Warburg
Austria, 1976	44	(349)	Fischer-Kowalski & Bucek
Los Angeles, 1979	53.9	115 ^a	Smith
U.K., 1979	55.0	149 ^a	Smith
New Zealand, 1979	55.6	356	Ross (N.Z. norm = 50.08)
Denmark, 1981	56.0	184	Warburg

Sources: United States, Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of the Census, *Census of Religious Bodies, 1906*, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1910); United States, Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Census of Religious Bodies, 1916*, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1919); idem, *Census of Religious Bodies, 1936*. Berger, "From Sect to Church: A Sociological Interpretation of the Bahá'í Movement," Ph.D. dissertation (New School for Social Research, New York, 1954); Margit Warburg, "The Circle" (this volume); Marina Fischer-Kowalski and Josef Bucek, *Strukturen der sozialen Ungleichheit in Österreich, Teil II: Endbericht, Band 2* (Vienna, Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Forschung, 1978); Peter Smith, "A Sociological Study of the Babi and Bahá'í Religions," Ph.D. dissertation (University of Lancaster, 1982); Margaret J. Ross, "Some Aspects of the Bahá'í Faith in New Zealand," M.A. thesis (University of Auckland, 1979).

Notes: See footnote 56.

a. Totals represent the number of males plus females rather than the total number reported.

Western Bahá'í leadership roles. However, women have always constituted an important minority of leaders. More detailed statistics are not at present available to the author, but as of 1988, some 37% of National Spiritual Assembly members and 42% of Auxiliary Board members in the Americas as a whole (that is, including Latin America) were women. The comparable figures for Europe were 28% and 31%, and for Australasia as a whole 26% for both.⁵⁹

(II) AGE

Most of the early surveys of Bahá'í membership concentrated on adult members. Indeed, for many years there was a tendency for only adult Bahá'ís to be fully incorporated into the Western communities. The predominance of adults is indicated in the 1936-1937 American data in Table 11, with only a little over 1% of the sample being aged less than twenty-one. Also of note is that a majority (65%) of the sample is over the age of forty. It has been noted that the early Australian Bahá'í community was also predominantly middle-aged or elderly.⁶⁰

Table 11: Age Distributions of Various Bahá'í Populations

Age Group	North America, 1936-37 (%)	United Kingdom, 1979 (%)	Los Angeles, 1979 (%)
0-14	0.4	2.7	2.5
15-20	0.9	16.9	16.1
21-30	12.9	29.7	23.7
31-40	20.3	13.5	22.0
41-50	22.9	19.6	13.6
51-60	19.7	10.8	9.3
Over 60	22.8	6.8	12.7
	N = 542	N = 148	N = 118

Sources: Smith, "Sociological Study," p. 438. See footnote 56.

Modern Western Bahá'í communities have generally shown a very different age structure, with a general predominance of those under the age of 41. During the 1970s at least, there was also a significant proportion under the age of 21. The two data sets given for 1979 (United Kingdom and Los Angeles) are probably not untypical, each with almost 20% in the 0-20 age group and well over 40% in the 21-40 group. In each population, there is a substantial proportion in the 41-60 age group (30% and 23% respectively), but a relatively small percentage over the age of 60 (7% and 13%). The method of data collection is likely to have excluded a large number of Bahá'í children from these two samples, so the overall youthfulness of modern Bahá'í populations is likely to be understated.

(III) CLASS AND OCCUPATION

The early American Bahá'í community appears to have been generally middle class.⁶¹ Certainly, those who were prominent within it included many business and professional men or their wives. It was also largely urban at a time when most Americans were still living in small towns and rural areas. There were, however, marked differences between the various Bahá'í communities.⁶² Chicago may have been predominantly middle-class. Thus, in 1899, out of 236 Chicago Bahá'ís whose occupation is known (out of a total Bahá'í community of about 790), sixty-five (28%) were professionals (doctors, teachers, engineers and lawyers, etc.), twenty (8%) of the men were in business, fifty-five (23%) were clerks, stenographers or bookkeepers, and a number were skilled artisans. There were none of the very rich or the highly educated. Nor were there any factory workers.⁶³ By contrast with Chicago, the Bahá'í community of Kenosha, Wisconsin, seems to have been predominantly working-class. In 1899, out of eighty-one Bahá'ís whose occupation is known (out of a total Bahá'í community of about 191), forty-three were "employees," "laborers," or machinists. There were also a small number of skilled artisans, engineers and small businessmen.⁶⁴ Information on other local Bahá'í communities is more sketchy. New York City and some of the other East Coast communities included Bahá'ís who were prominent businessmen and professionals or who were members of the social elite, but there were also clerks and skilled artisans. The Cincinnati community appears to have resembled Chicago in its social composition; that of Racine (Wisconsin) resembled Kenosha.⁶⁵

Table 12: Occupational Composition of Various Bahá'í Populations

Occupational Category	New York 1953		Los Angeles 1979		United Kingdom 1979		New Zealand 1979	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Professional	37	41.6	26	22.0	37	25.9	65 ^b	18.4
Business and Administration	8	9.0	15	12.7	12	8.4	14	4.0
Clerical	22	24.7	19	16.1	13	9.1	45	12.7
Skilled Manual	6	6.7	3	2.6	6	4.2	35	9.9
Semi-/Unskilled Manual	3	3.4	7	5.9	5	3.5	34	9.6
Students	-	-	20	17.0	38	26.6	43	12.2
Housewives	10	11.2	8	7.3	24	16.8	84	23.8
Retired	1	1.1	11	10.0	7	4.9	22	6.2
Non/unemployed	2	2.2	1	0.9	1	0.7	11	3.1
Totals	89	100.0	110	100.0	143 ^a	100.0	353	100.0

Sources: Berger, "From Sect to Church," p. 131; Ross, "Bahá'í Faith in New Zealand" (adapted); Smith, "Sociological Study." See footnote 56.

Notes: Occupational categories for the Los Angeles and United Kingdom samples derived from Gabriel Kolko, *Wealth and Power in America: An Analysis of Social Class and Income Distribution* (New York: Praeger, 1962).

a. Excludes 7 school children

b. Includes 10 "artists"

The predominantly middle class status of many Western Bahá'í communities is also suggested by some more recent data on occupational distribution for populations or sample populations in several countries (Tables 12 and 13). Of these, the sample surveys of New York, Los Angeles, and the United Kingdom most clearly reveal a predominance of professional, business, administrative and clerical occupations, together with a sizeable number of (potentially middle-class) college students in the latter two cases. Taken together, these groups constitute some 75% (New York), 73% (Los Angeles) and 70% (U.K.)

of the sample populations. By contrast, the combined totals for skilled, and semi- and unskilled manual workers amounts to only about one-tenth of each sample (10%, 9%, and 8% respectively). By contrast, the New Zealand survey reveals a much larger proportion of manual workers (19.5%) and unemployed (3.1%). Even here, students and the middle-class occupations comprise 47% of the population. It may also be that many in the large category of housewives (23.8% in New Zealand) are also members of middle-class households, but this is uncertain.

Table 13: Occupational Composition of the Bahá'ís of Austria (1976)
(National figures in parentheses)

Occupational Category	%	
School children and students	33.3	(22.2)
Workers	5.4	(20.0)
Clerical and civil servants	28.0	(16.7)
Self-employed	14.0	(6.7)
Housewives	16.1	(10.0)
Pensioners	3.2	(24.2)
Total	100.0	(100.0)

Source: Adapted from Fisher-Kowalski and Bucek, *Strukturen der sozialen Ungleichheit in Österreich*, p. 22, excluding the category of pre-school children (Bahá'í: 7%; national: 10%).

The Austrian data (Table 13) is less easy to interpret, the category of "workers" being quite vague, and the categories of school children (non-class specific) and college students being combined. However, the contrast between the Bahá'í and national figures is clear, the Bahá'ís having an appreciably larger proportion of clerical workers and civil servants (1.7 times as many), self-employed (x 2.1), and housewives (x 1.6), but an appreciably smaller proportion of "work-

ers" (x 0.27). A marked difference in age structure is also suggested, the Bahá'ís having 1.5 times as large a proportion of school children and students as the nation as a whole, but only about one-tenth of the proportion of pensioners.

As between the various middle-class categories, the largest in each case is that of professionals (the less specific Austrian data is here excluded), business, administrative and clerical categories being significantly less well represented. Within the category of professionals, no one type of profession is consistently over-represented. In Berger's New York study, seventeen out of the thirty-seven professionals (almost half) were identified as members of the "marginal intelligentsia," a type which Berger implied might be particularly attracted to the Bahá'í teachings.⁶⁶ This type is less well represented in the Los Angeles (eleven out of twenty-six) and British (five out of thirty-seven) samples, but it is notable that ten out of the sixty-five New Zealand professionals were specifically identified as "artists." Another type well represented is that of the medical and "caring" professions. These comprised nineteen out of thirty-seven in Britain, thirteen out of thirty-seven in New York, and six out of twenty-six in Los Angeles.

Another indication of the predominantly middle-class composition of Western Bahá'í communities is provided by the high educational levels recorded in several sets of survey data. We find 28.5% and 26.6%, respectively, of participants in the British and New Zealand surveys had either received or were receiving degree level education (8.6 percent of the British sample at higher degree level), and a further 12.6% of the British sample had received or were in pursuit of other higher certificates.⁶⁷ An American (1968) and the New Zealand surveys also recorded significantly higher educational levels among the Bahá'ís than in the national populations.⁶⁸ Of those taking or possessing degrees, no particular subject bias was discernible in the British sample.

A third indication of at least the British Bahá'ís' middle-class status lies in their readership of newspapers. Of 151 individuals, forty-one obtained copies of one or more "quality" dailies (*Guardian*, *Telegraph*, or *Times*), while a further seventeen only obtained copies of a Sunday quality paper or periodical (especially the American *Time* magazine). Of those who did not obtain quality papers, ten obtained copies of the up-market tabloids (*Express* and *Mail*), seven obtained

copies of other popular dailies, and 76 reported reading no national newspapers at all. No marked political bias was discernible in the choice of papers. Sixty-nine individuals also subscribed to one or more magazines, but no overall trend seemed evident in their choice.⁶⁹

As to class mobility, only the British sample survey contained pertinent data, although the high rate of non-response (36%) to the question about parental occupation must cast doubt on its usefulness. Of those who responded to this question, most of those employed (thirty-one out of forty-eight) had fathers in the same occupational category as themselves; 68.0% of the fathers were categorized as professional or business, 3.1% as clerical, and 28.9% as manual. Despite the low response rate, some definite upward mobility is suggested by these figures. While only eleven individuals were currently in manual occupations, at least twenty-eight had fathers who were so engaged.⁷⁰

These various data sets are indicative of what has probably been the prevailing class composition of most (if not all) Western Bahá'í communities for most of their history. That is, while there has always been some diversity of class membership, middle-class groups have always been disproportionately over-represented, even when they have not constituted an absolute majority of the membership. By contrast, working-class and socially elite groups have been greatly under-represented. This is not necessarily a fixed pattern. The conversion of members of North American minority groups—notably reservation-living Amerindians and rural southern black Americans, both groups which have been at the bottom of the North American class structure—indicates that the potential appeal of the Bahá'í Faith in the West is not limited to a single class category. The long-term success of the Bahá'ís in appealing to such groups and successfully incorporating them fully into their community structures has yet to be adequately assessed, however. Given that middle-class leadership and cultural styles appear to continue to be dominant within Western Bahá'í communities, it may well be that members of these minority groups who are more upwardly mobile will be fully integrated, while others who are not will be merely encapsulated as members of essentially marginal enclaves within the community as a whole.⁷¹ The geographical localization of the majority of these minority group members could well encourage such encapsulization.

(IV) RACE AND ETHNICITY

In North America, the overwhelming majority of early Bahá'ís were white, but some black converts were made from the 1890s onwards. The Bahá'í teachings concerning racial equality distinguished it from most other white-dominated American religious organizations of the time. Black Bahá'ís became a significant minority of Bahá'í membership. By the 1930s, some 7% of the community was black, as were 13% of a sample of newly declared Bahá'ís in 1968 (Table 14).⁷² Since then, the proportion of black Bahá'ís has massively increased, not only in the southern states where large-scale enrollments have occurred, but also in urban communities such as Los Angeles (Table 14), where 23% of the sample were black.

Table 14: Racial and National Composition of Various Bahá'í Populations

Racial/National Category	N America 1936-37		US enrollments December 1968		Los Angeles 1979		UK 1979 ^a	
	No.	%	% (U.S. average)		No.	%	No.	%
American (US)								
Black	40	6.7	13	(10.55)	27	22.9	-	-
White	554	92.2	87	(87.77)	40	33.9	-	-
(excl. Iranians)								
British (UK)	-	-	-	-	-	-	91	60.3
Iranian/Middle								
Eastern	5	0.8	-	-	38	32.2	48	31.8
Other	2	0.3	0	(1.68)	6	5.1	11	7.3
Non-response								
					7	5.9	1	0.7
Total	601	100.0	(N = 160)		118	100.0	151	100.0

Sources: Hampson, "Growth and Spread," p. 347; Smith, "Sociological Study," p. 436. See footnote 56.

Note: a. British figures by nationality rather than "race."

Although fewer in numbers, Native Americans have also come to constitute a distinctive (but localized) minority within the North Amer-

ican Bahá'í communities. This has particularly been the case in Canada, where in the early 1960s, Amerindians comprised as much as one-quarter of the Bahá'í community.⁷³

Of white Americans, the majority of early Bahá'í converts were of northwest European origin, whether native-born or recent immigrants (there were appreciable numbers of both).⁷⁴ By national origin, the largest group was of British stock (33% of the 1936-1937 sample, and 38% of those sample members that had become Bahá'ís by 1919), followed by Germans (15% and 34% respectively) and Scandinavians (7% and 8%). Almost all were former Protestants. The Irish and eastern and southern European groups—mostly non-Protestants, and who at that time were of much lower social status—were little represented. Outside North America, at present we have little data. In common with Bahá'í teaching endeavors throughout the rest of the world, Western minority groups have often been specially targeted for teaching. Thus, in Europe alone, Bahá'í literature has been produced in some seventy separate languages and dialects,⁷⁵ and systematic attempts have been made to gain converts among such groups as the Lapps (Same), Romanians, and Chinese. However, apart from refugees from Portugal's former African territories and Turkish migrants, significant numbers of conversions do not appear to have taken place. The British Bahá'í community may be indicative here, the substantial minorities of peoples of Afro-Caribbean, South Asian, or Chinese origin or descent being almost entirely unrepresented. In my 1979 sample survey (Table 14), there was a small "new-commonwealth" element (most of the 7.3% "other"), but most of these were students or medical workers from the Indian Ocean islands and Malaysia, and were likely to have become Bahá'ís before their arrival in Britain. Greater success in teaching minority peoples has been achieved in the Anglo-Pacific, not only in the cosmopolitan state of Hawaii, but also in New Zealand and Australia, where there are numbers of Maori and Aboriginal Bahá'ís.

Of considerable importance in almost all Western Bahá'í communities are numbers of Iranian Bahá'ís. Iranians have constituted an active element in some Western Bahá'í communities since the early 1900s. But it is only since the troubled years which led up to the Islamic Revolution in Iran (1979) that large numbers of Iranians have settled in the West. In the British and Los Angeles sample surveys, Iranians constituted close to one third of the populations (32% in each),

and it is likely that in some communities the proportion is even higher. The effect of this influx has varied considerably. While in some communities the Iranian Bahá'ís have become an active and well-integrated element within the Bahá'í population as a whole, it is evident that this has not always occurred, and that major cultural divisions developed at least initially within some Western communities between indigenous and Iranian Bahá'ís. Studies in Britain and Italy suggest that, in those countries at least, the Iranian immigrants became well integrated quite quickly in terms of administrative involvement in their host Bahá'í communities. There was also a high level of intermarriage between the Iranians and local Bahá'ís.⁷⁶

(V) RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND

Excluding Iranian Bahá'í immigrants, the majority of Western Bahá'ís are first-generation converts. In the United States, in particular, there are families that have been Bahá'í for several generations, but these are a minority in the Bahá'í population as a whole. Some indication of this is provided by the data in Table 15. Excluding Middle Easterners from the Los Angeles and British samples (i.e., reading columns 4b and 5b), those of Bahá'í background in each survey are in the range of 4.5% to 7%.

Until fairly recently, the vast majority of Westerners who became Bahá'ís were of Protestant background. This was true throughout the West, and in Europe was reflected in the much slower growth of the religion in those countries that are predominantly Roman Catholic or Eastern Orthodox. Greater numbers of Catholic converts have been gained in recent years, but overall, Protestants (active or nominal) still constitute the predominant source of new Western Bahá'ís outside of the former Communist states. This predominance is reflected in Table 15. Again excluding Iranians from the Los Angeles and British samples, the percentage of Protestants in the surveys ranges from 41.3% (Los Angeles) to 65% (USA, 1968), while the percentage of Catholics ranges from 5.2% (North America, 1936-37) to 15% (USA, 1968). Several surveys also record an appreciable percentage of individuals (6.0%-16.6%) who identified themselves only as having been "Christians," but whom it might be assumed were Protestants. As regards the type of Protestants that have become Bahá'ís, it would appear that, at

**Table 15: Previous Religious Affiliations
of Various Bahá'í Populations, 1934-1979**

Religion	1	2	3	4		5	
	North America 1936-7 (%)	New York 1953 %	U.S.A. 1968 %	Los Angeles 1979 (a) Total (%)	Non- Iranians (b) %	United Kingdom 1979 (a) Total %	British Nationals (b) (%)
Bahá'í	4.5	5.6	7	35.6	5	35.8	5.5
Catholic	5.2	7.8	15	7.6	11.3	6.6	8.8
Protestant	56.9	54.5	65	28.9	41.3	28.5	46.1
"Christian"	16.6	-	-	6.8	10	6.0	8.8
Jewish	2.5	16.7	4	9.3	13.8	2.0	3.3
Other Western groups	6.5	2.2	-	2.5	3.8	4.6	6.6
Eastern religions	0.8	1.1	-	2.5	3.8	6.6	5.5
No religion	7.0	12.2	7	7.6	11.3	10.6	15.4
Mixed	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
	(N=601)	(N=90)	(N=160)	(N=118)	(N=80)	(N=151)	(N=91)

Sources: Berger, "From Sect to Church," pp. 133-34; Hampson, "Growth and Spread," p. 347; Smith, "Sociological Study," p. 440. See footnote 56.

least in Britain and North America, the majority has been drawn from the mainstream churches and denominations, rather than from the smaller and less conventional Protestant groups. Some indication of this is provided in Table 16, which shows some 33% of the sample being drawn from the main "Anglo-Saxon" churches, while a further 11% is drawn from the "German/Scandinavian" Lutheran churches. The relatively large proportion (5%) of ultra-liberal Unitarians and Universalists is also of note in this sample of early Bahá'ís.

Table 16: Religious Backgrounds of a Group of Early American Bahá'ís

“Christian”	28			
Episcopalian	16	}	Total “main denominations” = 64	}
Methodist	16			
Congregationalist	10			
Presbyterian	16			
Baptist	6			
Lutheran	21		Total assumed Protestant = 137	
Unitarian/ Universalist	10			
“Protestant”	11			
Other Protestant	3			
Catholic	7			
Swedenborgian	1	}	Total “metaphysical” = 6	
Christian Science	3			
New Thought	1			
Theosophy	1			
Mormon	1			
Jewish	2			
Muslim	2			
Bahá’i	27			
None	10			
Insufficient data	<u>5</u>			
	197			

Source: Peter Smith, “The American Bahá’i Community, 1894-1917: A Preliminary Survey” in Moojan Momen, ed., *Studies in Bábí and Bahá’i History*, Vol. 1 (Los Angeles, Kalimát Press, 1982) p. 120. Calculated from a sample of 1936 “Bahá’i Historical Record Cards.” See footnote 56.

The survey data includes an appreciable number of marginal- and non-Christians. In Table 15, these comprise Jews (2.5% to 4% in the country surveys excluding Iranians, 13.8% and 16.7% in the Los Angeles and New York City samples); Eastern religions (mostly Buddhist or Indian, 0% to 5.5%); unorthodox Western religious groups such as the Latter-Day Saints (Mormons) and Christian Scientists (2.25 to

6.5%); and individuals without a former religion (7% to 15.4%). The large proportion of the non-religious and, in certain localities, Jews is noteworthy. Of those drawn from the unorthodox Western groups, the majority in the earlier American samples (North America, 1936-1937; New York, 1953) were former members of the various "metaphysical" groups such as Christian Science, New Thought, and Spiritualism. The large number of early converts drawn from this background has also been noted in more qualitative research accounts.⁷⁷ In the more recent surveys, there is a greater range of unorthodox backgrounds, several former Latter-Day Saints being included.

It is not yet possible to generalize about the former theological orientations of Western Bahá'ís. Certainly, many of the early American Bahá'ís were religious liberals, as may be evidenced by the appreciable number of Unitarian-Universalists and metaphysical group members among the early converts. Again, few if any extremely conservative or fundamentalist Christians appear to have been converted during the period covered by this survey. A range of attitudes is evident among both the early Western Bahá'ís and their modern-day successors, however. Liberal, conservative, and fundamentalist orientations are discernible, and it is likely that these distinctive attitudes are at least partly traceable to the pre-Bahá'í worldviews of the adherents. This is a topic that requires further research. The level of previous religious activity and involvement is another factor of interest. Again, generalization is not yet possible, beyond noting a considerable range: from those who formerly had little religious involvement to those who had been highly active religiously, whether as orthodox Christians or as religious seekers.

Conclusion

FURTHER STUDY of the various Western Bahá'í communities is evidently necessary. As yet, we have comparatively little material on which to base any detailed account of the development of the Bahá'í Faith in the West or to describe its present character. Of course, this is not an isolated lacunae: Bahá'í Studies as a whole has tended—so far—to focus on the history and texts of the earlier "heroic age" of

Bahá'í development, and to neglect both more recent developments and more sociological perspectives. I would hope that the present summary has the value of alerting readers to some of the research questions that need to be addressed, and of encouraging other researchers to take up the work of examining them. Certainly, despite the comparatively small number of Bahá'ís in the West, Western Bahá'ís and Western Bahá'í communities have played a major role in the development of the Bahá'í Faith. As such, they constitute an important topic of enquiry. Again, in terms of the history and sociology of religions in the West, the Bahá'í Faith is surely of interest, constituting as it does an example of a non-Christian religious movement which has succeeded in becoming part of Western religiosity, having sustained itself in the West for over a century, and having now established itself in every part of the Western world.

NOTES

The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of the Department of Statistics at the Bahá'í World Center for its provision of various data used in this paper. My particular thanks are also due to Dr. Moojan Momen and Dr. Ahang Rabbani for their assistance. This paper was prepared in 1997 and it has not been possible to update it.

1. Peter Smith, *The Babi and Baha'i Religions: From Messianic Shi'ism to a World Religion* (Cambridge University Press, 1987) pp. 162-71. The term "West" refers collectively to North America, Europe, and the Anglo-Pacific. North America refers to the continental United States and Canada, i.e., including Alaska, but excluding Hawaii. Puerto Rico and other U.S. Caribbean territories are not included. Europe here refers to the countries of Western and Eastern Europe, together with the European part of Russia. It also includes Cyprus. The former Soviet Caucasian republics and Turkey are excluded, despite this latter country being included as part of Europe in recent Bahá'í statistical digests. European external dependencies (e.g., French overseas departments in the Caribbean) are also excluded, with the exception of Greenland. The Anglo-Pacific refers to Australia, New Zealand, and Hawaii. The boundaries of the first two areas are delineated in Smith, *The Babi and Baha'i Religions*, Map 2. Bahá'í usage has varied over time, and in some of the figures cited here, the relatively small Bahá'í community of Hawaii is included with North America. In several instances, because of conflicting area definitions, both Hawaii and Cyprus (also a very small Bahá'í community) are excluded altogether from statistical tables in the present article.

2. On Kheiralla and the early establishment of the Bahá'í religion in North America, see Richard Hollinger, "Ibrahim George Kheiralla and the Bahá'í Faith in America" in Juan R. Cole and Moojan Momen, eds., *From Iran East and West, Studies in Bábí and Bahá'í History*, Vol. 2 (Los Angeles: Kalimát Press, 1984) pp. 95-133; and Robert H. Stockman, *The Bahá'í Faith in America*, Vol. 1: Origins, 1892-1900 (Wilmette, Ill.: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1985).
3. Stockman, *Bahá'í Faith in America*, p. 163. These included a Bahá'í group in Washington, D.C. On numbers, see also Richard Hollinger, "The Bahá'í Faith in America, 1894-1900," paper presented at the Second Los Angeles Bahá'í History Conference, August-September 1984; and Peter Smith, "The American Bahá'í Community, 1894-1917: A Preliminary Survey" in Moojan Momen, ed., *Studies in Bábí and Bahá'í History*, Vol. 1 (Los Angeles: Kalimát Press, 1982) pp. 203-204.
4. On the Behaists, see Richard Hollinger, "The Behaists of America," unpublished paper.
5. For a general account of this period, see Smith, "American Bahá'í Community," pp. 85-223, and Robert Stockman, *The Bahá'í Faith in America*, Vol. 2: Early Expansion, 1900-1912 (Oxford: George Ronald, 1995). See also Smith, *Babi and Baha'i Religions*, pp. 100-114.
6. United States, Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of the Census, *Census of Religious Bodies, 1906*, Vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1910) pp. 41-42.
7. On the Mashriqu'l-Adhkár project, see Bruce Whitmore, *The Dawning Place: The Building of a Temple, The Forging of a North American Bahá'í Community* (Wilmette, Ill.: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1984).
8. Sociologists and Bahá'ís have developed varying definitions for the basic sociological terms "community" and "group." For modern Bahá'ís, "community" refers to any centrally administered collectivity of Bahá'ís (e.g., the local Bahá'í community of Los Angeles, the national Bahá'í community of Canada, the world Bahá'í community). "Bahá'í International Community" refers to the collective representation of the Bahá'í Faith at the United Nations and its related bodies. "Group" is used by modern Bahá'ís to refer to a local body of Bahá'ís that has not yet formed a local Spiritual Assembly. By contrast, sociologists generally use the term "community" to refer to a relatively large group of people who live and work together, and whose basic needs are largely satisfied within the group, e.g., a local village community. The term "group" is used to refer to any number of people who interact together and have some sense of shared identity, e.g., a family, a formal organization (such as the Bahá'í Faith), or a community. The present work employs the modern Bahá'í usage of "community." Most Bahá'í "communities" are not in fact communities in a sociological sense, but the term is both ubiquitous in Bahá'í literature and is of use as a general referent. However, the Bahá'í usage of the term "group" is overly technical in the present context, and the more general sociological usage is retained.
9. The most detailed account of 'Abdu'l-Bahá's visit to North America is Mirzá Mahmud Zarqání, *Kitáb-i Badayi'u'l-Áthar*, 2 vols. (Hofheim-Langenhain:

- Bahá'í-Verlag, reprinted from the original 1928 edition). An English translation of this work has recently become available: *Mahmúd's Diary*. Trans. by Mohi Sobhani and Shirley Macias (Oxford: George Ronald, 1998). See also H. M. Balyuzi, *'Abdu'l-Bahá: The Centre of the Covenant of Bahá'u'lláh* (London: George Ronald, 1971) pp. 171-339, which draws extensively on Zarqání; Alan Lucius Ward, "An Historical Study of the North American Speaking Tour of 'Abdu'l-Bahá and a Rhetorical Analysis of His Addresses," Ph.D. dissertation (Ohio University, 1960); and idem, *239 Days: 'Abdu'l-Bahá's Journey in America* (Wilmette, Ill.: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1979).
10. United States, Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Census of Religious Bodies, 1916*, (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office 1919) Vol. 2, pp. 43-45. There is a reference to 5,000 Bahá'ís in 1913, immediately following 'Abdu'l-Bahá's visit (*Star of the West*, Vol. 4, p. 139). If valid, we may assume that this figure included sympathizers. Hollinger notes the vague terms of membership of many local Bahá'í groups at this time (Richard Hollinger, ed., *Community Histories: Studies in the Bábí and Bahá'í Religions*, Vol. 6 (Los Angeles: Kalimát Press, 1992) pp. xi-xiii).
 11. Smith, "American Bahá'í Community," pp. 155-61. See also Peter Smith, "Millenarianism in the Babi and Baha'í Religions" in Roy Wallis, ed., *Millennialism and Charisma* (Belfast: Queen's University, 1982) pp. 231-83.
 12. Richard Hollinger, "Bahá'ís and American Peace Movements" in Anthony A. Lee, ed., *Circle of Peace: Reflections on the Bahá'í Teachings* (Los Angeles: Kalimát Press, 1985) pp. 3-19.
 13. There has been little systematic study of Western Bahá'í history outside of the United States. On Australia, see Graham Hassall, "The Bahá'í Faith in Australia, 1920-1963," paper presented at the Second Los Angeles Bahá'í History Conference, August-September 1984, and "Outpost of a World Religion: The Bahá'í Faith in Australia, 1920-1947" (in this volume). On Britain, see Philip Smith, "From a Movement to a Religion: An Examination of the Development of the Bahá'í Faith in Britain from 1900 to 1950," M. Phil. thesis (University of Birmingham, 1987); idem., "The development and influence of the Bahá'í Administrative Order in Great Britain, 1914-50" in Hollinger, *Community Histories*, pp. 153-215; idem., "What was a Bahá'í? Concerns of British Bahá'ís, 1900-1920" in Moojan Momen, ed., *Studies in Honor of the Late Hasan M. Balyuzi: Studies in the Bábí and Bahá'í Religions*, Vol. 5 (Los Angeles: Kalimát Press, 1988) pp. 219-51. On Canada, see Will van den Hoonaard, "The development and decline of an early Bahá'í community: Saint John, New Brunswick, Canada, 1910-1925" in Hollinger, *Community Histories*, pp. 217-39; *The Origins of the Bahá'í Community of Canada, 1898-1948* (Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1996). On Denmark, see Margit Warburg, "From Circle to Community: The Bahá'í Religion in Denmark, 1925-2002" (in this volume). On Germany, see Rainer Flasche, "Die Religion der Einheit und Selbstverwirklichung der Menschichte und Mission der Bahá'í in Deutschland," *Zeitschrift für Missionwissenschaft und Religion*, Vol. 16, no. 3 (1977) pp. 188-213. On Hawaii, see Agnes B. Alexander, *Forty Years of the Bahá'í Cause in Hawaii, 1902-1942* (Honolulu: National Spiritual Assembly of the Bahá'ís of the

- Hawaiian Islands, 1974). On New Zealand, see Margaret J. Ross, "Some Aspects of the Bahá'í Faith in New Zealand," M.A. thesis (University of Auckland, 1979).
14. On 'Abdu'l-Bahá's visits to Europe, see Balyuzi, *'Abdu'l-Bahá*, pp. 250-68, 454-96. On his visit to Britain, see Lady [S. L.] Blomfield, *The Chosen Highway* (Wilmette, Ill.: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1967); Eric Hammond, *Abdul Baha in London* (East Sheen, Surrey: Unity Press, for the Bahai Publishing Society, 1912; Rev. edition. London: Baha'i Publishing Trust, 1982); and Anjam Khursheed, *The Seven Candles of Unity: The Story of 'Abdu'l-Bahá in Edinburgh* (London: Baha'i Publishing Trust, 1991).
 15. On the early development of the Administrative Order, see Shoghi Effendi, *God Passes By* (Wilmette, Ill.: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1944) pp. 323-53. See also Smith, *Babi and Baha'i Religions*, pp. 120-22.
 16. Shoghi Effendi, *Bahá'í Administration*, 5th edition (Wilmette, Ill.: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1945) pp. 17-25, 34-43.
 17. Smith, *Babi and Baha'i Religions*, pp. 145-46.
 18. *Ibid.*, pp. 112-13, 181.
 19. On these contrasting epistemologies, see Roy Wallis, "Ideology, Authority and the Development of Cultic Movements," *Social Research*, Vol. 412 (1974) pp. 299-327.
 20. Smith, "American Bahá'í Community," pp. 121, 161-70.
 21. *Ibid.*, pp. 103-105, 195.
 22. *Ibid.*, pp. 189-94.
 23. On Dyar, see Peter Smith, "Reality Magazine: Editorship and Ownership of an American Bahá'í Periodical" in J. R. Cole and M. Momen, eds., *From Iran East and West, Studies in Bábí and Bahá'í History*, Vol. 2 (Los Angeles: Kalimát Press, 1984) pp. 135-55. On White and Sohrab, see Vernon Elvin Johnson, "An Historical Analysis of Critical Transformations in the Evolution of the Bahá'í World Faith," Ph.D. dissertation (Baylor University, Texas, 1974) pp. 306-21. On White, see Loni Bramson-Lerche, "Some aspects of the establishment of the Guardianship" in Momen, *Studies in Honor of the Late Hasan M. Balyuzi*, pp. 253-93.
 24. For his own accounts, see Ahmad Sohrab, *Broken Silence: The Story of Today's Struggle for Religious Freedom* (New York: Universal Publishing Co., for the New History Society, 1942), and *The Story of the Divine Plan, Taking Place During and Immediately Following World War I* (New York: New History Foundation, 1947). For a brief account written on behalf of Shoghi Effendi, see Shoghi Effendi, *The Light of Divine Guidance: The Messages from the Guardian of the Bahá'í Faith to the Bahá'ís of Germany and Austria* (Hofheim-Langenhain: Bahá'í-Verlag, 1982) pp. 135-36.
 25. Bramson-Lerche, "Some aspects of the establishment," p. 280.
 26. 'Abdu'l-Bahá, *Tablets of the Divine Plan*, Rev. edition (Wilmette, Ill.: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1993).
 27. See Loni Bramson-Lerche, "The Plans of Unified Action: A Survey" (this volume).
 28. United States, Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Census of Religious Bodies, 1916*, Vol. 2, pp. 43-45; *idem*, *Census of Religious Bodies*,

- 1926, Vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1929-1930) pp. 70-76; idem, *Census of Religious Bodies, 1936*, Vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1939-1941) pp. 76-82.
29. Personal communication from Richard Hollinger.
 30. The whole topic of planned Bahá'í expansion is discussed in Arthur Hampson, "The Growth and Spread of the Bahá'í Faith," Ph.D. dissertation (University of Hawaii, 1980).
 31. *Bahá'í News*, No. 193, p. 8.
 32. David Millett, "A Typology of Religious Organizations Suggested by the Canadian Census," *Sociological Analysis*, Vol. 30 (1969) p. 109.
 33. National Spiritual Assembly of the Bahá'ís of the British Isles, *World Development of the Faith* (London: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1952) p. 29; and Hassall, "Bahá'í Faith in Australia," p. 12.
 34. Different methods of compiling population data may have exaggerated the extent of the increase between the early 1950s and 1963 estimates. The 1950s figures are here assumed to exclude children.
 35. *Christian Century*, Vol. 88, p. 616.
 36. Of particular importance here was the opening of a Bahá'í radio station in Hemingway, South Carolina (1984), in the area of the greatest concentration of new Bahá'ís in the United States. See Universal House of Justice, Department of Statistics (comp.), *The Seven Year Plan, 1979-1986: Statistical Report, Ridván 1986* (Haifa: Bahá'í World Centre, 143 B.E./1986) pp. 114-15.
 37. *Ibid.*, pp. 124-28.
 38. *Ibid.*, pp. 131-37. On development, see pp. 108-15. Universal House of Justice, *The Promise of World Peace* (Haifa: Bahá'í World Centre, 1985).
 39. Peter Smith and Moojan Momen, "The Baha'í Faith, 1957-1988: A Survey of Contemporary Developments," *Religion*, Vol. 19 (1989) pp. 63-91.
 40. Calculated from Universal House of Justice, Department of Statistics, Memorandum, dated 15 May 1988. In author's possession.
 41. Universal House of Justice, Department of Statistics, *Seven Year Plan, Ridván 1986*, p. 56.
 42. On Root, see *The Bahá'í World*, Vol. 8, pp. 643-48; M. R. Garis, *Martha Root: Lioness at the Threshold* (Wilmette, Ill.: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1983); Barron Deems Harper, *Lights of Fortitude: Glimpses into the Lives of the Hands of the Cause of God* (Oxford: George Ronald, 1997) pp. 112-22.
 43. See, in particular, R. Jackson Armstrong-Ingram, "American Bahá'í Women and the Education of Girls in Tehran, 1909-1934" in Peter Smith, ed., *In Iran, Studies in Bábí and Bahá'í History*, Vol. 3. (Los Angeles: Kalimát Press, 1986) pp. 181-210.
 44. On Holley, see *Bahá'í World*, Vol. 13, pp. 849-58; Harper, *Lights of Fortitude*, 253-64.
 45. Calculated from *The Bahá'í World*, Vol. 2, pp. 181-91. See also Smith, *Babi and Bahá'í Religions*, pp. 166-67.
 46. Calculated from Universal House of Justice, Department of Statistics, Statistical Summary Tables for Semi-Annual Reports of July 1987 (Haifa: Bahá'í World Centre, February 1988) and idem, Memorandum, dated 15 May 1988.

47. On administrative functioning in general, see Universal House of Justice, Department of Statistics, *Seven Year Plan, Ridván 1986*, pp. 65-80.
48. Smith, *Babi and Baha'i Religions*, p. 172.
49. "Cultural expressions" here refers to all formal and informal patterns of behavior and belief that are characteristic of a religious group as a collectivity, and which new members acquire through socialization. They include forms and styles of interaction between members; the conduct of meetings (both formal and informal); forms of organizations; attitudes towards outsiders and towards the socialization of children and new members; forms of personal behavior and appearance (dress, hair, etc.); and artistic expressions. Intellectual expressions (folk tales, formal religious codes, scriptural interpretations, etc.) constitute a specialized form of cultural expression. As in most religious movements, only a few of the cultural expressions of being a Bahá'í are scripturally prescribed. Most patterns of Bahá'í collective life emerge in the process of group interaction. In the Bahá'í case, these now vary quite considerably from one society to another, no doubt reflecting the Bahá'í principle of tolerance of diversity.
50. The topic of Western Bahá'í cultural styles has received little scholarly attention. See R. Jackson Armstrong-Ingram, *Music, Devotions, and Mashriqu'l-Adhkár, Studies in Bábí and Bahá'í History*, Vol. 4 (Los Angeles: Kalimát Press, 1987), and Sandra S. Kahn, "Encounter of Two Myths, Bahá'í and Christian, in the Rural American South: A Study in Transmythification," Ph.D. dissertation (University of California at Santa Barbara, 1977) for discussions of particular topics. More generally, see the various national Bahá'í periodicals.
51. 'Abdu'l-Bahá, *Some Answered Questions*, collected and trans. L. C. Barney (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1908); Rev. edition (Wilmette, Ill.: Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1981).
52. On Kheiralla's influence and writings, see the works by Hollinger and Stockman (note 2, above). For the rest, see Hippolyte Dreyfus, *Essai sur le Béhaïsme* (Paris: Leroux, 1908); idem. *The Universal Religion: Baháism* (London: Cope & Fenwick, 1909); John E. Esslemont, *Bahá'u'lláh and the New Era* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1923; subsequent editions have been posthumously revised and edited); Horace Holley, *Baháism: The Modern Social Religion* (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1913) and *Bahai: The Spirit of the Age* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Tubner and Co., 1921); Charles Mason Remey, *The Bahai Movement: A Series of Nineteen Papers*, 2d ed. (Washington, D.C.: J. D. Milans and Sons, 1913) and *The Bahai Revelation and Reconstruction* (Chicago: Bahai Publishing Society, 1919).
53. Data on the number and location of Bahá'í Spiritual Assemblies is readily available. A local Spiritual Assembly is generally formed when there are nine or more adult Bahá'ís (aged 21 or over) in a particular locality. As great efforts are made to ensure the continued existence of an Assembly after one has been formed, its existence indicates a certain minimum level of Bahá'í activity and the presence of what is effectively a Bahá'í congregation.
54. Those countries in which there were then no organized Bahá'í communities (i.e., Eastern Europe) are here excluded.

-
55. Universal House of Justice, Department of Statistics, *Seven Year Plan, Ridván 1986*, p. 51.
 56. The main sources of data for Tables 10-16 are as follows: (1) the United States Censuses of Religion for 1906-1936; (2) a one-third sample (n=601) by the present author of the set of "Bahá'í Historical Record Cards" collected by the National Spiritual Assembly of the United States and Canada in or about 1936 (Wilmette, Ill., National Bahá'í Archives); (3) a sample survey (n=90) of Bahá'ís in New York City in 1953. See Peter L. Berger, "From Sect to Church: A Sociological Interpretation of the Bahá'í Movement," Ph.D. dissertation (New School for Social Research, New York, 1954) pp. 131-39; (4) an unpublished survey (n=160) of newly-enrolled American Bahá'ís conducted in December 1968 (National Spiritual Assembly of the Bahá'ís of the United States, Department of Personnel and Administrative Services, "A Statistical Comparison of the Background of Newly Enrolled Bahá'ís with the U.S. Population" (Wilmette, Ill.: National Bahá'í Center, 1969)). See Arthur Hampson, "The Growth and Spread of the Bahá'í Faith," Ph.D. dissertation (University of Hawaii, 1980), pp. 344-49; (5) a survey of the Bahá'ís of Austria in 1976 (n=349) produced as part of a study of social groups by the Austrian Ministry of Science and Research. See Marina Fischer-Kowalski and Josef Bucek, *Strukturen der sozialen Ungleichheit in Österreich, Teil II: Endbericht, Band 2* (Vienna: Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft und Forschung, 1978); (6) a survey of the New Zealand Bahá'í community in 1978 (n=356). See Margaret J. Ross, "Some Aspects of the Bahá'í Faith in New Zealand," M.A. thesis (University of Auckland, 1979); (7) a sample survey (n=151) of British Bahá'ís by the present author in 1978; (8) a sample survey (n=118) of Los Angeles Bahá'ís conducted on behalf of the author in 1979; and (9) a series of figures on the composition of the Danish Bahá'í community in 1959, 1962, and 1981, in Warburg, "From Circle to Community." The sample surveys of New York (Berger), Britain (Smith) and Los Angeles (Smith) were conducted at second hand, through the intermediary of Local Spiritual Assembly officers who distributed and collected the survey questionnaires on the authors' behalf at regular Bahá'í Nineteen Day Feasts. Most religiously active Bahá'ís attend these Feasts and most or all of those present at each Feast completed the questionnaires. The New York survey represented between one-third and one-half of the total Bahá'í community, the British survey about fifty-two percent of the adult and youth membership of the nineteen local communities that participated (of a sample of twenty-nine that were contacted), and the Los Angeles survey about seventeen percent of local membership.
 57. Hollinger, "Bahá'í Faith in America."
 58. Warburg, "From Circle to Community."
 59. Universal House of Justice, Department of Statistics, Memorandum, 15 May 1988. The comparable figures for Africa were twenty-four and eighteen percent, and for Asia, eighteen and twenty-two percent. The world figures were twenty-seven percent for both National Assembly and Auxiliary Board Members. By 1996, the Assembly figures were forty-one percent for America and