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The Genesis and Evolution of A New Creed in the United Church of Canada

WILLIAM HAUGHTON
The United Church of Canada

In its brief history, The United Church of Canada has tried to articulate its theology in four official statements of faith: the Basis of Union (1925), the Statement of Faith (1940), A New Creed (1968) and A Song of Faith (2006). A noteworthy element of the most recent, A Song of Faith, is the deference it shows to just one of its predecessors: A New Creed. The Committee on Theology and Faith, which wrote A Song of Faith, claimed that “This statement is not intended to be in any way a replacement of the beloved New Creed,” which, they added, that “[p]eople in the United Church love.”1 Michael Bourgeois, chairperson, has said that the Committee on Theology and Faith encountered many individuals while drafting A Song of Faith who “thought that ‘A New Creed’ so perfectly summarized the faith of the church that nothing else was necessary.”2

Similar testimonies abound. Mardi Tindal, the fortieth and current Moderator of the United Church’s General Council, once said of A New Creed, “It’s the one thing I’ve made sure my children know. We say it as a grace at meals because I really want them to know it.”3 David Bruce wrote in 2008 that “the beautiful words of the much-loved ‘A New Creed’” are “the Christian faith as talked about by people in The United Church of Canada.”4

Although A New Creed is widely esteemed in the United Church, its story is not well known. Gretta Vosper, for example, has referred recently to a “mysterious process” by which it was composed and authorized for use in the United Church.5 Having concluded from an extensive survey of United Church literature that indeed its origin and development remain

Historical Papers 2011: Canadian Society of Church History
a mystery for many, the primary purpose of this paper is to shed light on
the little-known story of A New Creed. A secondary purpose will be to
reflect on the significance of this text and its use in the United Church. In
contrast to the kind of glowing descriptions already cited, A New Creed
will be shown to represent a striking lack of consensus about what it meant
in the 1960s, and still means today, to be a Christian within the United
Church. By the clear and insightful admission of its original authors, A
New Creed does not, nor was intended, to reflect a spiritual consensus in
the United Church. Rather, it was crafted as a strategy to manage the
breakdown of the United Church as a Christian community.

The Story of A New Creed

Although A New Creed now reflects revisions approved by the
General Council Executive in 1980 and 1995, its basic formulation was
The impetus for the creation of a new creedal statement for the United
Church, according to the Committee on Christian Faith, came in 1965. At
the beginning of that year, the committee had designated a group of
individuals to approach the Presbyterian Church in Canada with a view to
producing a joint statement of faith.6 While this never materialized, a
better and more important opportunity soon arrived. In May 1965 the
committee was studying a draft baptismal liturgy that had been proposed
by the Committee on Church Worship and Ritual for inclusion in the
upcoming Service Book. Uncomfortable with the suggested rubric “The
Apostles’ Creed shall be said by all,” committee members sought and
gained permission from the General Council Sub-executive to write a
“profession of faith, suitable for liturgical use, as a possible alternative to
the Apostles’ Creed.”7 Following the 22nd General Council, 1966, in time
for which such a task had not been possible, the Committee on Christian
Faith asked for and received an enlarged mandate from the Sub-executive:

1. To examine the status and authority of the classical creeds in The
United Church of Canada today.
2. To collect and examine representative modern statements of faith.
3. To attempt to formulate a modern credal statement suitable for use
in the liturgy, with special reference to the new order for the adminis-
tration of the sacrament of baptism.8

Beginning in October 1966, the group met monthly at Church House
in Toronto to analyze a variety of modern confessions and to write one for the United Church. Despite tremendous effort and lengthy discussion, the committee made no progress on writing a creed for several months, as there was complex debate and intense disagreement on virtually every issue before it – if and how to use and/or interpret the Apostles’ Creed, what sort of confession was needed as well as what status a newly created text could or should have. Surviving committee members remember a “deep divide,” that “We fought a lot” and even that, months into the process, “things seemed hopeless.”

A period of creativity and productivity was sparked, however, in October 1967 when Mac Freeman, of Victoria College, submitted a text that became the committee’s prototype:

I believe that
Man is not alone.
- God has created and is creating us.
- God has worked in history and is working to liberate us for true humanity in community.
- God has come among us in the true man Jesus and comes among us today in the Spirit of our risen Lord to deliver us from alienation from God, our fellows and ourselves.
- God has called and is calling us into the company of Jesus with whom we are chosen to be servants, by whom others are also set free.

Man is not alone.
- In life, in death, in life beyond death we are in the presence of God.

Believing that we are offered life and liberation from beyond our human resources, I trust God and commit my existence to his purpose.

For the next meeting, Richard Delorme, a minister from Valleyfield, Quebec, had been commissioned to revise Freeman’s creed in light of committee discussion and submitted an influential second draft:

We believe that:
Man is not alone; he lives in God’s world.
We believe in the God of this world and other worlds.
- In God Who has created and is creating us.
- In God Who has come among us in the True Man, Jesus.
- In God Who, in Jesus, reconciles us to himself and others.  
- In God Who, by His Spirit, liberates us to serve.  
We believe in this God.

Therefore:  
\begin{itemize}
  \item Man is not alone; he lives in God's world.
  \item In life, in death, in life beyond death, we are in his presence.
\end{itemize}

We believe in the God of this world and other worlds.  
We commit our existence to Him.\textsuperscript{11}

This version introduced the trademark phrase, ”Man is not alone; he lives in God’s world,” and signalled a lasting move towards a more poetic confession.

From that point onward, the committee spent its efforts essentially tinkering with what came to be known as the “Freeman-Delorme Creed.”\textsuperscript{12}

In February 1968, for example, Toronto-based minister Gordon Nodwell submitted a revision on behalf of a small group – including Alex Farquhar and Dorothy Wyman – which is strikingly like A New Creed as it first appeared in the \textit{Service Book}:

\begin{quote}
Man is not alone; he lives in God’s world.

We believe in God:  
\begin{itemize}
  \item Who has created and is creating,
  \item Who has come in the True Man, Jesus,
  \item Who works within us and among us by his Spirit.
\end{itemize}

We believe in Him.

He calls us into his Church, to love and serve our fellow men, 
and to share in his kingdom.
\begin{itemize}
  \item In life, in death, in life beyond death, he is with us.
\end{itemize}

We are not alone; we believe in God.\textsuperscript{13}
\end{quote}

Notably, this draft begins without “I/We believe.” Another lasting change was that “God has created and is creating” but not necessarily “us.” Despite the progress being made, the creed and its contents continued to be a source of fierce debate among committee members who differed on many issues of form, style, and theological content. Farquhar, for example,
also offered a dissenting revision and spoke strongly against the phrase, “In life, in death, in life beyond death . . .” because he considered it “redundant.”

By the March meeting, however, former chairperson Donald Mathers of Queen’s Theological College, told the committee that they had to finish the creed at the next meeting in April in order to present it to the 23rd General Council that summer.

The committee’s difficulty with the Apostles’ Creed also persisted. In March 1968, Dorothy Wyman presented a variety of possible rubrics for the ancient baptismal confession. After discussion, secretary Hugh Rose wrote to the Church Worship and Ritual Committee that his committee was requesting of their counterparts, “that the following introductory formula be recommended for use with the Apostles’ Creed: ‘Let us repeat the historic expression of the Christian faith known as the Apostles’ Creed . . .’” When the Committee on Church Worship and Ritual responded that it was unhappy with this phrase, proposing “say together” rather than “repeat,” it renewed debate at the Committee on Christian Faith. “At least one . . . member of the committee,” for example, “wanted a stronger statement than is implied with ‘say together’ and indicated we should seek an unambiguous statement.” Donald Evans and Donald Mathers were content with “Let us say together . . .” and moved its adoption. Wyman and Mac Freeman, however, pleaded for “repeat,” arguing that “say together” meant “confess” and that this was impossible for the Apostles’ Creed. In a vote, “say together” carried 6-5. Mathers then left the room and visited the Committee on Church Worship and Ritual that was also meeting at Church House that day. He reported that one member was totally opposed to “say together” and that this phrase left the group “badly split.” The Committee on Church Worship and Ritual then suggested “Let us repeat together . . .” a revision with which the Committee on Christian faith concurred.

Before adjourning, the committee agreed on the text of a creed that would be presented to the twenty-third General Council. In light of final group discussion and a letter from Ralph Chalmers, of Pine Hill Divinity Hall, the committee revised and expanded reference to the work of Christ:

Man is not alone; he lives in God’s world.

We believe in God:
Who has created and is creating,
Who has come in the true Man, Jesus, to reconcile and renew,
Who works within us and among us by his Spirit.
We trust him.

He calls us to be his Church:
   To celebrate his presence,
   To love and serve others,
   To seek justice and resist evil.

We proclaim his kingdom.

   In life, in death, in life beyond death, He is with us.
   We are not alone; we believe in God.\textsuperscript{17}

A New Creed was presented to the 23\textsuperscript{rd} General Council, meeting at Sydenham Street United Church in Kingston, Ontario. On the morning of August 29\textsuperscript{th}, Donald Mathers presented the committee’s report and then Hugh Rose spoke to the report.\textsuperscript{18} Rose recalled:

I remember being suitably intimidated standing before council and even more so when Ernie Howse, former moderator and minister of Bloor Street, and George Johnston, prof of New Testament at Emmanuel, neither of whom had the reputation of being conservatives, poured scorn on a creed that didn’t begin with I believe and then went on to dare to pretend to keep company with the “Historic Statements of the Church Catholic.”\textsuperscript{19}

For some time, the proposed creed was discussed on the floor and possible revisions were bandied about.\textsuperscript{20} Ralph Chalmers,\textsuperscript{21} a corresponding member of the committee for Maritime Conference finally,

Moved that the new Creed be referred back to the Committee on Christian Faith with the request that it be re-drafted in a manner that will give more adequate expression of the Christian Gospel for our time, and that the Committee report to the Executive of General Council which shall have power to issue.\textsuperscript{22}

Approving the motion, the General Council sent the creed back for further revision.

In late September, the committee reconvened and made the creed an “immediate priority.” For it to appear in the Service Book, changes would
have to be made quickly. Hugh Rose reported his experience in Kingston, saying that, “[t]here appeared to be no opposition to the effort to write creeds, but considerable concern as to the form and content of the Creed.” Correspondence was read highlighting the view that the creed featured “inadequate Christology” and that it “lacked depth.” Ralph Chalmers, in particular, sent a list of ten detailed criticisms, including:

The New Creed is very weak in Christology. Jesus is only “true Man.” Could not a Hindu say this of Gandhi, or a Buddhist of Buddha? We are Christians and this would appear to make it necessary to use the title Christ. Further, since the earliest confession was about Jesus being LORD, and the Church’s reference to Him as Saviour, should not these terms or titles also be used? Since Christology is the very heart of any Christian Creed it would seem that we require at least a second line in it to sum up Christ’s Incarnation, His ministry and teachings, death and resurrection, ascension and parousia.23

After discussion, minutes note the “lack of any reference to historic events of crucifixion and resurrection was recognized.” Rose, now chairperson, asked the others to send suggestions for distribution at the next meeting.24

When the committee met on 21 October 1968, it was made clear that they would have to finish the creed that day for it to be approved by the General Council Executive and included in the Service Book. The University of Toronto’s Donald Evans had prepared a thorough commentary on each line of the creed, based on the committee’s September discussion as well as feedback from prominent Canadian Catholic theologian Gregory Baum.25 The trademark opening line should remain unchanged for, as Evans’ noted, “[t]here was again general agreement within the committee, that the creed should start with man; the agreement was supported by Gregory Baum’s article.” Another suggestion was to acknowledge God’s presence outside the church – “who works within men and among men by his Spirit.” Most significant was his expansion of the phrase “We proclaim his kingdom” to include “to proclaim the risen Jesus, our judge and our hope.” Reference to “the risen Jesus,” he argued, “is more explicit in expressing the conviction that Jesus is alive.” “Our judge and our hope,” finally, introduced the elements of divine judgment and of eschatological hope. Evans also noted that “My proposal leaves open the possibility of various interpretations of the resurrection” and “is open to various interpretations as to the way in which the risen Jesus is our hope.”
Having added further a reference to Jesus’ crucifixion and the closing “Thanks be to God,” the committee sent its final text to the General Council Executive:

Man is not alone, he lives in God’s world.*
We believe in God:
  who has created and is creating,
  who has come in the true Man, Jesus, to reconcile and make new,
  who works in us and others by his Spirit.
We trust him.

He calls us to be his church:
  to celebrate his presence,
  to love and serve others,
  to seek justice and resist evil,
  to proclaim Jesus, crucified and risen, our judge and our hope.

In life, in death, in life beyond death, God is with us.
We are not alone.

Thanks be to God.**

* This line may be used as a versicle, with the rest as a response.
** This line is still under consideration as a possible addition.26

On November 5th, Hugh Rose presented the revised text to the Executive, which approved it for use in congregations and for publication in the Service Book.27

A decade later, A New Creed was formally revised to reflect principles of inclusive language. In March 1977, it was reported to the General Council Executive that the Committee on Christian Faith had become too large, met too infrequently and was paralyzed by theological diversity. In its place was created the Committee on Theology and Faith, consisting of twelve people and based in Toronto.28 One of its first tasks was to examine A New Creed. In late 1979, it suggested to the General Council Executive that the first line be changed to read, “We are not alone, we live in God’s world.” The Executive then asked the committee “That the [whole] Creed be revised to make it inclusive in its language.”29 A year later, a new version was presented and approved:
We are not alone, we live in God’s world.

We believe in God:
  who has created and is creating,
  who has come in Jesus, the Word made flesh,
  to reconcile and make new,
  who works in us and others
  by the Spirit.

We trust in God.

We are called to be the church:
  to celebrate God’s presence,
  to love and serve others,
  to seek justice and resist evil,
  to proclaim Jesus, crucified and risen,
  our judge and our hope.

In life, in death, in life beyond death,
God is with us.

We are not alone.

Thanks be to God.

One further change has since been made. In 1994, the Toronto Conference petitioned the thirty-fifth General Council to revise A New Creed in light of growing environmental concerns, citing “a need for our confessional language to reflect this awareness.” In 1995, the Theology and Faith Committee proposed the phrase “to live with respect in creation” and the General Council Executive approved its insertion immediately following “We are called to be the Church: / to celebrate God’s presence.”

Conclusions and Significance

A New Creed often inspires strong feelings in the United Church as it has done from its inception. An early critic, Kenneth Hamilton of the University of Winnipeg, told a visiting journalist at the twenty-third General Council that A New Creed was “tendentious,” “extremely superficial,” and “slightly ridiculous.” More recently, N. Keith Clifford
argued that it was “a product of the ‘culture of narcissism.’” Others have lamented the corresponding dismissal of the classical creeds within the United Church. Edwin Searcy has confessed a personal “conversion” on this issue engendered by his “growing engagement with the historic and contemporary ecumenical church.” Paul Scott Wilson said bluntly in 2009 that should the denomination “discard” the truths of the Apostles’ Creed, “we would cease to be ecumenical, we would become a cult.”

Conversely, many complimentary voices have always been heard. Moir Waters, of Robinson Memorial United Church and the Committee on Christian Faith, preached on A New Creed from his London, Ontario, pulpit on the Sunday following the twenty-third General Council. After reciting the text in his sermon, he said in disbelief, “This is the creed that was rejected!” Despite its rejection by the General Council, however, Waters commended A New Creed to his congregation for liturgical use and even encouraged his parishioners to memorize it. In 1969 Observer columnist John Burbidge offered a nearly identical evaluation. In commenting on the text that had just appeared in the Service Book, his only criticism was that it had been modified, since the twenty-third General Council, by the addition of reference to such “dead old things” such as the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus.

In light of such contrasting opinions, it is difficult to make a normative statement about the view, or views, of A New Creed held by the people of the United Church, either in the late 1960s or today. What should we make, then, of the hyperbole we read, for example, in the “Appendix” to A Song of Faith? An answer becomes clear when we see the origin of A New Creed in the context of the cultural and spiritual discord which characterized “the sixties.” As John Webster Grant described, this period was for the Canadian churches “A decade of ferment.” As many others also have noted, the cultural changes of the era have had a profound and lasting impact on the church. In the 1960s, Canadian and other Western societies experienced an increasingly rapid loss of cohesion. Among the many proposed causes of this decline, Robert Putnam has convincingly identified three which stand out: first, pressures of time, money and work; second, sprawl, suburbanization and commuting; and, third and most importantly, television. Together, they contributed to a culture of privacy in which people had much less opportunity, need or even desire for social engagement. In a complimentary way, Arthur Marwick concluded that “the sixties” saw the wilful overthrow of the former social order and its replacement with a vast collection of much
smaller sub-cultures. 42

United Church historian Phyllis Airhart once said A New Creed "sounds sort of '60sish to me." 43 In what ways might an appreciation of "the sixties" inform our understanding of A New Creed? It seems that while society as a whole was losing consensus and breaking down, the same thing was happening to the United Church and even to the Committee on Christian Faith. As meeting minutes indicate and as the memories of former participants confirm, there was deep disagreement among committee members on virtually every aspect of their mandate. 44 Even after years of work on A New Creed, they declared in their final report that, "The impulse that has driven us to discuss new creeds is not so much a sense that we have a new consensus to express as a dissatisfaction with the consensus we have inherited." 45 In the context of a diverse denomination, and without a consensus of its own, how did the committee proceed to write a creed for the United Church in "a decade of ferment"? It did so by crafting a text that replaced the goal of corporate confession with that of private profession. "The words and statements used," we read elsewhere in its report, "are suggestive rather than definitive, allowing for them to be filled with personal content by those who say the creed." 46 To this day, it is this "suggestive rather than definitive" element of A New Creed that has sustained its popularity in the United Church. The authors of A Song of Faith, who noted a widespread love for A New Creed, also described it as "concise and usefully open-ended." 47 Just as society was breaking down and being replaced by smaller sub-cultures in "the sixties," the same thing was happening in the United Church. A New Creed, which was first crafted in response to this cultural crisis and which continues to be popular today, represents in actuality a lack of spiritual consensus in the United Church. It represents a strategy to manage the breakdown of the United Church as a religious, specifically Christian community. The "Appendix" to A Song of Faith, numerous products from the United Church Publishing House 48 and especially the current liturgical resource – tellingly titled Celebrate God's Presence – each demonstrate the use of A New Creed by various elements in the denomination for this very purpose.
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Breaking the Silence on Suicide and Mental Illness:  
The Brethren in Christ, 1968-1989

LUCILLE MARR  
McGill University

In spring 1968 a tragic event catapulted the Brethren in Christ into a deep awareness of mental health issues. Lucille Lady, wife of a prominent church leader in the denomination, chose to end her life while her husband Jesse was out conducting a Bible Study. The couple lived in Upland, California, but with their public profile Lucille Lady’s suicide would impact not only their large kin network, but the denomination at large. Lucille came from a large family descended from a line of noted church leaders. Her grandfather Henry Davidson had begun the denomination’s periodical The Evangelical Visitor in 1870, nearly a century before Lucille’s death.1 His daughter, Lucille’s aunt Frances Davidson, had been the first to respond to the Brethren in Christ call to world missions in that same era.2 Lucille herself had worked beside her husband in his roles as pastor, professor, college president, evangelist, bishop and missionary.3

Whether the act of an individual holding public influence or of one less well-known, suicide leaves an indelible mark on those left behind.4 And yet, most often those who have endured the pain of mental illness – whether they have chosen to end it or to continue in unspeakable anguish – have suffered in silence. Stigma, shunning and shame have all deepened the pain experienced by both the large number of North Americans who have suffered from mental health issues and their families.5 Statistics from some twenty years after Lucille Lady chose to end her suffering suggest that up to twenty-five percent of American families have experienced mental illness.6 In Ontario at that time, nineteen percent of individuals
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between fifteen and sixty-four years of age suffered from psychiatric problems, with only one quarter of those seeking help.\(^7\) Indeed, in 1976 suicide was known to be the tenth leading cause of death in the United States.\(^8\) In light of these statistics, Lucille Lady’s decision to break the silence around her illness seems all the more momentous. Her and her husband Jesse’s public roles confronted their families and others in the Brethren in Christ constituency with the deep but silent pain suffered by many.

In this essay I outline the Brethren in Christ response to Lucille Lady’s breaking the silence regarding her struggles by surveying various ways the denomination attempted to inform, to educate, and to theologize on the matter of mental illness. After a brief introduction to the denomination’s roots, I shall offer some observations regarding Lucille’s funeral service. Following that, I will survey The Evangelical Visitor in the years following her death, the denomination’s General Conference records, and Shalom! A Journal for the Practice of Reconciliation. We shall see how the denomination took a stance contrary to the evangelical right that named suicide a “sin,” and challenged beliefs formerly held by some that holiness had the potential to lead to perfection. On the issue of mental health, the Brethren in Christ turned to their Anabaptist roots as they sought the potential of healing found in the midst of the body of Christ.

The denomination emerged in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, in the latter 1780s with a baptism in the Susquehanna River. Its roots were in Anabaptism and German Pietism.\(^9\) A century later the Brethren in Christ would also be influenced by Wesleyan Holiness and its “doctrine of Christian perfection.”\(^10\) While sharing with their Mennonite co-religionists a strict nonconformity during the first half of the twentieth century, the Brethren in Christ also embraced Wesleyanism’s doctrine of second-work holiness. At the same time, they placed an increasing emphasis on the role of higher education and expanded their mission outreach from North America to the Rhodesias (now Zambia and Zimbabwe), India and Japan.\(^11\) World War II would bring them into close relationship with various Mennonite groups as they worked together to negotiate conscientious objection privileges and came to support the work of the Mennonite Central Committee (MCC).\(^12\) The post-war era would see dramatic changes with a radical decision to create a new “self-image or identity” that would bring the Brethren in Christ “closer to the main stream of contemporary evangelicalism represented by the National Association of Evangelicals and the National Holiness Association.”\(^13\)
It was during these years of denominational reinventing that some members of the Brethren in Christ were also confronted with the reality that a deep faith did not necessarily provide a full antidote for those living with mental illness. In a letter sent to family and friends a month after Lucille Lady’s passing, her husband Jesse, a much-loved Bible teacher and holiness preacher, wrote:

I did realize that she was mentally depressed as well as physically sick, but as I look back now I think I did not realize how really serious it was. She was up and around most of the time. She did her housework in a cheerful spirit. She put on a brave front, for she did not want me to worry.

He continued, recalling how on the day of her passing,

when she got up she remarked, “Jesse, I just feel I can’t face another day.” Being an optimist [sic], I said, “Lucille, of course you can; the Lord has always taken care of us!” We had prayer together, and she seemed relieved. We both ate a good breakfast. After breakfast we had a second period of worship together . . . she seemed refreshed and remarked, “I feel much relaxed and better.”

Divulging for the first time to most of their circle that Lucille had struggled with depression for fifteen years, that she had repeatedly sought medical attention, and that she had been at times suicidal, Jesse revealed: “I lived under the shadow of knowing it could happen, but never really thought it would happen . . . Tears flow unbidden, but I am sure she is better off, and I can never question the purposes of God.” The letter must have been therapeutic for Jesse to write, and may have brought some comfort to their extensive kinship circle and faith community.

Indeed, Jesse’s colleague Arthur Climenhaga, who had served as bishop both in Zimbabwe and in California, had walked with the couple through the darkness of earlier suicide attempts. He now would set the stage by speaking eloquently at Lucille’s funeral. Based on the assessment of her medical doctor Owen Alderfer, who was also a member of their faith community, Climenhaga had insisted that Lucille could not have been responsible for her action. As Climenhaga later put it, his decision to use his spiritual authority as church leader to preach her into heaven provided direction for the denomination.

Climenhaga’s resonant tone was powerful and convincing as he read
out the following affirmation of Lucille Lady’s Christian walk at her funeral service. It must have provided great consolation for Jesse and others:

I shall remember our Sister Lucille Lady as a former missionary colleague spending the resources of her life in Rhodesia, Africa. As one whose passion for missions was expressed more recently in the co-founding of the Women’s Missionary Prayer Circle newsletter for the Western Conferences of the Brethren in Christ Churches’ World Wide Mission, as one whose active will was ever and always her utmost for the Lord’s highest, she has gone, and her going is one which we commit to the Lord, the righteous judge of all. Illness, with all its results, is known to the Lord Jesus Christ, who redeems that person, who actively accepts him as Lord and Saviour, in life, and death. O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the Law. But thanks be unto God, who giveth the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ.16

In the aftermath of Lucille Lady’s funeral, Bishop Arthur Climenhaga continued his pastoral response through the denomination’s paper, The Evangelical Visitor, which Lucille’s grandfather had begun nearly a century earlier. Climenhaga was editor of pastoral concerns and within two months of her death, he would place an excerpt from Where to Go for Help published a decade earlier by Southern Baptist educator Wayne Oates. The piece reflected Oates’ vision of bringing together the secular field of psychology and pastoral care: “Ministers have always been confidants of their people in the intimate crises of their lives,” Oates wrote.17 “Even though people for a while began to turn to secular counsellors rather than to ministers, there is good evidence that this tide has begun to turn.”18

In response to this crisis in the family of a respected leader with whom he had worked closely, Arthur Climenhaga attempted to divert such tragedies in the future. An inset, simply entitled HELP!, clearly stated the dilemma, inviting both individuals who might be struggling to seek support, and pastors and others in helping professions to respond with compassion:

At times the cry for help comes through loud and clear leaving no doubt that help is needed urgently. At other times the call for help is less obvious and may be disguised or oblique. Many times the plea
for help may not be definitely recognized by the person involved, but felt or detected by the listener. There is so much which needs to be said in this area of human need by way of giving encouragement to seek help early, and also where to seek it.19

We do not know how people responded. The Visitor, as the paper was known in Brethren in Christ circles, was silent on mental health concerns for a time. However, two and a half years after Jesse Lady’s death, a related article appeared. Penned by a Presbyterian minister, it might have been telling the Ladys’ story. Under the pseudonym Jim Bryan, this pastor told the story of his journey in which he walked with his wife in her struggle with mental illness. Writing with pathos and conviction, the author charged: “. . . the church has failed in her healing and educational ministry.”20

The Brethren in Christ responded to the challenge to attend to mental health concerns triggered by Lucille Lady’s death through a Commission on Peace and Justice formed in July 1970.21 When the denomination’s General Conference mandated the newly established Commission to prepare a position paper on “The Church, War and Respect for Human Life,” suicide took centre stage.22 This dark blot was explored alongside studies of abortion, alcohol, and tobacco. Roger Sider, a Brethren in Christ professor of Psychiatry at Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine in Baltimore, Maryland, took on the challenge of helping the denomination come to terms with the devastating effects of suicide in its midst. In a paper boldly entitled “Suicide,” presented to the denomination’s General Conference in July 1976, Sider showed sensitivity to the unresolved grief still festering, while addressing two theological questions within the context of the evangelicalism and holiness doctrine that influenced Brethren in Christ thinking: “What ought to be the message of the church regarding suicide?” Sider asked. Bringing the denomination to its Anabaptist roots, he queried: “How can the brotherhood respond to this tragedy preventively and redemptively [sic]?”23

While pointing out that the Bible nowhere explicitly condemns it, Sider noted that “suicide is usually regarded as a violation of the sixth commandment (Exodus 20:13) and, therefore is a sin.” Here was the dilemma: “It is the persistence of acts of suicide among those who may have lived for decades as genuinely committed Christians that constitutes the most troubling aspect of the problem. Hearing of the death by suicide of a Christian brother or sister,” he acknowledged, “we are deeply
distressed, our reason fails to provide answers and our faith is tested.\textsuperscript{24}

Sider set out to fill the gap in “evangelical theology” that, while it lacked formal writing on this subject, held a view which he insisted was unhelpful, even devastating. In his words, “the common opinion is that suicide is a simple act of will, in violation of God’s command and therefore sinful . . . Moreover, since it is an irreversible act which precludes repentance, the soul of the suicide is believed to be doomed.”

Turning to theologian Karl Barth, Sider challenged this perspective: “there is grave danger in making judgements [sic] regarding the suicide of another believer,” he insisted. “We may know little of the severity of affliction” that he or she experiences. In Barthian theology, Sider maintained,

there is no need to regard suicide as unforgivable. Inasmuch as God’s grace is sufficient for all sin and there are many ways in which a Christian may die without having repented of a particular sin it is unnecessary to place the sin of suicide in a special category.\textsuperscript{25}

Sider then proceeded to challenge the doctrine of perfectionism emerging from the holiness beliefs held by some among the Brethren in Christ, including the Ladys themselves. Acknowledging that suicide is “the legacy of sin,” he pointed out that it is one in which “we can scarcely expect complete victory.” Personal responsibility varies: it may be “rebellion against God;” but it could also have been the result of mental or physical illness, childhood traumas or – and here was the rub – “failure of a congregation to come to the support of those in need.”\textsuperscript{26}

Having challenged evangelical and holiness thinking, Sider used New Testament language emerging from the denomination’s Anabaptist roots to encourage the church, the “Body of Christ,” to “be sensitive to the needs of its members,” whether elderly, widowed, divorced, or mentally ill. Citing Roman 12: 4-8, he asked: “Is our faith strong enough to believe that every member of the body of Christ is necessary for the optimal functioning of the church and has a contribution to make for which no one else is uniquely suited?” Sider challenged the church to support surviving family members and to look at their own “failures” in being “sufficiently helpful.” He encouraged congregations “to be the first to bring the healing of solace and comfort through supportive relationships.”\textsuperscript{27}

Sider ended this challenge to mainstream evangelicalism and perfectionist doctrine with several suggestions foundational to a theology of
mental health. First, he insisted, it is important to understand that “suicidal wishes” are understandable when the load is “too heavy to carry.” Second, he pointed out, “[i]t would appear to be both unscriptural and insensitive to teach that the Christian never is tempted to take his own life.” Rather, suicide is often “evidence of overwhelming stress.”

In words reminiscent of their Anabaptist heritage, Sider concluded his study by reminding his audience that the Body of Christ held a key role in providing understanding and support for those who struggled.

Over the following years, Sider’s ideas were reflected in a variety of articles published in the denomination’s Evangelical Visitor and a newsletter that emerged in 1980 out of a consultation on peace education held in Grantham, Pennsylvania. The acknowledgement of Harriet Bicksler, the newsletter’s editor, of her own struggles with anxiety and depression and how she sought help through psychotherapy, set the stage for Shalom’s goal of healing and wholeness. Along with the more public questions of militarism and racism, issues of mental health, addiction, sexual abuse, homosexuality and other struggles would be explored during the next thirty years of publication.

As Rowland Shank concluded in his 1990 discussion on “Barriers to Psychotherapy for Christians,” much still needed to be done “to de-stigmatize psychology and mental health treatment for Christians.”

Pieces such as Roger Massie’s “Am I Going Crazy?” Glenn A. Robitaille’s “Ministry to the Mentally Ill,” Jeremy Ritch’s “Dealing with the Stigma of Mental Health,” and Faith Zecher’s “A Sense of Belonging for People with Mental Illness,” would continue to challenge thinking about mental illness. Indeed, this forum where readers could be deeply honest and reflect theologically about the stigma, the shunning, and struggle to trust in God during these difficult times, became an important aspect of Shalom’s ministry towards peace and reconciliation.

In the 1980s The Visitor began to publish materials made available by a variety of Mennonite mental health agencies including Mennonite Mental Health Services, Mennonite Mutual Aid and MCC Canada’s Mental Health Concerns Program. Reviewing the inspiration for mental health care rooted in the service of conscientious objectors during World War II, these articles challenged “fear and ignorance.” They encouraged Mennonites and Brethren in Christ to include mental health in their practice of Menno Simons’ call to “true evangelical faith.” Indeed, members were challenged to be as ready to help people with mental health concerns as they would be with those who suffered physically. As Carl
Kreider explained it,

if I know someone who feels depressed, I often do little for them. Intellectually, I know mental health is just as important as physical health; that mental illness often leads to physical ills that are genuine, not just imagined. The hurt of mental illness may be just as profound as the pain of a physical injury, and unfortunately, the duration may be much longer. I know these facts in my mind – but so often I fail to react concretely to them.  

For the Brethren in Christ, an essential part of their exposing and exploring mental health concerns were theological reflections intent on reframing the doctrine of perfectionism. In “Contemplating Wholeness,” for instance, Andrea Harrison queried: “Where in the Bible does it say that people born of the Spirit have total immunity?” Are people challenged with “spiritual battles,” anger, menopausal hormones, resentments … necessarily in a wrong relationship with God?” Reminding readers that Jesus ministered to a variety of needs and broken people, and that the apostle Paul “acknowledged the complexity of human nature in Roman 7-8,” Harrison framed an alternate paradigm to perfectionist thinking. Her suggestion that “[t]he battle ground of inner struggle is one place where we can learn of God’s grace and power” paralleled the language being used in wider Mennonite circles, as is illustrated in Mennonite Central Committee Canada’s Mental Health Concerns director Travis Reimer’s admonishment to congregations to “[p]ray that God will give your congregation a vision of the church as a therapeutic community of faith.” As he put it,

We who were no people are now the people of God. Our disgrace is removed. We have been called and enabled to care. Regarding brokenness, we know we cannot be saved unless we come in brokenness to the cross. Each succeeding step of discipleship reiterates our fracturedness, hence Christians can empathize with broken people.

The Evangelical Visitor was also a place where professionals took the opportunity to publicize their questions about their work in the contemporary mental health movement. In an address to the 37th annual dinner meeting of Philhaven Hospital in Mount Gretna, Pennsylvania, for instance, Roger Sider critiqued the “tremendous growth of egocentricity
in our society.”

“We need to recover a professional moral vision which will enable us to confront our patients in love when sin masquerades as sickness, and when immersion in self eclipses the acknowledgment of responsibility to others,” he insisted. Claiming the efficacy of the Anabaptist tradition, he underscored his theological reflections by reminding his audience that “the image of ‘Christ the servant’ requires that we not follow, but lead in modeling professional servanthood.”

Indeed, servanthood was demonstrated in concrete ways. Take the Lancaster Brethren in Christ congregation, for instance. During these years, its Sunday school program mirrored concerns voiced by Mennonite Mental Health Services with the establishment of a Sunday school class for developmentally disabled people. By 1985, between thirty and forty people were arriving at the congregation’s doors from their respective group homes on Sunday mornings. Reflecting MCC’s vision of accepting these folk as members, the Lancaster congregation baptized those who requested it.

Another example featured in The Visitor was Paxton Street Home in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. This institution, which emerged in 1982 as a result of encouragement by the Mennonite Mental Health Association, would develop a strong witness with Christian-based housing for people suffering from mental health challenges. As Dona Marchant, who identified herself as suffering from manic depression, put it, “I found I was full of dark, ugly things psychiatry couldn’t tell me what to do with. They sure helped me find them, though.” Having worn out most of her friends, she became isolated. Her pastor offered spiritual support and guidance and a support group. In her words, “[o]nly in the body of Christ I discovered that it is OK to be different.”

From the sources used, it is impossible to quantify the results of the efforts made by Brethren in Christ leadership to bring the stigma and pain of mental illness into the light. The most that can be said is that during the decades following Lucille Lady’s sudden and tragic death, the denomination took seriously the challenges of mental illness. The silence under which she and countless others suffered was broken. This research also suggests a humility amongst Brethren in Christ leaders as they encouraged a shift in doctrine and theological thinking from one that promoted the ideal of Wesleyan perfectionism to one grounded in the reality of human sin and brokenness and the potential of healing in relationship-building and reconciliation necessary in Menno Simons’ vision of “True Evangelical Faith.”
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At a recent Edinburgh 2010 assembly honouring the centenary of the World Missionary Conference, a thousand international delegates gathered in Scotland to listen as John Senamu, the Archbishop of York, issued a common call to mission. In his plenary address, Senamu stated, “Disturbed by the asymmetries and imbalances of power that divide and trouble us in church and world, we are called to repentance, to critical reflection on systems of power, and to accountable use of power structures.” Senamu’s remarks resonate with contemporary sociologists and theologians calling the church to recognize and deal with social sin. Yet, sinful social structures are not new phenomena. After briefly advancing a contemporary definition of social sin, this paper will seek to explore how this concept has been understood in the life and thought of Methodist leader, John Wesley.

Social Sin: A Definition

In recent decades, Canadian Catholic theologian Gregory Baum has been a harbinger in discussion regarding social sin. In his seminal work, Religion and Alienation, Baum introduces the term “social sin” to describe concealed and institutionalized pathogens embedded in dominant societal structures. His analysis of social sin begins with an identification of dehumanizing trends embedded within formational contexts and traditions. Living in a world marred by human wickedness, the potential exists for individuals to accept destructive habits embedded in social,
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political, economic, and religious institutions. Additionally, by embracing harmful ideologies, Baum argues that we commonly legitimize forms of social sin that serve to protect the power and privilege of society's dominant individuals and structures. Baum contends that social sin is further characterized by a menacing false consciousness through which “people involve themselves collectively in destructive action as if they were doing the right thing.” By both subordinating and oppressing members of society, this self-delusion exacerbates cruel and unjust behaviour. Finally, social sin is comprised of the collective decisions, exemplified in laws, policies, and norms that provide the reinforcement for certain injustices to be embraced without any volition.

Social Sin in Wesley’s Era

Baum’s definition of social sin functions as an analytical tool in discerning some significant societal concerns in eighteenth-century Britain. While this period represented the dawning of a new age in which Enlightenment rationale provided tremendous possibilities for some, eighteenth-century Britain saw the emergence of various dehumanizing trends, some of which still persist. In particular, harmful class stratification and destructive treatment of the working poor exemplify two societal injustices. Hungarian economist Karl Polanyi describes the devastating situation in the latter half of the 1700s by noting, “It happened for the first time that a boom in trade was remarked to have been accompanied by signs of growing distress of the poor.”

In addition to dehumanizing trends, an ideology of individualism served self-interest, created aspects of alienation, and reinforced unjust systems. Alexis de Tocqueville, an important early nineteenth-century thinker, observed that a “new individualism” fueled the Industrial Revolution and separated people from their environment. In similar fashion, German sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies, expressed concern that the autonomous spirit surrounding this era gave way to gesellschaft – the alienation of people from each other.

False consciousness is also observable during this period in Britain. As society promoted increased personal comfort and capital gain, members of the upper classes demonstrated a false consciousness that prevented them from seeing how their actions subordinated others. From an affluent perspective, the plight of the poor was commonly viewed as either the will of God or the result of poor morals and behaviour among the lower
class. Yet, a false consciousness typified those in the oppressed working classes as well. Surrounded by hopelessness, pain, and deplorable employee conditions, the working poor became increasingly anesthetized to the oppression they themselves endured.

Baum's final factor in social sin, harmful collective decisions, was also a sociological phenomenon in eighteenth-century Britain. Those in authoritative positions of employment used ruthless institutional decision making to dehumanize people in the lower strata of society. Those in the ascending classes, who wanted to take advantage of the economic climate, were able to influence decisions and increase their power, wealth, comfort, and overall standard of living. Two examples, child labour and enclosure acts, demonstrate how destructive trends, ideology, and false consciousness were perpetuated via dehumanizing institutional and collective decisions.

Obviously, this brief application of Baum's model to an eighteenth-century context is by no means exhaustive. Still, the historical landscape of Britain in the mid-to-late eighteenth century offers considerable sociological evidence resonant with Baum's fourfold descriptor of social sin. Dehumanizing trends concerning societal stratification and treatment of the poor were firmly embedded into the context of this industrializing society. These trends were fueled by an ideology that championed the individual and blinded both the oppressed and oppressor. Further, collective decisions endorsed by institutional leaders exacerbated problems and perpetuated the social sin implanted in the structures and organizations of the eighteenth century.

**Wesley and Social Sin**

Having considered the pervasiveness of social sin in eighteenth-century Britain, another question can be raised: How did Wesley handle this phenomenon? As this section will seek to show, some ambiguity exists both within Wesley himself and among historical scholars regarding his ability to address the complexities of social evil. Some scholars argue that he served as a shining model for his age, and was able to critique successfully the structured complexities of social sin. Others, however, are more cautious in their appraisal. They express concern that his response to systematic evil was overly simplistic, individualistic, and, in some cases, more damaging than constructive.
A disregard toward the poor by members of the upper classes serves as an example of an eighteenth century destructive social trend. In response to this dehumanizing trend, proponents of Wesley suggest he was a voice for the marginalized and underprivileged. For example, after observing the way the poor were being oppressed in his day, he preached a sermon entitled, “On Divine Providence,” in which he remarked, “it is hard, indeed, to comprehend this; nay, it is hard to believe it, considering the complicated wickedness and the complicated misery [emphasis added], which we see on every side.” As he addressed the problem of poverty, in the midst of gross prosperity among the affluent British population, it became commonplace for Wesley to refer to “complicated wickedness” and “complicated villainy” as descriptors for the problematic social deadness, greed, and general disrespect for human life he observed around him. Beyond merely speaking against these injustices, Wesley also acted to alleviate the burden forced upon the lower members of society. Some Wesley scholars, such as Christina Pohl, argue he was a lively pursuer of employment for those who were unemployed. For example, when work was in short supply, he initiated cottage industries in activities such as cotton processing and knitting.

Wesley also attacked the injustices of class stratification that, he argued, did not merely neglect, but actually promoted poverty. One of his most consistent assaults against the stratifying trends he observed came in the form of a critique against the accumulated wealth and property he observed in the upper classes of society. To ignore the plight of the poor while accumulating wealth and spending it on unnecessary things represented an injustice that significantly distressed Wesley. To those who spent money, for example, on “elegant” clothing and “delicate” food, he wrote, “you bind your own hands. You make it impossible for you to do that good which otherwise you might. So that you injure the poor in the same proportion as you poison your own soul . . . And so this wasting of thy Lord’s goods is an instance of complicated wickedness [emphasis added]; since hereby thy poor brother perisheth, for whom Christ died.”

Perhaps his most direct commentary on stratification was expressed in “Thoughts upon the Present Scarcity of Provisions.” Supporters of Wesley argue that this short editorial offers a convincing example of his critical dealing of poverty, unemployment, and social stratification. He began this commentary by asking rhetorically, “Why are thousands of
people starving, perishing for want, in every part of the nation... Now why is this? Why have all these nothing to eat? Because they have nothing to do. The plain reason why they have no meat is, because they have no work.”

From this, Wesley attempted to provide answers for the rising unemployment rate, arguing that high food and land costs and taxes were largely to blame. He further indicted those in the ascending classes who were living luxuriously at the expense of others. Wesley wrote:

Another cause (the most terrible of all, and the most destructive both of personal and social happiness) why not only beef, mutton, and pork, but all kinds of victuals, are so dear, is luxury. What can stand against this? Will it not waste and destroy all that nature can produce? If a person of quality will boil down three dozen of neat's tongues, to make two or three quarts of soup (and so proportionably in other things), what wonder that provisions fail? Only look into the kitchens of the great, the nobility and gentry, almost without exception; (considering withal that “the tow of the peasant tread upon the heel of the courtier;”) and when you have observed the amazing waste which is made there, you will no longer wonder at the scarcity, and consequently dearness, of the things which they use so much art to destroy.

Thus, while it has been held by some that the Protestant work ethic adversely contributed to the development of a stratified, capitalist society, supporters of Wesley contend that he served as an exception to this attitude. His strong language leads some to herald him as a robust representative for the poor within an ascending populace embracing dreams associated with the glory of newfound capitalism.

Despite these accolades, however, other scholars believe he did not go far enough in his critique of dehumanizing trends that privileged the rich at the expense of the lower class members of society. Argentinian Methodist José Bonino, for example, argues that Wesley’s solutions to the complex social problems of poverty and stratification were, by today’s standards at least, far too simplistic. In fact, he interprets Wesley’s article, “Thoughts on the Present Scarcity of Provisions,” as an attempt to exemplify his reductionist tendencies and inability to fully understand the more systematic and complex aspects of evil in his day. Bonino posits, “[h]is attempt to work with hard data, statistics, prices, and market conditions is extraordinary for a religious leader. But when he attempts to find causes and remedies, he remains totally within the premises of the
mercantilist system and completely unaware of the structural causes of the crises.”

Furthermore, there are those who contend Wesley’s inability to see the complex nature of the social problems around him ultimately prevented those in the lower social classes from addressing their deep-rooted problems and led them to accept their role in society without adequately challenging “the rules of the game.” Detractors of Wesley refer to the Halévy thesis for this argument. French philosopher and historian Elie Halévy asserted that Britain’s avoidance of civil revolution was correlated to the suppression that emerging British Methodism invoked upon the general population in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. He concluded, “England was spared the revolution toward which the contradictions in her polity and economy might otherwise have led her, through the stabilizing influence of evangelical religion, particularly Methodism . . . The despair of the working class was the raw material to which Methodist doctrine and discipline gave a shape.” In other words, it is argued Wesley birthed a movement so conservatively numbing that liberating and revolutionary impulses were minimized while nonviolent and politically accommodating positions were internalized in their place.

Thus, while some scholars consider Wesley to have effectively dealt with the destructive social trends of poverty and stratification, we must also acknowledge there are those who consider his approach on these issues to have been less than ideal and even detrimental in dealing with contextual social sin. I make no attempt to shy away from this ambiguity. Still, as we consider the diagnostic tools at Wesley’s disposal and the unchecked optimism concerning human advancement in the eighteenth century, I am inclined to argue that Wesley’s approach to dehumanizing trends, though not flawless, had some redeeming qualities.

Wesley on an Ideology of Individualism

Those who claim Wesley adequately addressed the ideological individualism that characterized the early British Industrial Revolution interpret his writings as evidencing a soteriology focused on the atoning work of Christ for all humanity. They argue his words and actions typified a constant battle against the increasingly individualistic focus of modern economic thought. In his sermon, “Fourth Discourse upon Our Lord’s Sermon on the Mount,” for example, he remarked, “Christianity is
essentially a social religion; and that to turn it into a solitary one, is to destroy it... When I say this is essentially a social religion, I mean not only that it cannot subsist so well, but that it cannot subsist at all, without society – without living and conversing with other men.”

31 From this, it is argued that Wesley clearly insisted upon a form of Christianity that makes a clear connection between a relationship with God and a relationship with fellow human beings. Referring to the social ethics of Wesley’s doctrine of sanctification, economist Thomas Madron writes:

The love of which Wesley speaks is completely inclusive, extending to all classes and states of people... The doctrine of perfection was at once profoundly theological and ethical, which led his thinking into the problems of political and social reform. The love concept was first a social concept, rather than an individualistic one, and as such led to social and political criticism. 32

Nonetheless, Wesley has been criticized by others who consider his philosophies and actions firmly entrenched within eighteenth-century ideological individualism. While prepared to concede that he spoke of social holiness, some still criticize Wesley for possessing an anthropology that was incurably individualistic and incapable of dealing with the complexity of social sin. 33 Wesley scholar Rupert E. Davies argues that “salvation for Wesley concerned an individual’s personal life and personal relations, first with God and then with neighbors and friends and fellow Christians. This was as far as Wesley looked for the whole self.” 34

A close scrutiny of his words also reveals that his understanding of the human predicament reflects a convenient arrangement of terms (e.g., social religion) that ultimately describes sin, manifested in social expression, as little more than a projection of individual sins. 35 Thus, critics argue that while his doctrine of holiness was social in the narrow sense (i.e. it related persons with one another), it still suffered from the influence of a contextual ideology in which the individual, in the end, is the primary focus. 36 Methodist scholar Theodore R. Weber notes:

There is nothing in Wesley of the notion that the individual is a societal epiphenomenon, a cog in the machine, a drop in the ocean of liquid society. Nor, conversely, is there anything to suggest belief in the concept of social as a person, with unified organs of reason and will i.e. the presuppositions of personal responsibility. Neither does one find in Wesley a concept of collective guilt of the kind necessary
to make the transfer. He knows that the people collectively are guilty, and he tells them so, but they are guilty of a collection of various types of sins; they are not guilty of acting wrongly with one mind and will as a solidary people.  

Any attempt, then, to provide an analysis of Wesley’s treatment of the prominent individualistic mindset of his time must take into account the conflicting views regarding his effectiveness, message, and legacy on this issue. I prefer not to shy away from these inconsistencies. We cannot deny the potential impact that a culture obsessed with individual, human agency had upon Wesley any more than we can deny this influencing fixation among us today. Nonetheless, I argue it can be said he was among the very few theologians in his day that made attempts, at the very least, to consider the social aspect of both the Christian faith and societal norms. In that respect, I believe there are significant qualities in Wesley’s thought to address what is called social sin today.

**Wesley on False Consciousness**

Inevitably, any assessment of false consciousness in Wesley’s day leads us into the realm of an analysis of his hamartiology. Those who suggest he dealt adequately with the blinding nature of social sin are also prone to argue that his longest single essay and only explicit doctrinal opus is a strong defense of the doctrine of original sin. This 1757 essay was, in part, a response to the claims of John Taylor, an individual considered by Wesley to be “easily persuaded to think favourably of himself.” Against the common view that the doctrine of human depravity was a bothersome and irritating “superstitious error,” Wesley was adamant that all humans are born inherently dead in trespasses and sin. Taking this main doctrinal treatise and condensing it into a sermon entitled, “Original Sin,” he wrote, “So long as a man born blind continues so, he is scarce sensible of his want: Much less, could we suppose a place where all were born without sight, would they be sensible of the want of it. In like manner, so long as men remain in their natural blindness of understanding, they are not sensible of their spiritual wants.” In another sermon, called “The Christian Treasure,” he wrote:

Let a musician be ever so skillful, he will make but poor music if his instrument be out of tune. From a disordered brain (such as is, more or less, that of every child of man) there will necessarily arise
confusedness of apprehension, showing itself in a thousand instances; false judgment, the natural result thereof; and wrong inferences; and from these, innumerable mistakes will follow, in spite of all the caution we can use.\textsuperscript{42}

It is held by some scholars that these references to blindness, insensibility, deafness, and disorder of the human condition reveal a keen responsiveness in Wesley’s writings to the unconscious nature of social sin.

Some scholars further interpret his strong denunciation of oppression against the poor as evidence of his thorough understanding of the blinding characteristic of social sin. They contend that a large amount of his writings and preaching invoked urgency for those in the privileged classes to overcome the blindness that prevented them from seeing their own selfishness and the suffering of others.\textsuperscript{43} For example, in a sermon labeled, “The Fall of Man,” he tenaciously proclaimed to Britain’s affluent population:

Open your eyes! Look round you! See darkness that may be felt; see ignorance and error; see vice in ten thousand forms; see consciousness of guilt, fear, sorrow, shame, remorse, covering the face of the earth! See misery, daughter of sin. See on every side, sickness and pain, inhabitants of every nation under heaven; driving on the poor, helpless sons of men, in every age, to the gates of death!\textsuperscript{44}

In another sermon titled, “On Visiting the Sick,” Wesley chastised the rich, in particular, for accepting a blinded approach toward the poor. He wrote, “[h]ence it is that . . . one part of the world does not know what the other suffers. Many of them do not know because they care not to know: They keep out of the way of knowing it and then plead their voluntary ignorance as an excuse for their hardness of heart.”\textsuperscript{45} Some argue from sermonic excerpts such as these that Wesley exemplified a comprehensive understanding of what social scientists today refer to as false consciousness.

On the other hand, I cannot overlook that Wesley’s treatment of the doctrine of sin is the locus of much debate among theologians. Whether or not he adequately handled the blinding nature of original sin, some scholars argue that false consciousness, proposed as a feature of social sin, is nowhere to be found in his theology. In particular, his commentary entitled, “A Plain Account of Christian Perfection,” is commonly referenced by critics. In this article, Wesley made a clear distinction
between sin as “voluntary” and “involuntary” disobedience. He wrote, “[t]o explain myself a little farther on this head: Not only sin, properly so called (that is, a voluntary transgression of a known law), but sin, improperly so called [emphasis added] (that is, an involuntary transgression of a divine law, known or unknown), needs the atoning blood.”

By making this distinction, some scholars insist that Wesley departed from a more absolute definition of sin and drew upon the classical (Augustinian) and medieval distinction that only voluntary transgressions should be properly called sin and incur a sense of guilt.

Critics suggest this clear distinction in Wesley’s definition of sin reinforces a strident individualistic line that makes any notion of blinding social sin extremely difficult to reconcile with Wesleyan theology. In other words, if distinctions can be made between “properly so called” sin and “improperly so called” sin, then it becomes very difficult to build an argument for a theology of systemic social evil, that, by nature, is often expressed involuntarily and hidden elusively in social structures.

In this regard, detractors argue that Wesley presented a naïve understanding of systematic blindness and personal guilt that does not transmit beyond a cursory level of human ignorance. Wesley critic, R. Newton Flew, for example, charges that Wesley’s stress on the conscious and deliberate intention of sin represents the most formidable defect in his doctrine of hamartiology.

This argument against Wesley is substantial. However, I contend this criticism fails to take into account the polemic and exacting purpose of the commentary, “A Plain Account of Christian Perfection,” which was written specifically for Christians dealing with the residual effects of sin. In addition, claims that Wesley either ignored or disregarded “involuntary” sin are not substantiated by his overall actions, or by an extensive appraisal of his writings. In another sermon titled, “Spirit of Bondage and Adoption,” Wesley appears to argue that sin, more broadly defined, is utterly reprehensible. He writes, “[i]f thou dost [commit sin], is it willingly or unwillingly? In either case God hath told thee whose thou art – ‘He that committeth sin is of the devil.’” Admittedly, his inconsistency on this issue requires us to take Wesley beyond his own work if we are to apply to him a response to social sin that includes the notion of false consciousness. Still, substantial underpinnings remain for an understanding of the blinding character of systemic injustice and societal evil.

Wesley on Collective Institutional Decisions
Finally, an examination of Wesley’s dealings with unjust collective decisions inevitably leads scholars to focus on his peculiar engagement with political issues in his day. While he may well have said, “I am no politician; politics lie quite out of my province. Neither have I any acquaintance, at least no intimacy, with any that bear that character,” his life and writings reveal he was prone to involve himself in decisions of a political and economic nature.

Supporters contend it was not beyond him to challenge Parliament in areas he considered unjust and discriminatory. One example of this is illustrated by a 1776 journal entry in which he appears surprised that someone would not consider it appropriate to petition government for change regarding food-price inflation. He writes, “[I]n [sic] my way to Exeter, I read over an ingenious tract, containing some observations I never saw before . . . that to petition Parliament to alter [food inflation] is to put them upon impossibilities, and can answer no end but that of inflaming the people against their Governors.” From this, advocates conclude he was not above calling and challenging government for intervention in complex problems facing Britain. Wesley supporters also invoke other examples where he challenged government policy. Regarding the issue of government-sponsored land enclosures, he objected to them strongly in his writings because of the way in which enclosures edged smaller farmers in Britain out of business. In his sermon, “Thoughts on The Present Scarcity of Provisions,” he argued:

But why are pork, poultry, and eggs so dear? Because of the monop-
lizing of farms; perhaps as mischievous a monopoly as was ever introduced into these kingdoms. The land which was some years ago divided between ten or twenty little farmers, and enabled them comfortably to provide for their families, is now generally engrossed by one great farmer. One farms an estate of a thousand a year, which formerly maintained ten or twenty.

It is likewise contended that, later in his life, Wesley invested considerable energy acting and speaking out against the exploiting institution of slavery. His journal entry from 12 February 1772 reads, “In returning, I read a very different book, published by an honest Quaker, on that execrable sum of all villainies, commonly called the Slave Trade. I read of nothing like it in the heathen world, whether ancient or modern: And it infinitely exceeds, in every instance of barbarity, whatever Christian slaves suffer in Mahometan countries.” Later in 1774, he published a counter-
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cultural pamphlet entitled, “Thoughts upon Slavery,” which outlined his position concerning institutionalized slave trade. Concerning slave owners, he accusingly wrote:

> Are you a man? Then you should have an human heart. But have you indeed? What is your heart made of? Is there no such principle as compassion there? Do you never feel another’s pain? Have you no sympathy? No sense of human woe? No pity for the miserable? When you saw the flowing eyes, the heaving breasts, or the bleeding sides and tortured limbs of your fellow-creatures, was [sic] you a stone, or a brute? Did you look upon them with the eyes of a tiger? When you squeezed the agonizing creatures down in the ship, or when you threw their poor mangled remains into the sea, had you no relenting? Did not one tear drop from your eye, one sigh escape from your breast? Do you feel no relenting now? If you do not, you must go on, till the measure of your iniquities is full. Then will the great God deal with you as you have dealt with them, and require all their blood at your hands.59

Such diatribes established him among the first in Britain to speak forcefully against the trans-Atlantic slave trade. Consequently, advocates of Wesley regard him as a leader who consistently battled against dehumanizing collective decisions imposed by societal structures in his day.

On the other hand, some scholars argue that his strong allegiance to the British monarchy exemplified a more acquiescent approach when dealing with institutionalized social and political problems. Wesley scholar, Theodore Jennings notes that:

> Wesley’s political views seem to make him a most unlikely advocate of anything remotely like a radical social ethic. He was devoted to the king, wrote vigorously in favour of the institution of the constitutional monarchy, opposed democracy, attacked the American Revolution – even appears to have offered to raise an army in support of the king when the revolution threatened to spread to England – and maintained that his preachers should deal with politics only to defend the king against slander.60

Critics suggest that, given the option to either challenge or comply with governmental decisions, Wesley’s approach regularly evidenced a political
compliance, bolstered by his Christian faith. Particularly, they suggest that Wesley demonstrated his kingly loyalties in several important articles written in the 1760s and 1770s, the first of which was, “Free Thoughts on the Present State of Public Affairs.” Speaking of the rising discontent among the British populace with the decisions made by King George, he wrote:

His Majesty’s character, then, after all the pains have been taken to make him odious, as well as contemptible, remains unimpeached; and therefore cannot be, in any degree, the cause of the present commotions. His whole conduct, both in public and private, ever since he began his reign, the uniform tenor of his behaviour, the general course both of his words and actions, has been worthy of an Englishman, worthy of a Christian, and worthy of a King.  

Detractors contend that if there was any question where his political allegiances lay, he made them abundantly clear in a 1777 tract entitled “A Calm Address to the Inhabitants of England,” which, incidentally, was a follow-up to a highly controversial earlier tract called, “A Calm Address to Our American Colonies.” In “Calm Address to the Inhabitants of England,” he wrote, “[d]o any of you blaspheme God or the King? None of you, I trust who are in connexion with me. I would no more continue in fellowship with those who continued in such practice, than with whoremongers, or Sabbath-breakers, or thieves, or drunkards, or common swearers.”

Consequently, while some scholars suggest Wesley championed a countercultural position against governmental and economic decisions, we must allow that his allegiance to the monarchy, which, incidentally, was the common standard for all clergy in the Church of England until 1841, may have compromised his positions at times. Once again, I do not intend to deny or disregard this tension. Nevertheless, I am inclined to argue that his life and writings present certain features which are estimable and redeeming in his opposition of institutional collective decisions.

Conclusion

In this essay I have endeavoured to provide a balanced critique of Wesley using a contemporary definition of social sin elucidated by Catholic theologian, Gregory Baum. In doing so, I have not overlooked Wesley’s critics. Having explored the views of various scholars, however,
I take particular interest in those scholars who interpret his actions and writings as providing ample and convincing witness to a critical address of complex, social sin within an eighteenth-century context. From my own readings of Wesley, I conclude he was effective, in varying degrees, at dealing with dehumanizing trends, destructive ideology, harmful false consciousness, and unjust collective decisions. Although I must also admit, for some, his actions and writings also evidence a simplistic, inconsistent, and compromising approach to social sin, ultimately, I conclude that, for all of his apparent limitations, there are admirable and praiseworthy aspects of his life and writings that can help to inform our contemporary struggle against social sin.
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At the end of the eighteenth century, there was a profound transformation of English dissenting churches as they embraced evangelical theology and piety. The expansionist and activist signs of that evangelical renewal have been well catalogued: reinvigorated associational life, the promotion of international missions, voluntary societies for spiritual growth, widespread itinerancy and lay ministry, and initiatives in education. These new emphases and activities changed the shape of the church in important ways. Deryck Lovegrove has argued persuasively, for example, that the new emphasis on evangelistic itinerancy, entailed “the adaptation of the traditional pastorate” by enlarging the scope of preaching ministry and by allowing greater lay involvement. W.R. Ward has similarly noted that the evangelical transformation of the church was compelling a redefinition of pastoral ministry. The direction of the change that Lovegrove and Ward describe is outward: pastors and congregations engaging new hearers, rural villages, social reform, and even the nations.

Andrew Fuller’s (1754-1815) contributions to this evangelical transformation of the church were many: his participation in the Northamptonshire Particular Baptist Association’s cooperative ventures in prayer, itinerancy, education, and social reform; his role in founding, and then as an administrator and advocate for, the Baptist Missionary Society; and especially his articulation of an evangelical and moderate Calvinism which was seen as enabling, even obligating, this more activist
and expansionist view of the church’s ministry.\footnote{5}

But if the transformed church had these new expressions of outward-focused ministry, what difference did this evangelical renewal make to the inner life of congregations, particularly the regular ministry of pastors in their weekly preaching? What impact did evangelical theology have on pastoral theology? Andrew Fuller was a pastor as well as a theologian, missionary administrator, and frequent village preacher, and an account of the transformation of the church should also include its effects upon that, his primary vocation. So the question arises: Since the transformed church and the redefined pastorate still relied on preaching and pastoral care, did those congregational acts in any way undergo a corresponding evangelical transformation? Was there a renewal of the congregation and its pulpit, as well as the signs of more outward expansion?

In a discussion of Anglican pastoralia in the eighteenth century, John Walsh and Stephen Taylor suggest: “What distinguished the self-consciously ‘serious’ Evangelical clergy toward the end of the century was less their definition of pastoral duties than their conception of what it was to be a Christian.”\footnote{6} This study of Andrew Fuller will argue, however, that the particular evangelical “conception of what it was to be a Christian” – its theology and piety – was precisely what did have a bearing on pastoral theology. Preaching, perhaps the clearest example of this renewal, remained the central activity of pastoral ministry for evangelicals, but there was an important change in their understanding of what preaching was for, and consequently what its main themes, manner of delivery, and intended audience should be. The change was not primarily in terms of new pastoral duties as much as a renewal of the character of those duties from within.

There are marks of evangelical theology and piety evident in several aspects of Fuller’s pastoral theology. First, Fuller’s seminal theological text, The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation, articulated a moderate Calvinism that was urgent in its conversionism. Second, he found his congregational ecclesiology well-suited to evangelical voluntarism, in a way comparable to Methodist connexions or Anglican religious societies. Third, in his preaching, Fuller emphasized the centrality of the cross of Christ and the use of affectionate language. Together, these emphases – conversionism, voluntarism, the centrality of the cross, and affectionate language – indicate an evangelical renewal of pastoral theology, alongside other ways in which the church was transformed by evangelicalism.
Conversionism in Fuller’s Pastoral Theology

Fuller urged preachers to have a “zealous perseverance in the use of all possible means for the conversion of sinners.” 7 Such a zeal for conversion, or conversionism, has been identified by David Bebbington as one of the defining characteristics of evangelicalism. 8 The emergence of such urgency about conversion was the most significant development in Andrew Fuller’s pastoral theology. Fuller had grown up in a high Calvinist church in which the preacher had “little or nothing to say to the unconverted,” and as a young preacher himself he did not dare to “address an invitation to the unconverted to come to Jesus,” 9 a reticence grounded in a theological system which did not want to presume spiritual ability. From being reticent to offer his hearers the gospel, Fuller went on to write *The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation* (1781), in which he made the case that all people not only have the capacity to respond to the gospel, but indeed, have an obligation to do so: “Unconverted sinners are commanded, exhorted, and invited to believe in Christ for salvation.” 10 This duty on the part of hearers mapped onto the obligation of preachers: “It is the duty of ministers not only to exhort their carnal auditors to believe in Jesus Christ for the salvation of their souls; but it is at our peril to exhort them to anything short of it.” 11 In his confession of faith on settling at Kettering, he summarized the central features of his evangelical conversionism:

> I believe, it is the duty of every minister of Christ plainly and faithfully to preach the gospel to all who will hear it; and, as I believe the inability of men to be spiritual things to be wholly of the moral, and, therefore, of the criminal kind – and that it is their duty to love the Lord Jesus Christ, and trust in him for salvation, though they do not; I, therefore, believe free and solemn addresses, invitations, calls, and warnings to them, to be not only consistent, but directly adapted, as means, in the hand of the Spirit of God, to bring them to Christ. I consider it as a part of my duty, which I could not omit without being guilty of the blood of souls. 12

This evangelical Calvinism, with its more conversionist bearing, was significant in the emergence of the Baptist Missionary Society and William Carey’s work in India, but Fuller’s theology also had an equally important effect upon preachers at home, freeing them to have a more directly conversionist stance in offering the gospel. 13
Voluntarism contributed to the emergence of evangelicalism as a distinctive strain of piety, expressing a concern for individual agency, free choices, and personal responsibility for spiritual growth. The Evangelical Revival saw the use of creative ecclesiological constructions which particularly emphasized voluntarism. The Methodist construction was a “connexion” of voluntary societies, existing more or less alongside church or chapel. The construction employed by evangelical Anglican clergy and laity was the “religious society,” in which a small fellowship within the local parish voluntarily embraced a more rigorous rule of piety. The pastoral theology of Andrew Fuller demonstrates that there was another method of promoting evangelical experience: the renewal of congregational ecclesiology, neither alongside nor within, but the local church itself and its ordained ministry.

John Wesley’s Methodist societies employed voluntary participation and oversight to accomplish their evangelical ends. Frederick Dreyer has argued, for example, that Wesley framed his authority to direct the connexion of societies in consensual and voluntary terms: “I cannot guide any soul unless he consent to be guided by me. Neither can any soul force me to guide him, if I consent not.” Dreyer also observes Wesley’s explicit differentiation between voluntary authority and ordination; his authority in the connexion derived not from his ordination as a minister, but rather, from voluntary consent. As a congregationalist, by contrast, Fuller emphasized the voluntary essence of ordination and the pastoral relationship itself, rather than circumventing ordination to validate pastoral authority. With characteristic clarity, he said: “The connexion of pastor and people, in dissenting churches, is altogether voluntary. There are no bonds to bring them together, or to keep them together, but love.”

Evangelical Anglicans who scrupled the perceived irregularity of Methodist meetings revived the use of voluntary religious societies within the parish to encourage serious evangelical piety. John Newton planted a number of such societies at Olney, and to one correspondent he offered this enthusiastic evaluation: “I think nothing has been more visibly useful to strengthen my heart, and to unite the people closely together in bonds of love.” Fuller also perceived that a voluntary and affectionate relationship between pastor and people was the most suitable bond for the promotion of evangelical religion: “Christian love is love for Christ’s sake ... Personal religion is now to be the bond of union.”
is a phrase nicely expressing evangelicalism’s concern for a sincere and voluntary faith, and it is this which is to be, Fuller asserted, the “bond of union.” Isabel Rivers suggests that in the evangelical dissenting tradition, the essence of revived personal religion “lay in the relationship between minister and congregation, a relationship based on close knowledge of the heart and close application by the minister of evangelical doctrine to the special circumstances of the individual member of the congregation.”

So, while Newton and Fuller shared this common concern for the voluntary nature of the bonds which promoted evangelical piety, they differed on the location of such a pastoral relationship, with Fuller insisting that the voluntarily-gathered congregation itself could be the place of personal renewal.

**Evangelical Doctrine & Affectionate Language in Fuller’s Preaching**

The evangelical transformation of the church did not only mean preaching in new places, but also, preaching in a new way. The pastoral theology of Andrew Fuller demonstrates how evangelical concerns influenced both the content and accent of his preaching. Fuller’s preaching was characterized by the centrality of the cross of Christ, and by the use of the language of the affections. And so he could state not only, “Preach Christ, or you had better be any thing than a preacher,” but also, “You had better do any thing than be a minister, if your heart is not engaged in it.” Neither the cross nor the heart were negotiable, if pastoral theology and practice were to be evangelical.

**1) The Centrality of the Cross of Christ**

The central doctrinal of Andrew Fuller’s preaching was the atoning death of Jesus on the cross, a theme described as “crucicentrism” by David Bebbington. Emphasizing the cross, Fuller wrote, “Every sermon should contain a portion of the doctrine of salvation by the death of Christ . . . A sermon, therefore, in which this doctrine has not a place, and I might add, a prominent place, cannot be a gospel sermon.” Understanding the atoning death of Jesus to be the unique source of salvation, Fuller urged that evangelical preaching give it repeated emphasis and great prominence.

Fuller’s evangelical crucicentrism was also expressed by emphasizing the cross’s interrelation with all other themes in preaching. Early in his Kettering ministry, he wrote in his diary, “Christ, and his cross be all my
theme.’ Surely I love his name, and wish to make it the centre in which all
the lines of my ministry might meet!" Later, to his father-in-law, Fuller
wrote from Ireland, “The doctrine of the cross is more dear to me than
when I went. I wish I may never preach another sermon but what shall
bear some relation to it.” Fuller believed that the whole of scripture bears
witness to Jesus, and that, therefore, expositions of any part of the Bible
inevitably manifest something of His person or work: “If you preach
Christ, you need not fear for want of matter. His person and work are rich
in fullness. Every Divine attribute is seen in him. All the types prefigure
him. The prophecies point to him. Every truth bears relation to him. The
law itself must be so explained and enforced as to lead to him.”
Reflecting on systematic theology, Fuller asserted that “the centre of
Christianity [is] the doctrine of the cross,” and that “The whole of the
Christian system appears to be presupposed by it, included in it, or to arise
from it.” Fuller’s preaching could be distinguished from Deistic or
moralistic, or even generally orthodox preaching, by the centrality of the
cross of Christ, and it is that prominence which marks it as evangelical.

2) Affectionate Language and Evangelical Experience

George Wallis, a deacon and diarist in Fuller’s Kettering congrega-
tion, described Fuller’s ministry as “very affecting and evangelical.” In
doing so he highlighted the language of the affections which was so
characteristic of Andrew Fuller’s pastoral theology, and which helped to
define what he meant by “evangelical.” While to modern readers “affec-
tions” usually connotes emotion and feeling over against reason and
intellect, to Fuller and his eighteenth-century contemporaries the use of the
language of the affections was more nuanced and comprehensive, and in
fact quite successfully integrated, rather than set at odds, mind and heart.

Wallis’ description of Fuller’s pastoral ministry as “very affecting
and evangelical” also suggests the mutual importance of the terms, for the
language of the heart was a kind of evangelical accent to accompany
evangelical doctrinal content. The affections were emphasized in concert
with orthodox doctrine, reflecting a concern for a heartfelt response to the
gospel – for a voluntary, sincere, and personal Christianity, as opposed to
rationalism, nominalism, or cold orthodoxy. Isabel Rivers, who has made
a penetrating study of the “Affectionate religion” of early evangelical
Dissent in the context of eighteenth century moral philosophy, notes the
complementary concerns for orthodox doctrine, personal experience, and
affectionate language:

The evangelical tendency emphasizes the traditional Reformation doctrines of grace, atonement, justification by faith (often covered by the label “orthodoxy”), the importance of experimental knowledge, meaning both the believer’s own experience of religion, and acquaintance with the variety of the experience of others, and the central function of the heart and affections in religion in relation to the will and understanding.32

Fuller condensed the thought thus: “The union of genuine orthodoxy and affection constitutes true religion.”33 Fuller’s understanding of the affections bears the particular influence of Jonathan Edwards’ A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections (1746).34 Sharing Edwards concept of a “sense of the heart,” he wrote that spiritual truths cannot be known by “mere intellect any more than the sweetness of honey . . . can be ascertained by the sight of the eye.” Rather, the gospel can be known only as God imparts a “holy susceptibility and relish for the truth,” by which one can have a “sense of their Divine excellency.”35

Fuller made strong assertions about the centrality of the affections in evangelical ministry – “Beware that you do not preach an unfelt gospel”36 – but was careful to communicate both the subjective and cognitive aspects of evangelical affections. He said, that “Knowledge and affection have a mutual influence on each other . . . Affection is fed by knowledge . . . By the expansion of the mind the heart is supplied with objects which fill it with delight.”37 That religious psychology mapped onto his pastoral theology: “The two main objects to be attained in the work of the Christian ministry,” Fuller urged, are “enlightening the minds and affecting the hearts of the people.”38

Affectionate preaching had the deeply felt faith of two subjects in view – both preacher and hearer – and the heart to heart manner of the sermon’s delivery from one to the other. Fuller poignantly summarized: “If you would affect others, you must feel.”39 Or again, “we must preach from the heart, or we shall seldom, if ever, produce any good in the hearts of our hearers.”40 Fuller’s use of the language of feeling, the heart, and the affections signalled the importance of a sincere, personal experience of faith, and the affectionate communication of evangelical doctrine.
Summary

The evangelical transformation of the dissenting churches of the late eighteenth century included, in addition to the more frequently noted aspects of outward expansion and activism, the renewal of their pastoral theology. Evangelical theology and piety certainly issued in international missions, voluntary societies, and itinerant preaching, but was also expressed in Andrew Fuller’s recovery of a conversionist pastoral theology, his emphasis on the voluntary nature of the local congregation, and his weekly preaching, which was evangelical in its Christ-centred doctrine and affectionate language. There can be identified in the work of Andrew Fuller one distinctively evangelical pastoral theology – a specifically evangelical contribution to pastoralia and an underappreciated aspect of how the church was transformed by evangelicalism.
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The recent Canadian federal election was filled with many surprises, including the marking of a shift in traditional voting patterns among Canadian Christians. On April 23rd, one week before the vote, an Angus-Reid Survey for the Toronto Star indicated that “50 per cent of self-described English-speaking Catholics outside of Quebec” would vote for the Conservative Party on 2 May 2011. The Liberals, who historically had been the party of choice for Roman Catholics, and who had boasted at least four Catholic prime ministers since 1968, would glean only twenty-five percent support from English-speaking Catholics. The NDP and Greens could count on the support of nineteen percent of Catholics and four percent respectively. While the poll only surveyed 2,269 English-speaking Catholic adults, it still claimed a margin of error of plus or minus 1.8 percent. These numbers aside, it appeared that Catholics within Canada were not less interested in engaging in Canadian politics and the myriad of issues at play in the public square; they were simply moving to the right and placing their trust in a prime minister who was openly an evangelical Christian and whose party, at least in some quarters, proposed a more socially conservative agenda, informed by traditional Judaeo-Christian values. Therein, in the larger national debate about “What Canada Is, or What Canada Must Represent,” this poll signals, perhaps, that one of Canada’s largest religious groups is holding firmly to a more traditional notion of Canada as a Christian country and seeking new partisan ways to achieve this vision.
There is little doubt, historically, that Catholics believed that Canada was intended to be a Christian country. Not surprisingly, where they differed from their Protestant “separated Brethren,” was the belief that the country was intended by Divine providence to be Catholic. Yet, even with a common assumption that they might be part of an evangelizing presence in Canada – which could be loosely described as a *gestae dei per catholicos* – Catholics themselves disagreed on the manner by which this Catholic Canada was to be accomplished. Until the mid-twentieth century the Catholic Church was openly divided along clear cultural and linguistic lines, between the majority of Francophone Catholics who lived in the province of Quebec and in small linguistic enclaves in other provinces, and Scottish and Irish Catholics who dominated the Church outside of Quebec. While each of these groups could demonstrate unity if not uniformity on matters of doctrine, morals, and obedience to the Church’s magisterium, there was considerable disagreement on how the Catholic faith could best be represented and transmitted in Canada. When tens of thousands of Catholic immigrants from southern, eastern and central Europe began to arrive in Canada in the early twentieth century, the two charter Catholic groups feared a complete upset of the fragile ethno-linguistic balance that had been created in the Canadian Church. For their part new Catholic Canadians – Germans, Italians, Poles, Slovaks, Hungarians, Portuguese, Ukrainians, and the Syrians, to name just a few – had their own sense that their new home was a receptive Christian country, if not a Protestant one, and more to the point that in face of this Protestant dominance their Catholicism was best preserved by their own languages and cultural traditions. This paper merely outlines how Catholics identified and professed their loyalty to Canada as a Christian nation, but could not agree among themselves the manner in which Christianity could most effectively complement the variety of Catholic visions and expectations of the nation.

The French Canadian Catholic vision of Canada, and the role of their communities in it, possesses the richest historiography of all of the Catholic traditions. From the first arrival of the Catholic French during the explorations of Jacques Cartier in 1534, it has always been acknowledged in the historical literature that the Catholic Church was an integral part of French colonization and settlement in North America. In a mirror of *Ancien Régime* France that promoted emigration to and trade in Acadia and the St. Lawrence Valley, the French of the New World were aggressive in their evangelization of the First Nations whom they found living in
their newly explored and claimed lands, and were conscious of recon-
structing parish, institutional structures, and the episcopate they had
known in the old world. In 1641, the colonists travelling with the Sieur de
la Maisonneuve, who founded Montreal, were clear in their resolve that
they were building a New Jerusalem in the North American forest. The
Company of the Holy Sacrament, was linked with the post-Tridentine
Catholic revival in seventeenth-century France and its members were
confident that they would transform this new terra incognita and its
indigenous peoples into a strong Catholic Christian kingdom, focused at
Ville Marie, the city of Mary, now Montreal.

The dreams of the Compagnie de Saint-Sacrament were unrequited
as merchants, politicians, military personnel, landholders, and agricultur-
ists, and even other missionaries, pushed their own agendas to the fore.
The Church still maintained a central place within the popular cultural life
of New France and more formally in its institutional structures, but it never
had the strength accorded it by such historians as Francis Parkman.
Squabbling between bishops and priests, clergy and bureaucrats, numerous
absentee bishops after 1700, and differing views of Catholic practice
between laypersons and the clergy, weakened the power of the Church in
the day-to-day life of the colonies; nevertheless, how ever tenuous Mass
attendance might have been or how indifferent the classes and masses may
have been to the dictates of the Bishop, few would argue that the Church
was not part of the fabric of French culture, in the old world or the new.

With the formalization of the British Conquest in 1763 under the Treaty
of Paris, French Catholicism was allowed to persist “so far as the laws of
Great Britain permit,” which meant in practice that Catholicism survived
in what became known as the Province of Quebec and over time Catholic
leaders developed important links to the Protestant governors of the
colony, who, in the early period of the conquest, turned a blind eye to the
Church’s survival and expansion.

The possibility of a Catholic presence in a Christian Canada was
given a greater degree of promise and permanence by the Quebec Act
(1774). Under the terms of the Act, Catholics were accorded religious
freedom in Quebec and rights and privileges to the liberal professions and
public office unknown to Catholics elsewhere in the Empire, where the
Penal Laws were still operative. Regarded by the neighbouring Anglo-
Protestant colonies as one of the “intolerable acts,” because it accorded
rights to “popery” in America and potentially blocked the expansion of the
tidewater colonies into the Mississippi valley, it was at best a unique
experiment in toleration or perhaps, at worst, a crass attempt to keep Quebec loyal in the face of a potential political disruption in other British American colonies. Regardless of the British intent behind the legislation, over time the Quebec Act became in reality a *magna carta* for all Canadian Catholics. The rights accorded to Catholics in 1774 became the basis upon which Catholic rights in the central and western colonies would be grounded and made an ongoing friendly relationship necessary between the Canadian state and the Catholic hierarchy. By 1791, Catholics were able to vote in provincial elections, stand for election to the legislatures, rise in the legal profession, sit on the bench, and aspire to political equality with their non-Catholic neighbours. In Lower Canada (now Quebec) new generations of Catholic liberal professionals and politicians arose, creating for themselves a loud a powerful voice in provincial affairs. Such rights and dignities were not secured for Catholics in the Maritime colonies until Catholic Emancipation in 1829, and one year later in Newfoundland. In the province of Upper Canada, carved out of the old Province of Quebec in 1791, the Catholic minorities, both Francophone and Anglophone, would also be able to avail themselves of the rights and privileges that could be traced back to the Quebec Act.\(^7\)

Circumstances both domestic and international transformed the French Canadian Catholic Church and its view of Canada in the mid-nineteenth century. First, the political and constitutional changes of the creation of the United Province of Canada in 1840, which merged the Upper and Lower provinces into one political entity, was perceived as a threat to French and Catholic culture, which was relegated to minority status in the new Union. With the weakening of the French liberal professions and civil leaders as a result of the failed rebellions by the *patriotes* in 1837-38, the Catholic clergy quickly filled the leadership void.\(^8\) This new generation of churchmen was deeply influenced by the growing Ultramontane Catholic revival in Europe, a movement brought forcefully to Quebec in 1840-41 by the enthusiastic preaching of the exiled Bishop of Nancy and Toul, Charles-August Forbin-Janson.\(^9\) Ultramontane Catholicism worked at several levels: it re-invigorated the laity to embrace the Catholic devotional and sacramental life; it prompted a greater clerical presence in political life, actively defending Church teachings and positions against potentially harmful government policies; it reawakened a strong sense of Catholic distinctiveness from the world around; it re-established a rather firm hierarchy of authority which enhanced clerical control of the Church from the desk of the bishop right
down to the curé’s pulpit. The Church came to view itself as playing a bigger role in the public square whether in its public pronouncements of faith in architecture, processions, the public calendar, and the rhythms of daily life, or by exerting its influence in the civil corridors of power. For good or for ill, this brand of French Canadian Catholicism left its indelible imprint of popular perceptions of the Catholic church in Canada, while carving out a distinct place in the power structures of Quebec, which was created as a province in the Dominion of Canada by the British North America Act of 1867.

This revitalized French Canadian Catholicism was not exclusive to Quebec. As Canada grew territorially and as new immigrants arrived, many French Canadian Catholics became assertive of their religious and linguistic rights in other parts of Canada. While Quebec might be regarded by French Canadian Catholics as their homeland, it became clear that such comfort could not be accorded to their compatriots elsewhere in the country. In 1869-70, French Canadians and francophone Métis at Red River took up arms against what they perceived as Canadian aggression, from the “beachhead” of Anglophone and Protestant settlers who had made their way to the Great Plains; similarly, in New Brunswick, the Protestant-dominated provincial government summarily cut off funding to French Canadian Catholic schools, principally on the grounds that the government was not obliged “by law” to finance Acadian separate schools. New French Canadian Catholic leaders, such as Bishop A.A. Taché of St. Boniface, Manitoba, and, later, nationalist politician Henri Bourassa, came to regard Canada as a country that ought to ensure equal rights for Anglophones and Francophones, Catholics and Protestants, *a mare usque ad mare*, in every part of Canada. Raymond Huel has argued persuasively that French Canadian settlers from Quebec, and the bishops and priests who led and served them, carried with them a *gestae dei per franos*, a sense that as Francophone Catholics they were ordained to spread “the things of God” to the rest of Canada by means of the French language and culture. In one sense, the Quebec Church regarded itself as the saving francophone remnant of the Faith, particularly after the French Revolution had destroyed the Church and secularized mother France. By 1900, this vision of Canada appeared to be coming to fruition, the Quebec Church was vibrant and confident, while francophone bishops and clergy, both Canadian and French-born, many of whom belonged to the religious order of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, dominated the territory stretching from Lake Superior to Vancouver Island and as far north as the
Arctic Ocean.\textsuperscript{15}

The fact of the matter, however, was that while French-speaking Catholics dominated the Canadian Church numerically, historically, territorially, and in terms of power and influence, by 1900 they were not alone. From colonial times there had been sizeable minorities of Scottish Catholics in Cape Breton, eastern Nova Scotia, PEI, and eastern Upper Canada, and Irish Catholic communities in Newfoundland, the Maritime Colonies, parts of Lower Canada and in the town and rural areas of Upper Canada.\textsuperscript{16} By the late nineteenth century, these Anglophone (and in some cases Gaelic-speaking) communities had set down roots, produced new Canadian-born generations, absorbed American Catholics who had departed the Republic to the south, and constituted about one third of all of British North America’s Catholics.\textsuperscript{17}

It should be pointed out, however, that although numerically a minority among Catholics in British North America when counted in aggregate terms, these Anglophone Catholics were often the primary Catholic group in provinces and colonies outside of Quebec, comprising significant minorities of the total population in Newfoundland, PEI, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and sections of Ontario. In his landmark essay “The Problem of the Double Minority,”\textsuperscript{18} historian John S. Moir referred to English-speaking Catholics as a double minority – a linguistic minority in their own Church, and a religious minority among Canada’s largely Protestant Anglophone population. Moir suggested that this “double minority status” may have developed the specific religious and social character of English-speaking Catholic communities, depending on the intensity of their multiple minority status in a given region of Canada at any given time. Surprisingly, few historians of Canadian Catholicism have taken up Moir’s invitation to investigate the relevance of double minority status for specific Anglophone groups, although his hypothesis may go a long way in explaining why Catholics of Irish and Scottish descent broke ranks with their Francophone co-religionists and Protestant rivals, siding with one majority or the other on specific issues, so many times over the course of modern Canadian history.

As Irish Catholics become the predominant group of non-Francophones by the middle of the nineteenth century, it is not surprising that their voice emerged strongly as a counterbalance to the French Canadian ecclesiastical establishment, and the expression “les Irlandais” was often accompanied by a colourful adjective to describe those Catholics who provided stumbling blocks to French Canadian ambitions and vision of the
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Although there have been no thorough scholarly studies exploring the idea of Irish Catholic providentialism in Canada, there are shards of evidence that suggest that part of the Irish self-image in Canada was coloured by a greater sense of divine mission. In one of his many St. Patrick’s Day addresses, clerico-nationalist Archbishop of Toronto, John Joseph Lynch, referred to the contemporary mission of the Irish Catholics to convert the world, just as St. Patrick had done centuries before. Over thirty years later, the Catholic Church Extension Society, the Canadian Church’s chief fundraising agency for home missionary activity, referred to their mission as that of the conversion of Canada. Its founders, Father Alfred E. Burke of Prince Edward Island, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, entrepreneur Eugene O’Keefe, professionals Michael Haney and Michael Davis stood behind Archbishop Fergus Patrick McEvay of Toronto when he explained to his French Canadian colleagues:

We have been striving to do our best in a most disinterested and what appeared to be the most practical way. The foreign element, the main object of our solicitude can in the opinion of some of us at least, be reached only in one of two ways, either through the medium of men who speak their own language, or through the offices of those who speak the English language which is that of the majority of the West and which is the language the foreigners must learn of necessity if they are to procure a livelihood in the places in which they live . . .

At that time, Bishop Michael Francis Fallon of London Ontario, the son of Irish-Catholic immigrants, clearly identified the advantageous position of Catholics who spoke English as being perhaps the most effective agents of evangelization directed at the Protestant majority in Canada. Such views were not lost on Rome’s representatives in Canada, who paid attention to Anglophone Catholic claims, and often supported the causes of Scottish or Irish Canadian candidates for Episcopal nominations, particularly in Episcopal sees where there was a distinctive ethnic or linguistic mix. The impression that Anglophone Catholics were gaining force within the Church was confirmed by the successful domination by 1930 of the western Canadian sees by Anglophones (most of whom were Ontarians or Maritimers ) and even the acclaim given to the words of John Bourne, Archbishop of Westminster, when he rather imprudently spoke at the International Eucharistic Congress in Montreal in 1910: “it is plain that English will be the language of the West as French is the language of the
East; and it is hoped that the splendid example of those who did settle in days gone by in Quebec . . . will be followed by a new English-speaking race of settlers.”

What emerged by the early twentieth century was an English-speaking Catholic vision of Canada that could be characterized by the following: a dedication to Canadian and British institutions and law; a strong sense of loyalty, though not uncritical, to the Crown and the British Empire; a communal drive to seek economic and political respectability, head and shoulders with other Canadians; and, a strong identification with Canada, its history, its landscape, and its potential. In some measure, French Canadian Catholics might agree with many of these aspirations, except for their co-religionists’ disposition to see the English-language as the primary vehicle for Catholic success.

The collision of these differing visions of Canada can be made clearly in three examples for the early twentieth century: the school questions, the aforementioned challenges brought by immigration and the settlement of the Canadian West, and engagement in Britain’s Imperial wars. In Ontario and Quebec, and subsequently the Territories, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Newfoundland, publicly funded separate denominational schools for Roman Catholics were protected by the Federal government under section 93 of the British North America Act. At Confederation when the newly created provinces assumed authority over education, and religious minorities – Catholics in Ontario and Protestants in Quebec – feared for their educational rights in the face of a potentially hostile majority, it was deemed necessary to protect minority education rights as they existed in law prior to federation. Over time, the gentleman’s agreements, as opposed to enshrined legal rights, that allowed the existence of separate Catholic schools in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia proved to be dead letter. In 1890, Manitoba’s Protestant majority eliminated Catholic schools with virtual impunity.

In Ontario, the case was less that of Catholic schools, but of bilingual schools, most of which were French-language separate schools, but had no constitutional guarantees to deliver the curriculum other than in the English language. In 1910, the provincial government, under Regulation 17, prohibited French language education after the second grade; Regulation 18 mandated that any school board disobeying Regulation 17 would cease to receive its educational grants from the province. To their horror, French Catholics could not count on support from their Anglophone co-religionists who supported the measure.
English-speaking Catholics resented the fallout that resulted from the French assertions and public agitation for extended language privileges; Ontario’s Anglo-Celtic bishops blamed the controversy prompted by ACFEO, the Franco-Ontarian Education Association, for the renewed assault by many non-Catholics on the concept of separate schools generally. For their part, Anglophone Catholic leaders left little negotiating room for their French coreligionists when they claimed that bilingual schools were inefficient and were handicapping Francophone children intellectually, thereby depriving them of the opportunity to succeed in Ontario. In addition, there was also a sense among Anglophone Catholic leaders that they must assert their own sovereignty and power over the Church in Ontario. While the bitterness within the Catholic community was palpable and lingered below the surface for generations, the educational crisis revealed clearly that the English-speaking Catholic vision for a Christian Canada was at loggerheads with the views of Francophone Catholics, some of whom were ardent French Canadian nationalists.

As mentioned earlier, hundreds of thousands of immigrants poured into Canada in the early twentieth century and after the Great War. Many of these new Canadians were Catholics, who had arrived without priests, without disposable incomes, but with expectations that, as in their former homelands, the state would somehow accommodate their religious needs. Implicit in these desires was the immigrant acknowledgment, that even if Protestant outside of Quebec, and Catholic in patches, Canada was a Christian country. For Francophone and Anglophone Catholics the new arrivals necessitated new efforts to recruit clergy with linguistic gifts, build or purchase houses of worship, negotiate cultural Catholicisms that were described in some cases as exotic, given Canadian precedents, and create canonical parishes that were national in focus and not “territorial.” Perhaps the fragile entente already reached between the charter cultural groups in the Canadian Church facilitated the easy conception and formation of national parishes, without much of the rancour associated with similar actions in the United States. On the Prairies, however, the situation appeared more urgent as the region was more akin to mission territory in which Methodists, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Catholics, and the Orthodox were all competing for the souls of the newcomers. For Catholics the question was twofold: keep the foreigners Catholic for the sake of a Catholic Canada and, depending on the charter linguistic group, make them cultural allies. The challenges posed by western immigration serious strained the already complicated relations between Anglophone and
Francophone Catholics. From 1890 to 1915, the Canadian-born Archbishop Adélard Langevin of St. Boniface insisted that new Canadian Catholics fall under his watchful eye, while the Catholic Church Extension Society, which was headquartered in Toronto, became an exponent for evangelization either in the language of the immigrant, or by Anglo-Celtic priests who had the requisite language skills. Langevin and his successor, Arthur Beliveau, had little time for these Irlandaises who threatened the gestae dei per francos west of the Great Lakes.28

The immigrants themselves, however, were content to be agents of their own destiny. Ukrainian Catholics of the Byzantine-Greek Rite insisted on their own priests, their distinctive churches and liturgies, and their own Eparchy. They feared the Latinization and, in some cases, the Francisation that they suspected of their Canadian Catholic hosts.29 Similarly, other new Canadian Catholics – Poles, Italians, Slovaks, Czechs, Portuguese, Hungarians, Slovenes, Maltese, Lebanese Maronites, Syrian Melkites, Iraqi Chaldaens, Germans, and Chinese – all insisted on preserving their distinctive languages, group identities, and popular religious cultures over the course of the twentieth century. In this way, the Catholic Church in Canada came to accept diversity as a way of life, making perhaps the emergence of official multiculturalism in the 1960s not too surprising for many Catholic Canadians.30

Disagreements between the charter partner groups in the Catholic Church in Canada over issues such as education and immigration were exacerbated by how English-speaking Catholics in many regions of the country came to understand themselves as active members of the British Empire. The participation of Irish Catholics, in particular in the South African War, 1899-1902 and the Great War, 1914-1918, widened an already large gulf between French and English speakers in the Church. Like many of their relatives in Ireland, Canada’s Irish Catholics did not hesitate in their support of Britain’s campaign against the Dutch Calvinist Boer minority in Orange Free State and Transvaal. Although at times critical of British unilateral decision making, warmongering and jingoistic politicians, and a grudging respect for the plucky resistance of the Boers, the Catholic press was generally supportive of the war effort as were such leading politicians as Charles Fitzpatrick, Federal Minister of Justice, and prelates like Archbishop Cornelius O’Brien of Halifax, who was a proud member of the Imperial Federation League. Father Peter O’Leary from Quebec City became the first Roman Catholic chaplain to serve with Canada’s overseas contingent. Rank and file Irish and Scottish Catholics,
particularly in Ontario and Nova Scotia, joined with Canadians from all Protestant denominations in fighting in South Africa. Irish Catholic participation was not a case of shovelling out the unemployed and paupers, since only forty percent were blue collar workers, and few left cities and towns where the economy was not robust. Moreover, of those Irish Catholics serving in the Canadian contingent, over seventy-five percent were Canadian born, compared to sixty-three percent of the contingent overall. Although some French Canadian Catholics served in South Africa, most took the lead of nationalist and ardent Catholic politician Henri Bourassa who broke with Sir Wilfrid Laurier’s government and condemned the war as merely an imperialist venture and none of Canada’s business. His position was gainsaid by Fitzpatrick, Laurier’s Minister of Justice who asserted:

I say that the time had come . . . when it was necessary for the whelps of the lion to rally to the defence of the old land. The time had come when every man must be made to understand whether on the European continent or in South Africa, that blow for blow, whenever the blow might come, must be struck back by the British, and would be struck as freely from Australia and Canada as from the heart of the Empire itself.  

South Africa merely set the stage for further controversy between French and English Catholics when Britain declared war on Germany and the Central powers in 1914, placing Canada automatically at war. Canada’s Anglophone Catholics and many Francophone bishops were very supportive of Britain’s war effort. English-speaking politicians, lay leaders, fraternal associations, religious orders, clergy, and bishops openly support the war effort and facilitated recruitment of men. Non-francophone Catholics enlisted commensurate to their numbers in the early stages of the war. While some could be found in the Canadian Expeditionary Force because of weak economy in 1914, others were enraged by alleged German atrocities, the capture of Catholic Belgium and the looting of its churches and Louvain University, and the prospect of the Empire being shattered. Some regarded recruitment as a sign of the firmness of Catholic resolve as loyal Canadians and Imperial citizens. On the other hand, French Canadian Catholics were subject to an anglicized military structure, poor recruitment techniques, and compelling rhetoric from Bourassa and others that the best defence of Canada was at home in Canada. Fellow politician Olivier Asselin claimed that in the context of
Regulation 17, why should French Canadians fight in Europe for the self-determination of peoples, when one knows that the “Prussians” are next door in Ontario. When the federal government mandated national registration of men and resources in 1916 and later legislated conscription in 1917, French Canadians resisted, and although they had some support from a few English-speaking Catholics, the weight of the non-Francophone Church was squarely in the Imperial camp. For many French Canadians, les Irlandaises had been transformed into les orangistes.

The Great War and, in the minds of many English Canadians of many religious stripes, the Christian values for which it was fought, demonstrated clearly how the charter groups in the Catholic Church had drifted from each other on issues of national vision. It clearly brought to the fore how the vision of Anglophone Catholic Canadians had taken shape. Anglophone Catholics had found common cause with Protestant Canadians on issues of Canada’s role in the world, the potential of Canada economically and politically within the Empire and the necessity to make better lives for themselves through their economic, political and social integration into the fabric of Canadian life. They would share strong religious bonds with their French-Canadian co-religionists and would defend Catholic rights to the bitter end, regardless of language or ethnicity, but they would also underscore, throughout, that the future of the faith outside of Quebec rested in the leadership exercised by the Anglophone Catholic bishops. Their Canada, outside of fortress Quebec, would be a Christian Canada, but one in which the Catholic Church would prevail under the agency of the English language.

By mid-century there appeared to be a more formal entente between the two charter members of the Catholic Church in Canada. While the scholarship on the period still requires much development, there are a number of events that suggest how this rapprochement took shape in the 1930s through the 1950s. First, immediately after the Great War, Archbishop Neil McNeil of Toronto took an active leadership role in the Bonne Entente movement, which was an attempt by Anglophone and Francophone elites to mend fences through a series of conferences and private meetings. Secondly, the Ontario Government, in response to some positive recommendations and bilingual school reforms prompted by Senator Napoleon Belcourt, relaxed the notorious Regulation 17 and it was finally removed from the books in 1947, thereby dissipating the “open sore” which had been Catholic educational politics in Ontario. This previously explosive situation was perhaps further ameliorated by the
deaths of so many of the protagonists on both sides of the question. Thirdly, in the 1920s and 1930s, an assault on Catholic educational rights in Saskatchewan during the administration of Premier James Thomas Anderson and at the grass roots level by the Ku Klux Klan, prompted a greater degree of Catholic unity, regardless of language. Fourthly, the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, in 1917, the subsequent Red Scare throughout North America in the 1920s, and the advance of Communist internationally in the 1930s, drew Catholics together against the threat of a potentially devastating common enemy. Led by the uncompromising denunciations of Communism by Pius XI and Pius XII, Catholics in Canada firmly positioned themselves as defenders of a Christian culture and its values as the bedrock of Canadian society. Fifthly, although World War II brought yet another conscription crisis, the period 1939-1945, did not witness the bitter division evident in the first global war, a generation previous, but witnessed heightened Catholic involvement, French and non-French in the war effort, both in the corridors of power and on the ground.

In fact, with the war’s end and the soon to follow declaration of the Cold War between the West and the forces of Communism, Catholics appeared united not only as a Church but also with non-Catholic Canadians. The most visible sign that Catholics were squarely aligned with Western political values and social aspirations came in 1947 at the Marian Congress in Ottawa. Organized by Archbishop Alexandre Vachon of Ottawa to commemorate the centennial of his Diocese and honour his personal devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Congress was a gathering of 200,000 Catholics from Canada and abroad, and all celebrations were carried out in both official languages. Pope Pius XII designated the freshly minted Cardinal, James C. McGuigan of Toronto, as his official legate. Politicians of all religious stripes, including Prime Minister Mackenzie King, were notable by their official presence at the Congress. Noteworthy, however, was the theme of the Congress and the undercurrent of the new cold war tensions between the West and the rising communist bloc. Dedicated to “Our Lady Queen of Peace,” and echoing the messages of the apparition of Mary at Fatima, bishops and cardinals spoke about the “false liberty,” errors, and threats to Christianity in the post-war period, and that only the “conversion” of Russia would usher in “an era of peace in the world.” The leaders of Canada’s Catholics, English and French, had now publicly aligned themselves as Cold Warriors to push back the forces of “atheistic, militant, and materialistic” Communists. According
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to Cardinal McGuigan:

If the world turns away from Christ it turns away from truth and it delivers itself into bondage. We have seen this in great countries in our own day. If liberty is one of our traditions as Canadians, if British institutions to which we belong and from which we inherited our civic traditions are contrived to safeguard liberty and the sacredness of the human person, if we have been taught by our fathers to abhor political systems which treat the individual merely as a creature and instrument of the State, it is because we belong to a family of nations nourished in infancy on the milk of Christian truth and trained to maturity on the practice of Gospel precepts.30

Evidently, Protestant Canadians approved. The lone dissenting voice, at least in public, was that of T.T. Shields and his Canadian Protestant League, who formally objected to the presence of a Papal Army on Canadian soil. A detachment of papal zouaves had formed an honour guard as the statue of Notre Dame du Cap (from Trois Rivieres) had been processed across the bridge from Hull, Quebec, down the Rideau Canal to Lansdowne Park, the site of the Congress.41

By the 1950s, Catholics of all languages could be described as churchgoing citizens who could be found in nearly every corner of Canada and in every socio-occupational category. The new media, radio and television, had their fair share of Catholic radio priests, elucidating matters of faith, lecturing on academic subjects, and reporting on world affairs. In the mid-1950s, American media dynamo and vociferous anti-communist, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, was as popular with French Canadian television viewers in Montreal and Quebec City as he was with Catholics elsewhere in Canada.42 Catholics, both French and English-speaking could be found in the corridors of power provincially and federally, in all political parties. With the departure of Mackenzie King in 1948, the new Canadian Prime Minister was Louis Stephen St. Laurent, a Quebec lawyer who had both French Canadian and Irish ancestry. By 1961, Quebec was clearly only one home to Canada’s Catholics. Catholics were in excess of 45 percent of the persons living in PEI and New Brunswick, and they were over 30 percent of the population in Ontario, Newfoundland and Labrador, and Nova Scotia. One in every four persons in Manitoba and Saskatchewan was Catholic.43 While not always appreciated or warmly welcomed by non-Catholics in some Canadian regions, their churches, schools, convents, hospitals, social services, and charitable networks were visible
in nearly every major centre of population in the country.

The calling of the Second Vatican Council in 1958, and its subsequent convocation from 1962 to 1965 marked a significant modern watershed in the Church’s encounter with the secular world and the Council’s impact was felt almost immediately in Canada. The sixteen constitutions, declarations and decrees from the Council changed the face and practice of Catholicism across the planet in the decades following their promulgation. The Church in Canada changed as well as the liturgies in the Roman Rite promoted vernacular languages, not Latin, and as worship moved from the Tridentine Mass, to a new Rite that gathered the priest and people around the table of the Lord. The former emphasis on clericalism and the hierarchical pyramid of power and control, from the episcopacy at its apex to the laity at is based was turned upside down. Beginning from the new Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, the Church was defined in less institutional terms as “the people of God” and each member – clerical, religious, or lay – was regarded as “co-responsible” for the Church by merit of their common baptism. Lay persons were called to be active as witnesses of the Gospel in the world, and new voices were heard in Catholicism for ecumenical and interfaith dialogue. Clearly the Council had changed the course and disposition of the Church with regard to the world, while retaining its continuity with the sacred teachings it had nurtured for close to two millennia.

The discussion of secularization in Canada has been a subject that has preoccupied church historians in Canada for a generation. While not featured prominently, or sometimes even tangentially in the historiographical discussion, Catholics in the 1960s were implementing the seismic changes of Vatican II, while Canadian society itself was grappling with the civil, ecumenical, social, and moral transformation afoot in the Western world. In the 1950s, Catholics across the country had little inkling of the changes that were to come although, as has been argued recently by Michael Gauvreau in the context of Quebec; some Catholics may have already been agents of or at least antecedents of the changes at the grassroots level that were taking place within the flurry of the Quiet Revolution. Over the next two decades, Church attendance everywhere in Canada dropped significantly and numbers of Canadians proclaiming that they had “no religion” rose dramatically. Catholics were not exempt from this, and by the 1980s Catholic attendance at regular weekly Mass and participation in Church life plummeted especially in Quebec. By 1998, Quebec had willing surrendered its denominational schools and replaced
them with a preferred system based on language. The Quebec state had taken control of education, health care and social services, and by the twenty-first century was even attempting to mandate its own generic course in morals and values in all publicly funded schools. In Ontario, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and the Territories, publicly funded Catholic schools continue to exist and, by some definitions flourish, but the reality is that these schools often provide the only “face” of the Church that its pupils will ever see.

In the public square, Catholics became deeply divided over a variety of moral questions that were brought to the fore by new legislation, human rights challenges, and decisions of the Canadian judicial system. Abortion, euthanasia, and equity and diversity issues seriously divided the Church in both French and English Canada. Catholics with a passion for social justice issues in Canada, have a long tradition and pedigree in Canada, with roots in the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, Antigonish Movement, the Jeunesse movements, and Catholic Action, but they have lost much of their steam in the face of ecclesiastical retrenchment, renewed clericalism, and new interpretations of the Council which emphasise continuity over change.

On the other hand, Catholics who have retained more traditional or socially conservative positions on end-of-life life issues, abortion, genetic experimentation, family planning, and same sex marriage, have found they have much more in common with evangelical Protestant Christians than with many members of their own Church and, in particular, Catholic politicians who carefully separated their public positions from their private religious beliefs. It could be argued that it is this traditional group of Catholics, perhaps the mainstream today, who bear closest resemblance to their co-religionists prior to the 1960s. In the years following the Council there is little evidence to suggest that these practicing Catholics have ceased to believe that Canada was Christian at its heart, and that this relationship with the state has not been altered by the emergent religious pluralism in the Church, brought by immigrants of non-European origins, but perhaps strengthened by it. Catholics in Quebec, of course, have long departed the institution, save for moments best described now as rites of passage – catching, hatching and dispatching. When viewed over the long term, however, the notion that loyalty to the state, rendering unto Caesar, has been compatible, perhaps integral to being a good Catholic Christian, particularly to those Catholics living in English Canada. In this broad historical context, contemporary notions of strong Catholic citizenship in
a Canadian state grounded in Judeo-Christian values are hardly surprising. Moreover, in this light, the current political realignment of English-speaking Catholics, at the Federal level, may reflect more continuity with the past than a break from it.
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Mère Henriette Feller (1800-1868) of La Grande Ligne and Ordered Ministry in Canada

PHILIP G.A. GRIFFIN-ALLWOOD
Wesley Memorial United Church


These illustrations are all based on the assumed definition of ordained ministry as a reflection of order and ardour. However, as I previously written about when discussing the history of Baptist ordination, there has been a third component to the definition of ministry, namely that of function. Function carries within it an implicit rejection of a sacramental definition of ordination.

Ministry as Function

Prominent British North American/Canadian individuals who embodied ministry as function include John Mocket Cramp and Alexander Crawford. Cramp was a British Particular Baptist whose ordination took place without the laying on of hands. While a service of ordination was performed for Cramp, Alexander Crawford’s eldership would exist only
while he served a church.\footnote{Crawford was a Scotch Baptist trained in the Haldane school in Edinburgh. Scotch Baptists were an indigenous denomination in Scotland that had formed their first church in Edinburgh in 1765, after the acceptance of immersion by seceders from the established Church of Scotland. Under the leadership of Archibald McLean, Scotch Baptist churches were organized throughout Scotland, Wales, and northern England. Their ecclesial organization differed from that of the Particular Baptists, who were called “English” Baptists in Scotland to distinguish them from the Gaelic-speaking Scotch Baptists. The “apostolic plan” of the Scotch Baptists declared that: “. . . each Church, to answer the prototype, must have a presbytery of Elders – a plurality of Pastors – as well as a body of Deacons, otherwise it was considered defective . . .”\footnote{The influence of the Scotch Baptists included two wealthy laymen, James and Robert Haldane. Dissatisfied with the practices of the Established Church of Scotland (Presbyterian), they built a “tabernacle” in Edinburgh and invited British evangelist Rowland Hill to hold meetings. In 1799 they seceded from the Church of Scotland and organized an independent church. In 1808 the Haldane brothers adopted the principle of believer’s baptism by immersion. Their ecclesiastical goal was to establish “primitive churches” modelled upon their interpretation of scripture. They defined the church as a local independent body. Connectionalism, with the exception of societies formed for specific projects, was to be avoided. There was a specific place for women within church structure, as “widows” and as deaconesses, albeit with a same sex responsibility. James Haldane wrote that, “We see that the apostolic churches had deaconesses and female teachers. We may be sure they were very useful and if we follow the direction left for making a proper choice, we shall doubtless experience the good effects of it.” Haldane linked widows and female teachers to Titus 2:3, “the aged women (presbutidas, the female elders, as some render it).” Thus, on a theoretical level, Haldane’s ecclesiology defined female and male “elders” as necessary for church life.}}

Haldane’s Influence in Québec

The most prominent location where Haldane’s ecclesiology was put into practice was Switzerland. In the first decade of the nineteenth century,
Robert Haldane lived and taught in Geneva, instigating a revival in the city’s Theological Hall. From that revival an independent church movement developed in Switzerland.16

The influence of the Haldanes spread to Canada through Scottish immigrants. Among the settlers was Henry Wilkes (1805-1886), a Congregationalist who studied in Glasgow from 1829 until 1832.17 A Major-General Anderson wrote and distributed “appeals” for missions to “French Canadian Romanists” in 1829 and in 1834. Wilkes cooperated with Robert Haldane and others in forming “the Edinburgh Committee for the Management of the French-Canadian Mission.”18 The committee’s object was to: “. . . engage men of approved piety, without reference to names of party distinction, to preach and teach the unsearchable riches of Christ, to traverse the province as colporteurs, and to scatter the seed of the Kingdom wherever they go.”19

Commitment was made to fund the mission from Scotland and to seek a missionary from Switzerland. In Lausanne, Switzerland, members of the national and independent churches had united to form a missionary society.20 Responding to Canadian requests – Anderson’s pamphlets perhaps – in 1834 Henri Olivier, who had been minister of the Lausanne independent church, arrived in Montréal with his wife and two young men. The latter two became missionaries to aboriginal peoples in Mississippi, a task that the Oliviers were also expected to pursue. However, the Oliviers decided to stay in Montréal; their decision to preach to the French rather than to engage in missionary work with indigenous peoples resulted in severance from the Lausanne committee.21

In response to the decision of the cooperative Lausanne Missionary Society, the independent churches organized their own missionary society. At the organizational meeting a letter was received requesting a labourer for Québec.22

Henriette Feller

Henriette Odin lived in Lausanne with a family prominent enough that she was “introduced into society.”23 In 1822 she married a widower, Louis Feller, part of the “aristocracy (so to speak) of the Swiss Republic.”24 They also belonged to the established Reformed Church in Switzerland and family worship was practised in their home.25

The presence of Haldane-influenced revivalists in Lausanne coupled with the death of Henriette Feller’s only child, Elize, created a spiritual
crisis in Henriette’s life. After reading a treatise called *The Evangelical Doctrine*, she experienced a powerful moment of conversion. Following her conversion she associated with the *momiers*, as the independent revivalists were known in Lausanne. Following the death of her husband in 1826, Henriette Feller joined the independent church in Lausanne. Subsequently, Madame Olivier wrote Henriette Feller requesting that she join the missionary work. Thus, in 1835, she and Louis Roussy, a young man with theological training, joined the Oliviers in Canada, having been sent out by the “Commission of the Churches of Switzerland Associated for Evangelism,” as the independent society was known. For Feller, the decision was a spiritual one: “My convictions have been continually strengthened and confirmed, and now I am certain that I am answering God’s call.”

Henriette Feller expressed her vocational identity as part of the church. About 1830 she received believer’s baptism and served the Independent church in Lausanne as a deaconess. Her involvement in church was strictly within the terms prescribed by the Haldanes. Churches were to be independent of one another, save for particular moments of cooperation. The primary purpose of churches was revivalistic, not denominational. Thus the goal of the Swiss Mission, established by the Oliviers and continued by Feller and Roussy, in the words of John Mocket Cramp, “. . . was not to make them [the people of Québec] Protestants – to make them Baptists – it was to save their souls from death!” This posture would create tensions as Feller and her associates struggled to maintain Haldane distinctiveness.

*Maintaining the Haldane Identity*

The first missionary activity of the Ottawa Baptist Association formed in 1836 was the engagement of Roussy as missionary to French Canada. The association included others influenced by the Haldanes. At the General Meeting of the Ottawa Baptist Association on 30 March 1867, the Canada Baptist Missionary Society was organized as a cooperative organization with the Baptist Canadian Missionary Society in Great Britain, and responsibility for the mission to French Canada – under the direction of Roussy and Feller – was transferred to this society.

But by February 1839, the Canada Baptist Missionary Society announced: “. . . we are under the painful necessity of stating, that our connection with the Mission at La Grande Ligne . . . has been dissolved,
under circumstances which admitted of no alternative."38 Tensions had developed between the Swiss Mission and some of its advocates. Some supporters, reacting to the Baptist affiliation, had withdrawn support in 183939 and in August 1839 the French Canadian Missionary Society was organized. While the Swiss Mission worked in the Richelieu Valley, the French Canadian Missionary Society operated on the north shore of the St. Lawrence River.40

Within the Canada Baptist Missionary Society disagreement existed concerning the terms for co-operation with missions. For some Baptists the non-immersion of Feller and Roussy undoubtedly raised questions about associating with them. The issue was resolved in 1841 when the society declared: “That the society is, from the nature of its constitution, open to the co-operation of all who hold the distinguishing tenants of the Baptist [sic] denomination, in connexion [sic] with evangelical piety.”41

Following this controversy, which ran contrary to the Haldane ecclesiastical vision, the Mission felt that “they could labour more efficiently if they were independent religious parties.”42 Feller and Roussy thus turned for support to the Foreign Evangelical Society, based in New York City.43

Grants were received until 1845 when the Foreign Evangelical Society demanded that the mission join the French Canadian Missionary Society as a prerequisite for continuing aid.44 This was not acceptable to the mission. Madame Feller expressed her hope that the Mission’s open position could be maintained in the following letter:

. . . Notre liaison projetée avec la Société Évangélique de New York n’a pas eu lieu; diverses circonstances ont concouru à m’y faire croire que ce n’était pas là le chemin que Dieu nous avait . . .

. . . Nous sommes arrivés à la conclusion qu’une liaison avec les baptistes anglais était celle qui offrait le plus de sécurité pour l’avenir de la mission. Nous avons donc formé ce lien avec la Société missionnaire baptiste à Montréal qui elle-même est une branche de la Société d’Angleterre . . . Cette liaison n’apporte pas de changement à nos vues libérales. Nous demeurons open communion et nous espérons bien continuer nos deux rapports avec nos frères pédobaptistes. Je ne pense pas qu’il y ait aucun changement à notre égard et la part de la Société Évangélique . . .45

The Swiss Mission therefore re-aligned with the Canada Baptist Mission-
ary Society, thus accepting direction from a Swiss Mission Committee containing representatives from both organizations. The Swiss Missions conditions for reunion were those mentioned in the Feller letter. There was to be no change in their relationship to “pedobaptists” as those who did not practice believer’s baptism were known: “... [Swiss Mission] missionaries will be anxious to exemplify the manifestations of Christian friendship with all who ‘love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity,’ and to cultivate acquaintance with Brethren in Christ, of various denominations as heretofore.”

While maintaining a connection with the Canada Baptist Missionary Society, the mission was “essentially independent.” When the society ceased operations in 1849, plans were made by the Swiss Mission to become an independent society, which would remain “baptiste libéraux.”

With loss of support from the Baptist Missionary Society and its Canadian affiliate, the Swiss Mission turned toward the American Baptist Home Mission Society for support in 1849. Because of American Baptist concern about their ecclesiology in 1854 the mission agreed to “build up Regular Baptist churches so far as practicable.” This action apparently had limited effect for all but one of the missionaries of Grande Ligne were open communononists.

The maintenance of Haldane openness was rejected by Regular Baptists in the Canadas, and in 1858 the Grande Ligne church was removed from the list of Regular Baptist churches. Despite the pressures, the Swiss Mission, known by Henriette Feller’s death as the Grande Ligne Mission, resisted pressures to abandon Feller’s advocacy of Haldane ecclesiology. At the time of Feller’s death in 1868, an Ontario convention committee visited and declared that the Mission had “a considerable difference of opinion in regard to church-order and ordinances” and “loose views” concerning communion.

**Feller as Ordered Minister**

So how one should view Henriette Feller? When I initially read her self-description as *mère* I viewed her and Roussy’s role as emulating that of Catholicism. Both were single leaders of a religious community. Readers of the “Grande Ligne Mission” in the *The Canadian Baptist* would see “Sketches of Mme. Feller’s Furniture” that could be viewed at the Feller Institute. The display of relics suggest a Catholic religious model of leadership, especially in the light of her founding of a school,
that of the teaching sister.

Yet in the light of the continued Haldane ecclesiology, another view can be taken. Cramp described Feller in these terms:

... although Madame Feller occupied a somewhat anomalous position, for her influence was well-nigh all-powerful, and few ventured to contradict or oppose one in whom the tenderness of woman and the firmness of man were so happily united, she never overstepped apostolic limits.57

This description matches that of the female presbyter as stated by James Haldane. Thus Feller’s title as “mère” could be seen as being used as “Father” and “Mother” as in the revivallist tradition for ordered leadership. This practice, using a functional definition of ministry, makes her one of the first ordered ministers in what is now Canada.
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“Would You Sell Yourself For A Drink, Boy?”
Masculinity and Christianity in the Ontario Temperance Movement

MEGAN BAXTER
University of Western Ontario

The temperance movement was a pervasive feature of nineteenth-century Canadian life. Not everyone believed in the cause, but the discourse surrounding the consumption of alcohol and the effects of drinking as a habit would not have been unfamiliar. Temperance groups set themselves at odds with a society wherein alcohol consumption was an inescapable fact of life. It was made, traded, consumed on the job, during community events, political meetings, and for recreation and escape. Despite the prevalence of alcohol consumption, or because of it, temperance groups sprang up to express their concern over the effects of alcohol consumption, and their eventual conviction that the eradication of drinking would be a pivotal step towards creating a better society on earth and in creating the Kingdom of God.

In order to do so, however, they had to attract and retain members and find workable organizational forms that would inspire devotion among members, and convince those members not only to keep paying their dues, but also to reach outside the organization in attempts to convert others, and later, to work politically to promote their agenda. Although many small temperance organizations sprang up and faded in the Canadian landscape, the first groups that had wide appeal turned out to be the fraternal temperance lodges, which spurs three questions: Why did men (and sometimes women) join temperance lodges? Why did they choose to stay (or leave, as the case may be?) How did they incorporate religious belief
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and expression into patterns of joining, staying and leaving lodge life? The
answers to these, unsurprisingly, are complex. They included issues
surrounding entertainment, community, mutual support and ritual. But
underlying most of these motivations was an ideology of responsible
Christian masculinity that made the temperance lodges an attractive
proposition for men in the latter half of the nineteenth century and the first
few decades of the twentieth. The lodges attempted to frame the act of
joining as a specifically masculine one. They located an ideal masculinity
not only in the independence and strength of men, but also in an outward-
looking attitude of benevolence and concern. This reflects the strongly
Protestant (although nondenominational) character of the lodges.
However, this was not the only masculinity available to men, in the eyes
of the temperance lodge. If they did not take on the mantle of Christian
manly responsibility, men were believed to be prone to the worst evils
drink could bring, becoming religiously lost, low, destitute, irresponsible,
cruel abusers of wives and children. These two models of masculinity
framed much of the temperance rhetoric.

The title of this paper comes from a temperance poem. It was
reprinted in 1894 in the International Order of Good Templars’ newspaper,
The Camp Fire, which was edited by F.S. Spence and published in
Toronto. It is a good example of how the temperance lodges perceived
masculinity in both its idealized and depraved forms. In its entirety, it
reads:

Would you sell yourself for a drink, boys,
A drink from the poisoned cup?
For a taste of the gleaming wine, boys,
Would you give your manhood up?

Would you bind yourselves with chains, boys,
And rivet the fetters fast?
Would you bolt your prison doors, boys,
Preventing escape at last?

Would you wreck your youth and health, boys,
Those blessings God has given?
Would you ruin your life on earth, boys,
And blast your hopes of heaven?

Would you dig, with your own hands, your grave, boys,
And willingly cast yourselves in?
Would you die a besotted wretch, boys,
In poverty, sorrow, and sin?

Ah, no! A thousand times no! boys,
You were born for a noble end;
In you are your country’s hopes, boys,
Her honor the boys must defend.

Then join the great abstinence band, boys,
And pledge yourselves strong against rum;
Stand firm as a rock to your pledge, boys,
And fight till the foe is o’ercome.¹

This poem, while at times overwrought, is a good example of the kind of appeal that the temperance lodges made to men and boys to join and carry on the temperance cause. The role of men in the temperance movement has been largely overlooked in the recent historiography, yet the three main temperance fraternal organizations both predate and often outnumber the comparable women’s organization, the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU). Despite this, our historical memory tends to conceptualize the temperance movement in gendered terms, as a women’s movement, an attempt by women to control the drinking of the men around them.

In part, this may be due to the fact that most of the recent work on the temperance movement has been by feminist historians, who have logically focused on the WCTU as a subject of study.² These histories have looked at women’s involvement with the temperance movement as a site of feminist or “proto-feminist” political action, and the ways in which the WCTU was undoubtedly an important and influential organization. However, this recent focus on the WCTU has been coupled with a relative dearth of work on the other temperance organizations that littered the scene, and made the temperance movement vibrant, contested, and a frequent site of both collaboration and competition. The International Order of Good Templars, the Sons of Temperance and the Royal Templars of Temperance were all organizations that (eventually) admitted both men and women, but from my preliminary research, were largely run by men. These three orders were fraternal organizations loosely based on the practices of the Freemasons and the Odd Fellows.³ They had lodges, meetings full of ceremony and ritual, and were initially often mutual
benefit societies, providing insurance and burial benefits for members.

The oldest of these, The Sons of Temperance, was founded in the 1840s in the New York State, and spread to Canada in 1847, with the first lodge founded in Brockville. They tried to combine the aspect of both a fraternal organization and a mutual benefit society. The British remnants of the present-day organization describes the aims of the historical Sons of Temperance in these terms: “Its objects were to shield its members from the evils of intemperance, to afford mutual assistance in times of sickness, provide a sum of money at the death of a member, to elevate character, to enlist workers in an earnest and noble endeavour to reclaim those who fell under the influence of strong drink, to save the young from the terrible power of the drink habit, and to assist in every way the suppression of the drink traffic.”

The Independent Order of Good Templars (IOGT) was founded in the 1850s, also in New York State. It spread to Canada quickly, and eventually world-wide, particularly among British colonies. The official history states that the first two Canadian IOGT lodges were founded in 1853, at Merrickville and Easton’s Corners. The two main distinctions between the IOGT and the Sons were that the IOGT admitted women as full members from its inception, and did not provide insurance benefits. There was a schism in the Ontario Orders of Good Templars in 1858, resulting in there being separate Grand Lodges for the British-American Order of Good Templars and the Independent Order of Good Templars until 1888. The schism seems to have been over whether the movement should try to be entirely British or recognize its American roots, although issues of race are mentioned as reasons why it was difficult to reunite the two for several decades.

The Royal Templars entered the scene fairly late compared to the other two organizations, with the first Canadian lodge founded in Toronto in 1878, and like the IOGT, always included both women and men. There were other, smaller, groups that arose and faded with some regularity, but these were the three main lodges on the temperance scene in the nineteenth century. Although all three were organizations that existed outside the denominational system, their rituals and cause incorporated Christian belief at their very core, expressing an ecumenical belief that welcomed members from many different congregational affiliations. This desire to carry religious belief and action outside of the churches and into independent societies shows both the effects of religious belief on socialization and political action, but also displays a belief that
religion need not be confined to activities directly associated with the institutional churches. Many members combined church attendance and activity with their lodge life, and found little tension between the two.

In the nineteenth century, this form of fraternal organization was one of the most prominent ways in which Christian men and women participated in the fight for temperance and prohibition. So why did men join a fraternal lodge that would not allow them to drink? If they wished not to drink, why form a fraternal organization around this? How did traditional rituals of masculine sociability fit with Protestant religiosity? The lodges offered the vision of a better world, a postmillennial looking forward to the ushering of a Kingdom of God of which they would a part. They encouraged men and women of faith to participate in a noble cause, and reinforced their belief that they were doing God’s work. The lodges supplemented these lofty ideals with a sense of ritual, companionship, opportunities for socialization, encouragement for those who wished to stop drinking themselves, a vision of male members as respectable and manly citizens, entertainment, and sometimes, financial support in cases of injury or death.

Perhaps obviously, the first step in becoming part of the world of the temperance lodges was the act of joining. Pressure from family and friends often accounted for many of those who joined, and appears not dissimilar to previously noted patterns of religious conversion, in which family members often joined together, or under the influence of one particularly devout member. It is not uncommon to see numerous people with the same last name joining a lodge over a period of a couple of months. Although much of the literature on family influence on religious conversion and belief tends to focus on the power women had over sons, husbands and nephews, this has proven difficult to verify with the lodge records, so it is impossible as of yet to see if this gendered pattern extends to the temperance lodges. However, although members were often zealous about recruiting friends and family to the lodge, those family members did not always hold to their pledges as much as their sponsors might desire.

Sometimes people were pressured into joining even when they apparently felt no affinity for the cause. For example, Fred Robins was one of the founders of the London IOGT lodge in 1908. He and his wife were fervent Congregationalists, and believers in the temperance cause, and duly enrolled their four children in the lodge as soon as possible. Of the four children, three attended meetings faithfully, and held various positions in the organization as they grew up. The fourth child, Fred’s
oldest son, John, was a dues-paying member (or perhaps his parents continued to pay his dues to keep him as a member in good standing) from the beginning of the lodge until he and his younger brother Arthur joined the army. John remained on the rolls until the lodge became dormant in 1917. However, although his financial contributions were always made, John attended a mere handful of meetings out of the almost ten years he was a member. The only meetings he did attend were, notably, those immediately after the untimely death of his sister Margaret in 1911. John married after the war, but later deserted his wife and son to drift around Western Canada while his father and younger sister Jessie took care of his finances. Fred may have had high hopes for the roles his children would play in the temperance movement, but except for Jessie, the rest either died young, or were never interested in the cause to which Fred devoted so much effort. Family pressure can account for why some people joined, but not necessarily why they stayed.

If not for family pressure or religious fervour, why did other men (and women) remain members of the temperance lodges? Popular press consideration of the temperance lodges sometimes took a solely secular view, suggesting that the lodges prepared men for careers as strong political leaders, and also allowed a chance to socialize with the opposite gender in safe, respectable circumstances. In a heavily romanticized encomium to both Templary and rural life from the Toronto Daily Globe, republished in the 1888 International Good Templar, the writer discusses both the fun that there was to be had as well as the important civil impact of the lodges, writing first about the lodge outings, where:

The farmer and the missus, the clerk and the blacksmith, the hired man and the hired girl all piled into the sleigh together, knees were freely utilized when the seating accommodation gave out, strong and willing arms volunteered to keep the band together, generally however, confining their attentions to some favorite waist, the driver was crossed down on the tongue of the sleigh, and with song and joke and laughter, away went the jolly party through the keen, cold night, behind a farmer’s spanking team, ruthlessly destroying the fiction that temperance people are long-faced, and narrow-chested, and weak-limbed, and baby-muscled, and creaky-voiced, and watery-minded.

Temperance lodges may have been serious about the evils of alcohol and their Christian duty, but that did not interfere with efforts to make their meetings entertaining for members, with outings, picnics, teas, debates and
spelling bees, among other activities. In general, the entertainment and Christian political action were seen as compatible, although occasionally a temperance newspaper would sound the alarm that lodges were spending too much time on pleasant activities and not enough on their mission.17

The same Toronto Daily Globe journalist also saw the lodge not only as a locus for respectable fun, but also as a prime training ground for public life, writing that:

The pulpits all over this country are filled with men who got their preliminary training in the Temple or the Division, and thence were graduated into the ministry. Many of our municipal representatives date their interest in affairs and their capacity for public business to the opportunities which the Lodges afforded. In scores of young men the taste for reading and the desire for information had birth in the rivalries of the Lodges. Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, Hon. G.W. Ross, Hon. Geo. E. Foster, Sir Leonard Tilley, Hon. Mackenzie Bowell – scores of our public men have stepped from the threshold of the Lodge into public life and grown into prominence with the Temperance movement.18

The writer, notably, does not put much emphasis on the actual work of temperance, beyond its usefulness as a training ground for politicians and the pulpit, other than a brief mention of the few souls the temperance lodges managed to save from the evils of drinking. This lack of emphasis on the effectiveness of temperance training on politicians was something that members of the lodges saw borne out in practice, much to their dismay. Of the politicians listed above, only Sir Samuel Tilley carried his temperance beliefs into his political career. Tilley at one point held the office of the Most Worthy Patriarch of the Sons of Temperance of North America, the highest office in that organization, and worked publicly for temperance in his political career.19 Some of the others ran on temperance platforms, but made no effort to enact prohibitory legislation once elected.

A notable disappointments was Sir George William Ross, a member of the IOGT, who, as a backbencher for the Ontario Liberal Party in 1874 spoke in the House of Commons in support of prohibition, saying that “On a question like this, when the choice is between the paltry revenue of a few millions – paltry because life is invaluable as compared with money – and the sacrifice of many of the noblest and best of our young men, I decide in favor of humanity.”20 With rhetoric like this, members of the temperance lodges believed that when he became premier of the province in
1899, he would continue to bring his temperance beliefs into his public life and finally enact the prohibitory laws they had been long promised. In this, however, they were to be disappointed. However, he used the stalling tactic, also employed by Sir Oliver Mowat at the provincial level in 1894 and Sir Wilfrid Laurier at the federal level in 1898, of insisting on holding a plebiscite first to determine the will of the people. In 1902, the referendum was held, and although a majority of the votes cast were for prohibition, as they had also in 1894 and 1898, Sir George Ross disappointed his temperance supporters greatly by refusing to bring in the desired legislation. Long membership in the lodges was, as members discovered to their dismay, no guarantee that politicians would advance their goals and halt the sale of alcohol. Although some would take their ideals of Christian masculine stewardship of society to the political arena, most would not, at least when it came to enacting prohibitory laws.

But drinking and the pledge were obviously not secondary matters to the lodges themselves. On joining a lodge, the most formal part of the initiation ceremony was the public taking of the pledge, which varied slightly over time and between organizations, but this one is fairly representative: “You, in the presence of Almighty God, and of these witnesses, solemnly and unreservedly promise that you will never make, buy, sell, use, furnish, or cause to be furnished to others, as beverage, any Spirituous Liquors, Wine or Cider and that in all honorable ways you will discontinue their use in the community.”

In order to underscore the importance of abstaining from alcohol to the lodges and society as a whole, the Sons of Temperance initiation ceremony emphasized this point heavily, through use of the binary ideas of Christian masculinity vs. depraved manhood:

Man walks forth in the pride and dignity of his manhood. His eye searcheth upward after God. The earth and all its fullness minister unto him. On his brow wisdom sits enthroned, reason guides his footsteps, his great heart encompasseth all his kingdom. Plenty springs up in his pathway, he giveth aid to the needy, and is the supporting staff of parents and home. But strong drink takes possession of him, his visage is marred and debased, he creeps in the slough of sensuality, his heart’s best affections are blunted, the dear ties of kindred are broken, and cruelty and shame take up their habitations within him. Strong drink is the foe of man, the destroyer of manhood: therefore we hate it, O Brother.
In contrast to the depravity of drink, the temperance lodges set the figure of the ideal man, who was self-controlled, interested in the welfare of others, and independent.

In contrast, although the International Order of Good Templars had fairly similar views on ideal masculinity, their initiation ritual placed much less emphasis on gender roles. This may be due in part to the fact that the IOGT, from its inception, always allowed female members, whereas the Sons of Temperance started as a male organization, and only slowly and with some resistance started to allow women to join, initially as visitors and later as full members. But while the IOGT did not dwell on gender roles in their initiation ceremony, they did try to make it clear that, from the moment of joining the lodge, members were expected to take their pledges seriously and that the consequences of alcohol use were paramount in their minds: “We have seen the tears of the widow and orphan; and have heard the low sad wail of agony sent up by broken hearts. We have seen bright hopes and prospects blasted; and the innocence of youth grown old with the deformity of ignorance and want. We have seen beauty clothed with rags and shame, and manhood shorn of its glory – each repeating daily the sad warning of the past: ‘BEWARE OF STRONG DRINKS!’”

The initiation ceremony was merely the beginning of a new member’s exposure to rhetoric featuring the evils of alcohol. The ceremonies were designed to be an impressive introduction to the life and mission of the lodges, and to impress on initiates the importance and solemnity of the order, and the seriousness of their mission. However much fun and entertainment might follow in practice, initiation ceremonies were intended to be solemn affairs, dedicating the new members to the order, to God, and to the temperance cause. However, despite the pomp, circumstance and later attempts to make lodge life enjoyable, many of those who joined the lodge did not stay. By far the most common cause for expulsion from the lodge was for non-payment of dues, which suggests that of the many who joined, some found the obligations and expectations of lodge life too onerous, or the financial burden too heavy.

But many did stay, often for decades. When the Sons of Temperance lodge at Orono celebrated its fortieth anniversary in 1890, among those attending were several men who had belonged to the lodge for more than two decades, and in two cases, since the 1850s. These older members occasionally stated that they found it difficult to make it to meetings, but made an effort to pay their dues and remain as brothers. Two of these
long-term members, George Walkey and John Gifford, at a meeting years earlier, had related their reasons for joining the lodge, and both stated that they had been drinkers before joining the Sons of Temperance, and had, with the help of their fraternal brothers, stopped. Past Worthy Patriarch Robert Moment chimed in that he, too, had had “his own experience with the “Brown Jug” and explained for [that] reason he sympathised with others that now use the same.”25 These men, each of whom had joined the Orono Sons of Temperance lodge in the first decade of its founding, spoke out about their reasons for joining, and how the lodge had helped them to abstain from drinking held pride of place. They found in the fraternal atmosphere of the lodge what they needed to become total abstainers. Thus, the usefulness of the lodge to members who wished to stop drinking was a major reason that men stayed.

But what of those whose dedication to the temperance cause or their pledge was not as intense, or who gave in sporadically to the temptations of alcohol? Most of the expulsions that occurred from every lodge studied were due to the non-payment of dues, which may indicate a waning of sympathy with the temperance cause. But far more dramatic occasions were the expulsions of those who had broken their pledge. The IOGT records I have are mostly from the early twentieth century, and while violations do occur, they appear to be relatively infrequent. In contrast, the very complete records of the Orono Sons of Temperance Lodge over fifty years of their existence show many violations of their pledge. They did become relatively less frequent as the nineteenth century drew to a close, but never completely disappeared. Interestingly, the record of violations in the Orono lodge did not drop off after they started to admit women. The members did not seem to make any effort to amend their behaviour when female visitors started to attend.27 No records so far show a female member of any lodge being brought up on charges, much less expelled.

Not all violations of the temperance pledge led to expulsion, however. And when they did not, religious tropes of repentance and forgiveness provided a basis for the pattern the organizations tended to follow. In the Orono Sons of Temperance minutes, a very clear pattern emerges. If a man was charged with violating Article Two of their Constitution (the pledge), there were generally two outcomes. If the man refused to meet with the committee appointed to investigate the charge, or refused to come to a meeting and explain himself, the result was usually expulsion. However, if, once accused, a man admitted that he had violated the pledge, and stated that he wished to remain a member of the lodge and,
in general, acted with repentance, he was usually retained. Even habitual violators of the oath could, on occasion, be retained, although in general, the more violations, the more likely expulsion was. This tendency to keep those who admitted their wrongs and asked forgiveness shows that the lodges were not single-minded in their dedication to the ideals of temperance, and indeed, that their religious framework made it possible to expel some men for being unrepentant while welcoming back those who admitted their guilt and begged pardon. They did not condone violations of the oath, but they also understood that it was not as easy to forswear drinking as it was to recite the pledge.

Repentance was the key, which also points to their desire that members take manly responsibility for their actions, as well as indicating that they were not ready to give up on someone so easily. There is also a sense that long-time lodge members knew each other well, and knew who was actually struggling with what we would today call an addiction, and who was a member in name only. In the most dramatic case, Francis Fitzpatrick, shoemaker from Orono, joined the Sons of Temperance lodge in 1854 for the first time at the age of twenty-one, four years after the founding of the lodge. Over the next sixteen years, he was brought up on charges no fewer than thirteen times, and expelled six times in total.25 He often had the same sponsor nominating him for membership, possibly pointing to someone in the community who hoped he could be helped. Several of the times he was charged with a violation of Article Two, the charge was not brought by one of the brothers, but through a confession before the group by Fitzpatrick himself. However, he was always penitent when brought up on charges and showed a desire to do better, which can help us understand why the Sons of Temperance continuously admitted a man with a long history of habitual drunkenness. While the Sons took their oaths seriously, they believed in second chances, or, in this extraordinary case, thirteenth chances. They hoped they could help him attain the ideal of masculinity that they themselves worked hard to retain. In Frank’s case, however, the flip-side of masculine dissipation led them to finally refuse to continue admitting him to membership, although one brother tried repeatedly, even after the thirteenth offence.

In conclusion, men joined to socialize, to work for a cause they believed in, and often, for mutual aid in stopping drinking. Not all who joined stayed, and family pressure, religious belief and a fraternal atmosphere were not always enough to convince men that this was an organization and a cause with which they wanted to affiliate themselves.
Moreover, even among those who stayed, their political lives did not always live up to the hopes of the temperance movement. But those who remained did so because they found in the message of the lodges a cause to believe in, fun to be had, and an image of themselves as men that was appealing.
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The United Church of Canada’s Deaconess Order came into being in 1926, the year after the United Church was formed. Originating in the 1890s, in the Methodist and Presbyterian churches, the Deaconess Order provided a venue for women to get a theological education enabling them to carry out a variety of social and educational ministries: in congregations, with a focus on education and church expansion; in domestic or foreign missions, as teachers or nurses; and, in programming with youth and children. Deaconesses pioneered women in public ministerial leadership. They performed amazing and important work that helped to shape Canada’s commitment to provide universal social support and education. Their contribution wove a richness into the fabric of the United Church.

But the Deaconess Order was open only to single women. Members of the Order who married were “disjoined” from it and thereby forced to resign from employment and membership. Marriage bars in professions dominated by middle class women were common in the first half of the twentieth century. These bars prohibited women from entering training or a profession if married and from continuing in the job after marriage. Margaret Wonfor, one of the disjoined deaconesses observed, “So many [church] people, when they hear what the church did to me, they try to excuse it by saying, ‘Oh, that happened to teachers too’ as if that makes it okay. I think they are saying ‘we don’t need to be accountable.’” Margaret continues, “But the United Church policy of disjoining was different, I don’t know if people can understand that, we lost our status too.”
and that was the part that really stung.” Deaconesses were removed from the profession. The indignity was symbolized by the passing back of the deaconess pin that had been presented at the time of designation.

Disjoining, a violent word, conveys the severity of the rupture for women who experienced it. Hundreds of women were affected by this rule, not only those who were removed from ministry, but also those who chose marriage instead of ministry. The practice of disjoining was continued by the United Church well into the 1950s when it began to be overturned, but only for some. In 1960 the practice was officially discontinued, yet as late as 1968 disjoining occurred. Yet, even after the last woman was disjoined, the effects lingered. The attitudes and beliefs supported by disjoining proved difficult to shed and were actualized directly for another twenty years, most notably when women sought to regain their ministry status as that became possible.

In 2006 The United Church of Canada officially apologized to the women affected by disjoining in response to a petition motivated by the story of a disjoined woman, Joan (Peck) McDonald. The petition called on the church to apologize to the women for the cost to their lives from the evil of sexism. Elizabeth Eberhart Moffat, an initiator of the proposal explained, “I thought an apology might empower the women who are still alive . . . with new life and validate them, it is horrible when things are forgotten and buried.” However, the stories of the women remain hidden and the lessons that could be learned, from the disjoinings and from the apology, remain largely undiscovered.

The vast majority of people in the United Church will not have ever heard of the disjoining rule. Even fewer will know of the apology. Four disjoined women, Wilma (Unwin) Cade, Marion (Woods) Kirkwood, Ruth (Sandilands) Scott and Joan (Cheesman) Willis represented their sisters at the apology given by the General Council Executive in 2006. The women were appreciative of the effort of the church to confess and apologize, but they were also critical. Marion Kirkwood expressed the common feeling of the women: “Many parts of the service were affirming of my story, but, what I really wanted to say [was] . . . ‘we want to see some action now’ . . . Before we really accept this apology let’s see some ways of moving [the church] ahead.”

The apology was enacted to fulfill the obligation the church made when accepting the petition, but it largely lacked commitment and was devoid of passion. It was decided with virtually no consultation with those who were most directly wronged by the practice and offered with little
preparation among the church membership or even with those participating in the speaking of its words. Couched almost entirely in the past, delivered with no deliberation regarding restitution or reconciliation and enacted with no plan for any contemporary repentance for ongoing discrimination, the apology, perpetuates the poor treatment that the women received in the first place.

Margaret (Brown) Wonfor was disjoined in 1957. Her story illustrates the many effects of the disjoining. Margaret came from a farm in southwestern Ontario. She and the United Church were born in the same year, 1925. From a family proud of a missionary aunt, also named Margaret, who served in China for forty-three years, Margaret long held a dream of being a missionary too. Insufficient money for both her and her brother to go to university meant she went to teacher’s college. After eight years teaching in Toronto, Margaret decided to pursue her lingering dream and she went to the United Church Training School. As graduation approached she decided she would respond to a need for a Woman’s Missionary Society worker in Alberta. She was designated a deaconess and commissioned a missionary in 1954. After a short period of service in Lethbridge, Alberta she headed to Pincher Creek where she rode the circuit of small isolated congregations, establishing a new larger parish. Then she met Herb, an ordained minister, serving just about as far north in Alberta as she was south. Their long distance relationship began. When Margaret was asked to consider a Christian Education position in Calgary she told the congregation, “There may be a complicating factor!” She knew she had to decide: marriage or ministry? She and Herb met in Winnipeg at Christmas and she returned with an engagement ring. In recalling those weeks of discernment, Margaret describes a tough decision, and while happy with becoming a wife, she felt a true loss. The head of the Deaconess Order wrote promptly upon hearing the news of her engagement, “we will be expecting your resignation.” Margaret became another woman disjoined from ministry, simply because she decided to marry.

But disjoining was not the end of Margaret’s ministry. Five children in six years kept her focused on the home front but in recounting her life she talks about the congregations and communities “we” served. “I worked all the time, just not for money,” she explains, “but not teaming with my husband, no, I made my own contribution.” She established an outreach ministry and held many key leadership roles in the broader church. In her words both she and Herb “retired” in 1990, but continue to provide warm pastoral care and volunteer service to their church.
Margaret conveys a sense of satisfaction with her life. She made up for the lost opportunities of diaconal ministry through a fulfilling lay ministry. But she feels that the disjoining was unfair, not just for the loss of immediate employment, but most pointedly because she lost her status as a deaconess. In the 1980s, Margaret’s husband experienced some serious health problems, and they were unsure if he would be able to resume work. She approached the Toronto Conference staff to see what would be required for her to be readmitted to the diaconal order. “Oh, you’re one of those women we don’t know what to do with” was the response she received. She was then told that she would have to begin all over again, become a candidate and take the diaconal ministry education program. Margaret explained:

There was no thought that anything I had done in the past would be taken into consideration. I’m sure they wouldn’t have treated an ordained [man] the same way. [He wouldn’t have lost his status]. It was continued discrimination; if they hadn’t taken away my status in 1957 I would still have been a diaconal minister. Imagine, becoming a candidate all over again!

Herb’s health was restored and he was able to return to paid ministry. Margaret abandoned her quest for recognition in the face of what she experienced.

The 1926 Deaconess Constitution makes the rule explicit: “On marrying a deaconess ceases to be a member of the Order.”13 The same Constitution also assured women that anyone who withdrew and later wanted to be readmitted would, “receive the status that was hers at the time of withdrawal.” While the number of women who sought reinstatement in the 1970s and 80s was small, for the majority it did not happen.

Disjoining was supported by a common theological view that a woman’s primary vocation was that of wife and mother, and, to round out the trinity, church volunteer. But at the same time, the church needed the professional labour of women, so it also proclaimed a theology that supported a public vocation for women. In an attempt to fulfill its competing interests the church then established systems that allowed, but limited, women’s public vocations, while protecting the view of marriage as a vocation. Supporting and mirroring the social and economic controls of the secular world the church was effectively able to control this aspect of women’s lives.

It is not hard to find stories which demonstrate how disjoining
opportunistically served the needs of the church, which was willing to abandon rigidly held positions to suit its own needs, and treating women as disposable. The story of Gwen (Davis) McMurtry is an astounding example. She was the only woman disjoined twice.

Gwen was one of three sisters who graduated from the United Church Training School and became deaconesses. All three of them were disjoined. Gwen was designated a deaconess in May 1944. Although engaged to Doug McMurtry at the time, no objection was raised by the Committee on Deaconess Work, even though she was upfront that she would be marrying. This was not unusual; the whole system was predicated on deaconess work being temporary. Gwen went to serve the congregation at Lethbridge, Alberta. When Doug got word that he was going to be sent overseas he and Gwen got married in December 1944. She resigned from her position and passed back her pin, but in January, 1945, the Committee discussed the case and decided that: since Mrs. McMurtry’s husband would be serving in China with “The Friends Ambulance Unit” and considering the fine work she has been doing in Lethbridge that she be continued as a member of the Deaconess Order. Gwen agreed to this offer and was deployed again as a working deaconess. When the Committee became aware of Doug’s return to Canada in 1947 they then “agreed that Mrs. McMurtry be appraised of the ruling as found in the Constitution and that she be now disjoined from the Order.” Doug McMurtry did not recall his wife being angry at having to relinquish her status again. As he remembers, there was no real debate in her mind because “the option of work and vocation for women was just not possible.” But the church had the power to make it possible arbitrarily!

Gwen McMurtry’s story is unique; there is no evidence of other exemptions to the disjoining rule during the war period when the shortage of ministry personnel was so acute. She was the first, and only, married deaconess in the United Church until 1956. There is no indication why this aberration to the rules occurred because disjoining seems to have never been officially discussed.

In 1928, the minutes of the Committee on Employed Women Workers in the Church, grant three soon-to-be-married deaconesses an “honourable discharge.” The minutes also note, “Another problem is presented in the fact that the average term of service given by women is a short one and that new recruits must constantly be found.” However, there is no record of whether this minute of concern was informed by a discussion of their practice of “honourable discharge” for married women.
The record is silent. In fact, no recorded discussion of the practice of the marriage bar appears in any extant minutes from the adjudicatory structure, the deaconess and women workers associations or the training school. Only in the 1950s, just prior to its repeal does it appear as an item for debate. Until the 1950s the church, like the women affected by the rule, just seemed to accept as a given that deaconesses must be single.

During the post war period, in most professions, marriage bars were officially removed. The churches were one of the last holdouts. Roles for women in the church were being scrutinized worldwide in the 1950s. Yet even the United Church, which was a strong advocate for opening doors for women in social and economic policy, did not readily turn its gaze on its own practices as an employer. Official church documents of the period reveal the ambiguity in the church’s position. As early as 1951 the Committee on the Deaconess Order and Women Workers without any prior reference in the minutes, expressed the intention to remove the rule, and voted to recommend that the General Council do so. But opposition from within the Committee structure was voiced, affecting its implementation and in 1952 the decision was reversed. There is plenty of evidence that the church’s view on vocation and marriage is what historian Mary Kinnear calls, “fossilized assumptions about women that date back to a pre-industrial economy.”

It was at this time that that Ruth Sandilands (Lang) became a deaconess (1951) and undertook ministry as a Christian Education Director in a busy suburban church. In 1949, while studying at the United Church Training School, she had felt the rule was unfair. When asked by Jean Hutchinson, one of the staff members, if she was prepared to forego marriage for service she instantly said, “Yes.” But after a week of reflection she sought out her teacher to declare that she was not going to be put in the position of deciding. “I told her I would fight it.” As Ruth remembered the conversation, Jean neither encouraged nor discouraged her thinking. “[The staff] were conflicted, we knew that they didn’t like the rule, but they upheld the Church and its authority, things were different then for women. I guess I was a rabble rouser, and Mrs. Hutchinson knew it!”

In 1952, after the decision to rescind the rule was reversed, Harriet Christie, the Dean of the United Church Training School, wrote to the Committee:

I do not see why marriage, per se, disqualifies a woman from
membership in the Deaconess Order. If membership in the Order results from the call of God to serve Him, I do not see why marriage invalidates that call . . . Marriage in itself does not necessarily alter either the nature or the quality of the work, for many married women in all vocations continue to work after marriage. I can think of no vocation where marriage automatically removes status, and I do not see why it should in this case . . . It seems to me that this clause in the [Deaconess Order] Constitution contributes to the attitude that women’s place is in the home, that women may be classified together rather than individual persons considered for her own merits. 

Ruth recalled sharing news of her engagement with Harriet Christie at an alumni gathering in 1952. Harriet spoke to her about the possible changes coming, but only in a quiet, private conversation.

Earlier the next year Ruth asked the Deaconess Committee for an exemption to the marriage bar. She planned to be married in the spring and the congregation she was serving, at her request, had agreed to keep her employed for two years beyond her marriage. The Committee granted the two-year exemption for “as long as she continues to perform duties of a deaconess.” However, Ruth didn’t get married in 1953, but waited until 1955, when her employment with Grace United Church in Brampton, Ontario ended and she was disjoined. Ruth explained:

I don’t know why I gave up my idea [of an exemption]. Wib [my husband] was ordained, we moved, we were going to have a family, it was the 1950s, it was so different . . . Still it seemed unfair, we were just dumped, I had more experience than Wib. Oh well, we just went on doing the work.

When Ruth was asked for her pin back at the meeting of the Deaconess Association in 1955, she said with great passion, “You can’t have mine!”

Later in 1953, the Committee again decided to support the removal of the rule, but they did not take the revised Constitution to the General Council for adoption, and consequently, disjoining remained officially in place for seven more years. Dorothy Naylor, a United Church Training School student in 1957 remembers that the disjoining was like the elephant in the room. “Everyone talked about it, but, we never talked about it.” Dorothy tells a story about the first year students arriving to dinner, each wearing a sparkling ring from Woolworth’s on her left hand. The principal congratu-
lated each one on her engagement. Dorothy explains:

[It] was kind of a joke . . . [yet] we thought that whenever one of the students was going to be married, that would be considered by the staff as a really bad thing . . . We never heard a staff person [say] ‘Now we want to discourage you from being married because the church needs you,’ but in our minds, the staff – the mothers – would not want [us to get married].

The church did need the service of these trained women. In this period the demand for deaconesses was unprecedented. In one month alone the Committee had received “23 urgent requests from congregations” for trained women workers. In the years between 1956 and 1960 the Committee reported the marriages and disjoining of twenty deaconesses and that four students from the United Church Training School were to be married instead of becoming deaconesses. The Committee did grant five limited exemptions, yet, Tena Campion, the Order’s Executive Secretary, did not share the information about the possibility of applying for an exemption, nor report any of the discussion and decision making underway in the Committee and General Council structures in her biannual letters to the Order nor at the annual meeting of women workers. Even students at the United Church Training School, whose Principal was on the Deaconess Committee, were not aware of the exemptions. Mae (Walker) Gracey, who left the Training School before graduation to get married explains, ‘I don’t recall any information suggesting the rule would change . . . we were young, we didn’t ask questions, we were kept in the dark.’

It is, at the very least, ironic that Tena Campion, the Order’s Executive Secretary, was herself married. Married women were working in the church all the time that disjoining for marriage had been practiced, including working in positions that could be recognized as deaconess work, as this story illustrates. Mrs. Pearl (Spencer) Budge, a 1926 graduate of the Methodist school and a deaconess until she was married and disjoined in 1931, wrote to the Committee in 1961, requesting reinstatement to the Order as she began a new appointment in Christian Education at Bathurst Street United Church in Toronto. The minutes outline that Mrs. Budge served as a married “trained woman worker” from 1944 to 1959 in a variety of church positions. The Committee approved her application and granted her reinstatement.

Employing non-statused married women, who had even less
Caryn Douglas

protection against exploitation than deaconesses, who had at least the provisions of the Deaconess Constitution, was another plank in the church’s strategy to meet its own personnel needs without compromising views of women’s proper role. This plank continued to be used after the marriage bar disappeared in 1960, as women continued to be disjoined when they stopped working.

In the 1959 letter acknowledging deaconess Dorothy Naylor’s appointment to Glad Tidings Mission in Saint John, New Brunswick, the minister associated with the Mission wrote to her, “As a matter of interest, I may say that according to present plans, Joyce [the deaconess you are replacing] has her wedding scheduled for July third or fourth. I hope yours won’t come too soon, nor yet be delayed too long!”

Women were left trying to navigate a way through the mixed messages that the church sent, that women would commit to lifelong service and that they would be temporary workers in preparation for their real vocation as wife and mother.

In December 1960, Dorothy announced her engagement. She wrote to the Board of Home Missions staff, “I can imagine that by now the Board must consider Glad Tidings a dangerous place to send single women workers!” Dorothy continued to serve the Mission as a deaconess for a year after marriage and then left the employ of the church as she and her ordained husband moved for his graduate education to the United States. She recalls, “I always said that being married was not the issue in my case - it was about not working.” When she left the Mission, her status as a deaconess was revoked.

The end of the marriage bar for deaconesses happened in a pivotal period in women’s ministries in the United Church. In a complete overhaul that included ending the Woman’s Missionary Society, The Committee on Deaconesses and Women Workers was dissolved in 1962 and the Deaconess Order was concluded as deaconesses became ex officio members of Presbytery. In 1964 the courts of the church assumed full responsibility for “the receiving, supervising, designating and settlement of women candidates for work in the Church.”

During this period of confusion many questions about how, and by whom, deaconesses would be regulated arose and individuals and small groups of inexperienced and often ill-informed people had a lot of power to enact the rules as they understood them. The decisions made had life changing impacts on the women affected and they were not even consulted in the process.

The expectation that deaconesses should be single was well
entrenched. Awareness of the change in the rule was limited within the church structure. It was limited even among deaconesses, curtailing their educational and advocacy role within the courts. Ordained ministers were accustomed to setting the working conditions for the deaconesses that they hired and supervised. With nearly one hundred presbyteries and no national body to provide education or advocacy, deaconesses were in a vulnerable position.

Wilma (Unwin) Cade was disjoined in 1964. Upon graduation from the United Church Training School in 1960, she was designated a deaconess, and took up her first placement in Ontario where she met Peter, whom she married three years later. Wilma remembers, “[the ordained minister in the congregation where I worked] explained to me that the church really didn’t think that women should carry on after they were married. I did carry on for a year, at least he said that was alright, so I did carry on for a year.” At the end of the year, the minister informed Wilma her time was up. She lost her job and her status. Fifteen years later Wilma was again treated unjustly as she sought to regain her status. As a trained lay worker, Wilma had become a Director of Christian Education. When the congregation experienced financial difficulties she was let go. As she recalls, “it was explained to me that if I had been a deaconess they would not have been able to so summarily get rid of me.” She returned to volunteer work and to gain more security, and to enhance her chances of getting a position, Wilma decided to seek reinstatement to the Deaconess Order. She applied to Toronto Conference, but as Wilma explained:

... they were very formal about it and said they didn’t reinstate people unless they had a salary, a position in the church, so doing all this work for free didn’t qualify, so... while I had time to jump through the hoops... the church wouldn’t have me because I wasn’t being paid.

The last woman, I believe, to be officially disjoined by the United Church because she married was Joan (Davies) Sandy. She was disjoined in 1968. Joan graduated from the United Church Training School in 1961 and was designated a deaconess and appointed by the Woman’s Missionary Society (WMS) to serve as a missionary on a pastoral charge in northern Saskatchewan. When the WMS was integrated into the official structures of the United Church in 1962, Joan was transferred to the Board of Home Missions. During a furlough leave in 1967 she met with the staff from the Board and innocently mentioned she was to be married in the coming
summer. Returning home she found a letter informing her that since her appointment had been made under the WMS their rules governed her employment, and, since the WMS did not employ married women, upon her marriage, she would be required to leave the position she had filled for seven years. Further, she was obligated to pass back her pin and was resigned from the Deaconess Order. This latter action was justified by the same explanation as her firing, even though the WMS never administered the rules of the Order; they were distinctly separate entities. Joan was never certain who made the decision to fire and disjoin her, but it seemed to her that it was the decision of perhaps just one person. She recalled that she was angry at the time, but she was about to marry a farmer and was hoping to have a family and dedicate herself to parenting, so she accepted the decision. In the 1980s she applied and regained her status as a Diaconal Minister.39

It is difficult to document the end of the practice of disjoining because the situation for deaconesses was unclear for decades. Between the 1960s and the 1980s rules were applied with considerable variance. Clarity is only reached in the 1980s, when diaconal ministry is recognized as a stream of ordered ministry. It becomes a lifelong vocation regardless of marital or employment status.

Disjoining excluded women from a community, from the “family.” The rupture from community was painful for many of the women, both those who were disjoined and those who remained behind. Jean Angus, who was a deaconess from 1953 until she was ordained in 1977, expressed this loss.

There were mixed feelings about the girls who got married, like they were jumping ship. At the [annual Deaconess Order] meetings you would hear the news of who was getting married and you would think, just a bit, what a waste of their training . . . the old girls like me were left, we had each other.40

This pattern of clearly demarcating who was in, and out, affected and shaped the experience that deaconesses had. Disjoining contributed to the fragmentation of an already small community of women in church vocations.

The image of a deaconess as a young woman, just waiting for her man was strong. Older deaconesses, particularly those who served in Canada, were viewed as women who had failed to attain the real vocation of wife. Even young deaconesses expressed this negative view. One
Deaconess who had graduated in the 1960s commented that she was uncomfortable using the title “‘deaconess’ . . . which smacked of ‘old maiden aunts in black stockings.’”

The ministry of deaconesses has been trivialized over the years. Despite the significant and important work of the Order, much of their efforts and contributions were patronized and undervalued. Deaconesses were poorly paid, viewed as expendable, hired on short term contracts, had inadequate pensions, and were excluded from being involved in making the decisions that regulated their lives. By and large, church authorities argued that deaconesses did not require adequate remuneration or protection against exploitative working conditions because they were only young women, giving short service until they assumed their vocation of wife and mother, and the financial support of a husband. Even though as many as half of the women designated as deaconesses remained in the service of the church for their entire working lives, popular understanding highlighted that the deaconess order offered a temporary staging ground for marriage. Disjoining structurally systemized this minimization of women in the diaconate. Disjoining entrenched into policy discriminatory, and, sexist and heterosexist attitudes.

With the apology the United Church had an opportunity to sincerely address the disjoining and its legacy. Validation of the stories and an acknowledgement of the serious cost of the injustice to its victims could have been accomplished. However, it is not what disjoined woman Margaret Wonfor experienced.

In 2007, when London Conference marked the apology by incorporating a time of recognition into a service at their Annual Meeting Margaret Wonfor was one of two disjoined women present. They were not asked to play any role in the service. Margaret was appreciative of the work that a few women in particular had put into it, especially because she sensed there was some reluctance on behalf of the Conference to have a service at all, sensing a “climate of disinterest.” When asked how she felt about receiving the public apology, she responded: “They didn’t apologize . . . It was a brief part of a bigger service . . . but they didn’t say, ‘we are sorry’ . . . I was disappointed, it could have been leaven, it was a lost opportunity.”
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In her book, *A Long Eclipse*, Catherine Gidney describes the Student Christian Movement of Canada (SCM) as “the Public Voice of Religion and Reform on the University Campus from the 1920s to the 1960s.” Roger Hutchinson concludes, in his 1975 doctoral thesis on the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order (FCSO), that “by the mid-1940s most socially concerned Christians appear to have withdrawn from the struggle to change the basic social order or to have made their peace with the institutions that were directing the energies of the nation toward post-war reconstruction and cold-war prosperity.” I believe an examination of the work camp movement in the SCM, starting in 1945 and extending into the late sixties and seventies, is an important key to the former and an exception to the latter.

With more than sixty work camps affecting at least one thousand student participants for over twenty-five years, this piece of Canadian church history merits a thorough study in its own right. However, this essay focuses on the origins and early years of the work camp movement in the SCM, as background and context for the creation of Howland House, an SCM-related cooperative in Toronto from 1953 to 1975, the subject of my McGeachy-funded research.

The history of the SCM work camps sheds light on the period between the 1940s and 1970s and allows one to trace the ongoing current of Christian commitment to social justice and transformation. From the radicalism of the church of the depression years (represented for many by...
the emergence of the FCSO), through the expansive and yet politically cautious years of the cold war, to the inventive and experimental sixties and the emergence in the 1970s of the ecumenical coalitions as a significant avenue for engagement with social issues in the life of the Canadian churches, the SCM work camps inspired several generations of socially committed and engaged Christians.

The Beginnings

Similar to the creation of the SCM itself in 1921,³ with regard to the First World War, the radicalism that marked the SCM work camps was connected to the fact that many demobilized soldiers and others impacted by the Second World War were enrolled in university following the war and active in the SCM. The possibility of a new world where economic and social justice could be built was a real expectation as the independence movement in India signalled the defeat of colonialism, and the success of the Red Army in defeating the Japanese was followed by the creation of the People’s Republic of China. The Labour Party was elected in England and the worker priests were engaged in the industrial cities of post-war France. It was an exciting and potentially transformative period in these years before the Cold War hit full force in Canada with the onset of the Korean War in 1950.

There were other, more modest conjunctures which shaped this unique Canadian experiment in Christian student engagement with – and education about – the lives and working conditions of Canadian workers. The minutes of the 17 January 1945 SCM National Executive Committee record two actions, which would in the unfolding of the year, prove prescient. The first was the SCM’s decision to join the Canadian Work Camp Committee (CWCC) in planning a pioneering student-in-industry work camp in Welland, Ontario in the summer of 1945. To this end they appointed Reverend Norman MacKenzie, one of the promoters of this action to the Executive “as a part-time, ‘Student in Industry’ Secretary, on the SCM staff, to work under the direction of a committee of eight people, four being appointed by the C.W.C.C. and four by the S.C.M.”⁶ The second was the agreement to issue an invitation to Rev. Lex Miller to visit Canada and Canadian SCM’s as a speaker, on his way home to New Zealand after seven years in Britain during the war.

Lex Miller, who would become the Director of the first student-in-industry work camp in Welland in that summer of 1945, was a New
Zealander and Presbyterian minister. His father had emigrated to New Zealand from Scotland with his family in 1922. Miller was ordained there in 1934 and was General Secretary of the New Zealand SCM for three years before he left for England. There, he lived and worked for the Presbyterian Church in the east end of London during the early “blitz” years of the war, and then went to the Iona Community in Scotland from 1943-1945. While at Iona his first book, *Biblical Politics, Studies in Christian Social Doctrine*, was published by SCM Press in 1943. It was based on lectures he delivered to conferences of ministers at Iona.

The student-in-industry work camps may have been a uniquely Canadian phenomenon, but the streams that led to their emergence in 1945 included international influences. Lex Miller’s role as a New Zealand SCMer with Iona connections was one piece of this, but not unique. The roots of Christian work camps for students and young people appear to stem from the work of Pierre Ceresole (1879-1945), a Swiss radical pacifist, and his British Quaker friend Hubert Parris. Inspired by the first International Conference of the Fellowship of Reconciliation in Bilthoven, Netherlands in 1919, they organized an international work camp in 1920 to reconstruct the war-damaged village of Esnes-en-Argonne on the former battlefield of Verdun.7

Pierre Ceresole’s initiative resulted in the creation of Service Civil International, or International Voluntary Service, which continues today as a peace and solidarity organization committed to promoting peace and understanding through two- or three-week-long volunteer work camps all over the world.8

Through the American Friends Service Committee (1917), Quakers in the United States had a volunteer work camp tradition tracing back to the same origins. The British SCM and other Youth organizations also had a volunteer service work camp tradition which was enhanced in the early years of the World Council of Churches, when the Youth Department facilitated the participation of young people, including many SCMers, in ecumenical work camps all over the world.9

In Canada, Bev Oaten, Minister of Colborne St. United Church in Brantford from 1941 to 1952 and visionary for, and first Director of the Five Oaks Christian Worker’s Education Centre in Paris, Ontario, was a key actor in the emergence of volunteer service work camps, out of which were introduced the student-in-industry work camps. In *Five Oaks Centre: Its Roots and Growth* he writes, “two university students, Art Dayfoot and Norman Mackenzie, returned from the United States, enthused with work
The date of the establishment of the Canadian Work Camp Committee is a bit unclear, but by 1941 it emerges in the record$^{11}$ with Bev Oaten as Chair, and following the 1941 work camp in Muskoka, Eunice Pyfrom as Secretary. While Bev Oaten refers to a 1938 work camp in *Five Oaks: Its Roots and Growth*, The United Church Observer reports that the Canadian Work Camp Committee’s first work camp was in 1941 when they partnered with the Muskoka Community Project,$^{12}$ for whom Eunice may have worked at the time. Bev Oaten was Director of the work camp with sixteen participants: students, ministers and workers who took holiday time and paid one dollar a day to be part of this work camp experience.$^{13}$

Participants offered Vacation Bible School, painted and repaired church buildings and grounds, and built looms for the Muskoka Community Project. Billeted in different homes, campers met together for worship and breakfast and again at night for supper and study, followed by closing worship. Silent meditation was the form of the worship, building on the Quaker tradition from which one branch of the work camp movement grew, according to an account in *The Pathfinder*.$^{14}$

The following year, volunteer work camps were planned in Muskoka (near Cobalt, Ontario), Simcoe County, North Frontenac and Saskatchewan. Apart from the one planned for Simcoe County, which was to be of two months duration, the camps were scheduled for two to three weeks of volunteer labour.$^{15}$

A slight diversion here into a side-stream revealing another international connection to the emergence of the work camps in Canada and their relationship to other social movements of the time, specifically the cooperative movement. While Bev Oaten says Norman MacKenzie and Art Dayfoot returned from the United States in 1937, it may in fact have been 1935, and they describe the same event reported by Rita Baladad in *Just the Facts: A Brief Survey of Campus Co-op History*, referring to the Quadrennial Assembly of the Student Volunteer Movement which took place over the Christmas break in Indianapolis, Indiana, from 1935 to 1936. "Torohiko Kagawa, Japanese Co-operator, spoke at a Student Christian conference in Indianapolis in 1935. Four University of Toronto theology students, Donald Mclean, Art Dayfoot, Archie Manson and Alex Sim were so moved by his speech that upon returning to Toronto they formed a discussion group to debate the possibility of operating a co-operative. Riding on the tails of a depression, the men decided that a
housing cooperative would be the most pragmatic venture to undertake.”

With the in-kind support of Victoria University, who allowed them to use the second and third floors of 63 St. George Street for the cost of upkeep, Rochdale House, the first University of Toronto student housing cooperative, was established in October 1936.

While Norman MacKenzie’s name is not linked to the co-operative housing venture at the University of Toronto, he too was at the Jubilee Student Volunteer Movement Assembly in 1935 in Indianapolis, and it is reasonable to assume that his decision to work as an extension worker with the Coady Institute of St. Francis Xavier University after graduating from Victoria in 1938 was similarly inspired by his exposure to Yokohito Kogawa in 1935.

Knowing that he was waiting to be deployed as a missionary to China, the terms of Norman Mackenzie’s employment as the SCM’s “student-in-industry” staff included ending the contract with one day’s notice. This was wise, as in less than a month from the SCM Executive’s January 1945 decision to partner in the Welland student-in-industry work camp he was on his way back to China, via India. However, his wife Dorothy and their infant son, Ian, spent the summer at the Welland work camp as camp nurse and “model child.”

In 1945, Eunice Pyfrom, another important name in the emergence of student-in-industry work camps was just completing her studies at the United Church Training School and preparing to be commissioned by the Woman’s Missionary Society. But as Secretary of the Canadian Work Camp Committee, it appears that she had primary responsibility for the practical details of getting this pilot project off the ground.

Eunice’s version of the preparations for this inaugural work camp are found in the work camp’s log under the title, “How to Open a Student-in-Industry Camp – in 400 words.” The saga is amusingly presented but reflects an impressive ability to persist through daunting challenges (no precedent for such an initiative, no accommodation, no Director, no equipment) and, the need to negotiate with many different wartime departments and corporations to successfully locate housing and other basic equipment. A few excerpts offer a taste:

First Word – January – talk with Dr. Harvey Forster over long-distance telephone about such a camp. Does it sound feasible? Yes. Could it be worked in Welland? Quite likely.

Second Word – the next day – Have Douglas Steere talk to an SCM
Missionary Conference and mention the work camps. See that the question comes from the floor; Are there any work camps in Canada? Be sure to answer: Yes there will be a Student-in-Industry Camp in Welland, summer 1945. Then it has to happen.

Third Word – talk with Dr. Forster when he is in Toronto for Board of Home Mission meetings. Assure him that it is no ‘pietistic’ movement. Get his promise to talk it over with his Welland Associates.

Fourth Word – and many succeeding words – visit Welland on numerous occasions . . . Drive around through wartime Housing District . . . In desperation approach the head of the Federal Wartime Housing Commission. Be sure you have Bev Oaten do this, because he stands high in favour with said head. The latter will then inform his Toronto office to do everything possible for the Work Camp Committee . . . a certain building known as the Chinese staff house is empty and available . . . You rest in peace for a time, except for a trip to Philadelphia in an attempt to badger the American Friends Service Committee into sending up a Director for this venture, only to be told that they have 14 camps in prospect for which they have no directors . . . In the meantime you will have SCM Secretaries all across Canada sifting out the hundreds of applications to fill their limited quotas . . . Lex Miller arrives in Canada. You will immediately inform him that he has been appointed by God to direct the first Canadian Student in Industry Work Camp. No matter what he says, you go ahead on that assumption.

Have the Director (that’s Lex Miller) and Associate Director (that’s Eunice Pyfrom) visit Welland to find out that no permit has come through to Wartime Housing for the use of the building. Proceed with more telephone calls to Montreal and Ottawa and then proceed to wangle a load of firewood from a local lumber yard, bedding and other supplies from wartime housing, in desperation buy dishes and cooking utensils from a Farm Service Camp. Have a case of chickenpox develop and move into the building in firm faith that all will be well, even though at that moment you are sans lights, sans water, sans cleanliness . . . sans everything but faith. Three days before camp is to open telephone Mr. Freestone of Wartime Housing and allow him to tell you that permission has come through and the building is yours. The next hymn on the order of service is the Doxology.
The choice of Welland for this trial project was likely no accident. In Rev. Harvey Forster, Superintendent of the All People’s Church and Industrial Mission from 1925 to 1960, the summer student-in-industry work camp had a strong advocate for the engagement of the church in the lives of working people. The All People’s Church and Maple Leaf Mission were located on the “wrong” side of the canal, amidst the factories and homes of largely eastern European families who had been encouraged to move there for work in the industrializing years during the re-building of the Welland Canal in the first part of the twentieth century.

Rev. Harvey Forster and Rev. Fern Sayles, United Church ministers for the congregation and mission, were well-known and highly respected among the working class community, having supported their efforts to unionize in the early forties and protested the government’s seizure of the Ukrainian Hall in 1940 as part of the orders-in-council which made the Communist Party illegal in Canada and imprisoned many of its leaders for three years. When Harvey Forster was elected President of Hamilton Conference in 1943, The Observer noted that “his sympathies were undoubtedly with the common people, their economic and moral rights. The common labourer, and Canadian-born and foreign workers, find in him a friend.”

Having Harvey Forster on the ground facilitated the efforts to find a location for the work camp in the Crowland industrial district of Welland and offered a knowledgeable and passionate resource person for the study sessions of the camp. In his September 1945 article in The Observer, Jack Paterson reports that “Dr. Harvey Forster has been coming every Tuesday night to lead a series of discussions on finding God in History, the Social Order . . . tonight Finding God through Economics.”

The Giant Forge Summer Student-in-Industry Work Camp in Welland

This pioneering summer work camp brought students together to live as a cooperative Christian community and work in factories. It was partly born of the observation that although students were working their way through school in the summers while often attending religious student events, there was no sense of connection between work and worship. Jack E. Paterson, a participant, stated that “either work lacks Christian fellowship with student friends or discussion is carried on in an unreal
world devoid of work.” The Canadian Work Camp Committee and the SCM wanted to bring these together.

Lex Miller’s Report in the 1945 work camp log suggests that Eunice Pyfrom’s conscription of him as work camp director may not have been an answer to his prayers, but in hindsight it certainly appears to have been the work of the Spirit. This work camp became the model for all subsequent SCM work camps, either in the ways in which the organization and theology underlying its arrangements were followed, or amended. It was the blueprint, and a radical blueprint it was.

Because of its pioneering role in both demonstrating the positive impact of this type of summer experience for Christian students and the model created by those who found themselves in Welland in that last summer of World War Two, it is useful to explore some of the organizational details. Following a study of the Rochdale Principles, the camp was established as a cooperative with guidelines developed for setting up a cooperative camp management and a finance system for the summer. This suggests that the earlier side-eddy related to cooperatives is not in fact tangential, but a real component of this unique experiment in “Acts of the Apostles” living.

The Rochdale Principles are: open membership, democratic control (one person, one vote), distribution of surplus in proportion to trade, payment of limited interest on capital, political and religious neutrality, cash trading (no credit extended), and promotion of education. The Primary Principles adopted by the Giant Forge work camp included: one member equals one vote (irrespective of capital investment), capital investment is made with little or no interest, there are patronage dividends, cash terms, open membership and education expansion.

There were General Meetings at the beginning and end of camp, but operationally, the camp was divided into three executive groups of camp members who each took turns running the camp for a month. Each Executive had a Secretary and Historian, a General House Manager who supervised all the chores, an Accountant’s assistant, an Education Convenor who worked with a committee and the Director, a Worship Convenor who also worked with a committee and the Director, a Social Convenor, and a Kitchen Committee responsible for organizing kitchen help, menu planning, and budgeting and buying food.

The work camp was self-funding, with a small grant from the Canadian Work Camp Committee. Everyone provided a ten dollar loan up front for cash flow, and paid weekly room and board. The understanding
was that if there was any surplus at the end of the camp, ten to twenty per cent would go to the Canadian Work Camp Committee and the rest would be divided among participants in proportion to the volume of monetary business they had done with the camp.  

There were also special funds established on a cash basis. One was the Medical Pool, which was voluntary – fifteen cents a week, created because two members of the Camp came down with Chicken Pox early in their time at the camp. The Medical Pool helped offset any medical costs incurred while at the work camp, any surplus at the end of the summer was distributed to participants in the pool. This was prior to Medicare (1966), and the now more common practice of employers providing a certain number of paid sick days per month as part of their employment benefits. (Paid sick leave is still not required under the Employment Standards Act).

Recruited from SCMs across Canada, these work camp pioneers were almost equally male and female. Living co-educationally in a camp-like setting, there were many opportunities to encounter each other in real ways not so easily achieved in university and church settings. Work campers were responsible for finding their own jobs upon arrival and did so in places like Atlas Steel, Joseph Stokes Rubber Co., Plymouth Cordage Co., Page Hersey Pipe and Tube Co., Metallurgical Co., John Deere Co., and Haun Drop Forge Co. For the most part this was heavy work in newly unionized environments. The United Electrical Union had successfully organized in Welland in the early forties, but not all employers, including Atlas Steel, were willing to bargain with them. Harvey Forster had accompanied a delegation from Welland in March 1943 to Queen’s Park, demanding legislation to guarantee labour’s right to organize, make collective bargaining compulsory and outlaw company unions. This legislation was indeed passed by the Federal government in 1944.

**Wage Pool**

One of the innovations of the first student-in-industry work camp, and part of the work camp legend ever since, was the wage pool. It was voluntary and its purpose was to create a “just wage” recognizing that people’s earnings for the summer were different, due to a range in hourly wage from thirty to eighty cents an hour. People’s expenses to get to the camp were different as well and some had overtime pay, some received bonuses, some missed work because of sickness, and women’s wages were generally lower than men’s. There were many sources of inequity. In
addition, the financial needs of those upon leaving camp were different. It is unclear from the record who introduced the wage pool idea, although at the closing banquet, Margaret Albright in a tribute to Lex Miller’s impact on the work camp stated, “our practical venture in Christian brotherhood, the wage pool, grew from the seed of his planting.”

It may have been a logical extension of the SCM’s practice of having a travel pool for its regional and national meetings, or Miller’s involvement with the Iona Community and the movement for national average wage in England may have influenced the work camp or provided a model from which to build. It is interesting that on the night the Wage Pool Committee posted its results at the end of camp, Miller led his last educational session on “Marxism and its Christian Implications.”

Predictably, there was some difference of opinion about how to establish a wage pool. The work camp executive report in “The Giant Forge Log” outlines its proposal as well as one put forward by a camper which it did not endorse, but which proposed a form of taxation of those with higher incomes to bring those with lower summer incomes up to the minimum of two-hundred dollars for the summer. The process proposed and adopted by the work camp executive was complex but, basically, all participants put their earnings into the wage pool and everyone was paid what was considered an average wage – twenty dollars per week from ninety per cent of the pool. Ten per cent was used to compensate those who had received overtime or bonuses or those with particular needs. The wage pool was a voluntary feature of almost every subsequent work camp, although the system varied and was created anew each time. Many who were interviewed reported that this was one of the most radicalising and community-building aspects of the whole work camp experience.

In his contributions to the “Giant Forge Work Camp Log,” Lex Miller connected the experience of the gritty Welland work camp with the idyllic setting of Iona where he had spent his last four summers and observed that in both settings, “except the Lord keep the city – the watchman waketh but in vain.”

Reflecting on the opportunity created by the end of World War Two, he stated:

We have the certainty that we are in for a three-front struggle for the integrity of our own souls, for the true health of the church and for the real good of the wider society. We have had it rubbed into us, so that we shall not forget it all our life long, that the place where men earn their bread is to be the place of holiness; and that it will take us all of
our years to help make it so. We have also grasped the truth that it is no good taking up this challenge unless we see how costly it may be. The camp wage-pool is our symbol of that, in a mild way.

But best of all, we’ve learnt that wherever the struggle takes us and whatever it costs us, we shall never go alone and we shall never really be poor. You in Canada, and I in New Zealand, and all the servants of Christ throughout the world, know that we can depend on one another while together we depend on Christ and he is wholly dependable.39

**SCM Work Camps Launched**

The Welland student-in-industry work camp was judged a great success and the SCM and Canadian Work Camp Committee agreed to continue their partnership and hoped to expand to having more than one work camp each summer. At the 1945 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Work Camp Committee, held over Thanksgiving at Camp Thayendenaga (later to become the home of Five Oaks under Bev Oaten’s vision and leadership), the Committee agreed to change its name to the Christian Work Camp Fellowship (CWCF). Board members believed the name change reflected the purpose of the organization: “professing Christians of all creeds uniting in a common fellowship to give expression to their faith by physical work.”40

The SCM and Canadian Work Camp Fellowship continued their collaboration in organizing summer student work camps. The CWCF also continued to organize short-term volunteer work camps. In 1946 the CWCF and SCM added a student-in-agriculture work camp in St. Vital, on the outskirts of Winnipeg, directed by Frank Ball and Isobel Benham, to the student-in-industry work camp in Brantford, directed by John and Gwen Grant.

In 1947 there were three co-sponsored work camps, a student-in-agriculture camp in Dixie, Ontario, directed by Marjorie Peck and Earl Hawkesworth, and two student-in-industry camps, one in Brantford and the other in Montreal. The Brantford campers lived in a machine shop at the old RCAF airport. It was an international Canadian/American camp co-directed by Gerry Hutchinson, General Secretary of the Canadian SCM and Gale Engles, an American who had worked with Displaced Persons in Europe for two years and was about to go as Chaplain to Stanford University. In Montreal Cyril and Marjorie Powles (Secretary of the
McGill SCM) directed a student-in-industry work camp at St. Columba House.

That same summer, Bev Oaten directed the first WSCF volunteer work camp in Bievres, near Paris, France, where students were engaged in post-war rebuilding of the French SCM – the Fede’s, office and conference centre, La Roche Dieu. In another example of the international aspect of the SCM work camps, the Canadian work camps contributed to Bev’s travel costs.

1948 saw work camps in Brantford and Dixie once again, and in 1949 Lex Miller and his wife Jean returned to Canada to direct the Montreal student-in-industry work camp with primarily senior work campers, (people who had previously attended a work camp). Lex was available to direct the Montreal work camp because he had come to Union Seminary in New York with his family in the fall of 1948 to begin a PhD in Religion at Colombia.

The camp lived at Chalmers United Church in Verdun where Gardiner Ward was in ministry. The evening study and discussion sessions were intense and grappled with the long term implications of the church aligning itself with the working class. Miller’s publishing in the area of Christianity and Marxism, and work as a Christian vocation provided a focus for discussion and debate as did the immediacy of labour struggles such as the Asbestos Strike. Resources provided by Miller were supplemented by many guest speakers. Regular Bible Study and a series on the Twentieth Century Christian kept the discussions lively, and discussion of the connection of the Christian Church to specific political parties included the Communist Party.

A number of McGill SCMers had become involved with the Society for a Catholic Commonwealth (SCC) by this time, and had a specific sense of the place of Eucharist in the practice of the church and a theological understanding that made a strong connection between radical politics and high church liturgy. Unfortunately, in this instance it created a barrier to a joint Eucharist for all campers. The Society of the Catholic Commonwealth (SCC) was a religious community founded in 1939 in Massachusetts by Frederick Hastings Smyth (1888-1960), an American Episcopalian priest and Christian Marxist theologian. Smyth was invited as a guest speaker to the second Arundel Conference of the Anglican Fellowship for Social Action (AFSA) near Montreal in 1944 and again in 1947. A number of Anglican SCMers present at these events were inspired by Smyth’s radical political and liturgical marrying of a particular Anglo-
Catholic Eucharistic theology, known as anamnesis, with a dialectical political critique.

Cyril Powles described Smyth’s theology of the offertory and its powerful attractiveness for some SCMers at the time in these words: “when you came to the Eucharist you brought your work and that work was part of the bread and wine that were offered in the offertory and that offertory theology, the idea that your work is offered in your worship and forms part of the material basis of your worship was our theology at that time.”

SCC’s contact with the radical SCM McGill students, experienced in the practical solidarity of SCM work camps, brought a new lease on life to the Society, even as it became the logical next step for many graduating SCMers. Several former United Church SCMers, some who were preparing for ministry in the United Church of Canada, became Anglicans in order to join the Society.

They, along with a number of SCMers from the 1949 Montreal student-in-industry work camp also joined in the formation of a co-op in Montreal called the COOP at the end of the 1949 work camp. The Montreal COOP included both those sharing accommodation and others who came to meetings, and together produced and circulated newsletters reflecting their thinking and discussions. The COOP lasted two years and was a first effort of several subsequent initiatives, where those radicalized and inspired by their work camp experiences sought to find a sustained way to support Christian engagement in the lives of working people.

Lex Miller was undoubtedly a key influence in these choices. Reading Lex Miller’s books, it is not hard to see both how he influenced the work camp movement in the SCM in a seminal way, and how his experience in the Canadian SCM work camps and on-going correspondence with many Canadian SCMers influenced his own writing and theology. Interviews with those who attended the 1945 and 1949 work camps reflect what a charismatic person he must have been to have so profoundly inspired and shaped the vocational and life choices of so many. Many of those interviewed during my research spoke of Lex Miller as a major architect of the SCM work camp movement, both those who had met him, those who had heard of him and those who had only read his books.

SCM Takes on Work Camps by Themselves

By the 1950s, SCM work camps had become something of an
institution and with this came the growing pains and struggles common to
the process of movements becoming established and permanent. Discuss-
ion of the focus and purpose of work camps can be found in the record
throughout the 1950s. Lex Miller was aware of it even before this as he
writes in a 4 December, 1948 letter to Dorothy Beales:

The suggestion from all sides about a crisis over work camps seems
to have been a false alarm. Nobody wanted to turn them into either
Quaker shows or Marxist shows though various personal letters had
given that impression. John Rowe it was (excellent man) who framed
the resolutions which confirmed the basis essentially as we worked it
at Welland. Two general safeguards 1. a committee is to examine and
make recommendations about worship. 2. recruiting is to aim at a
more miscellaneous section of students. No uniform Quaker or
Marxist or neurotic flavour if you please. John Rowe was quite
astonished at the suggestion that he was supposed to want Marxist
camps: so was Vince . . .

Around this time a Handbook for Work Camps was created and begins
with a philosophy section: “The underlying philosophy of all work camps
is that work and worship, daily labour and Christian faith, belong
inextricably together in the total offering of one’s life to God. Student
Work Camps are not service projects; they are learning situations in which
students, through participation in actual pay-envelope jobs are enabled to
test the validity of this philosophy and to discover its implications and
contradictions in contemporary society,” but goes on to recognize the
different types of work camps and concludes with:

Closely related in the Work Camp experience to the experiment in the
inter-relatedness of work and worship is the experiment in community
living. This is not a sentimental feeling of “everybody being a good
fellow.” That wears off after the first two weeks. It is rather a
discovery, through actual experience of the ways in which the
possibility of true community is denied by the impersonal and highly
competitive organization of modern society. This has emerged most
clearly in the past, through discussions about wage pool . . . The total
camp experience rests upon and develops from basic Christian
assumptions – belief in God as Creator and Redeemer; belief in the
dignity of human beings as children of God; belief that the purpose of
social organization is to enable men and women to live as children of
In 1951 the national council of the SCM decided to take on sole responsibility for organizing summer student work camps. I haven’t followed the CWCF story but it seems they continued to organize short-term voluntary work camp opportunities. However, both Bev Oaten and Eunice Pyfrom were also heavily involved at this time in the creation of Five Oaks, another strategy for bringing together work, worship and study in order to equip lay-people for their vocation in the world.

The first meeting of the SCM Work Camp Committee on 2 October 1951 began with an evaluation of the first six years of experience with work camps, and also received input from the previous summer’s Student in Industry Camps in Toronto and Montreal, to the effect that there should be clarity about the particular philosophy of student-in industry camps. It was also suggested that some thought be given to offer these as senior work camps, while others such as Mental Health or general work camps would be good entry points for students not necessarily focused on the place of industry in social, political and theological issues.

In the 1951 Work Camp Committee Minutes, Harriet Christie, SCM Associate Secretary, remembers the beginning of work camps, a mere six years previously, as reflecting various factors:

- visit of Lex Miller to Canada and his interest in the church’s task in this area
- desire to continue the experience of short-term work camps in camps of long duration, particularly the experience of the relation between work and worship
- desire to give students an experience of working in industry
- desire by students to have an experience of living in Christian community
- and attempt to find where faith has relevance in the modern world.

The general discussion recorded in these minutes reflects a diverse perspective ranging from those who think that “the industrial situation is basic to everything else in our society and that only by tackling it can we get to the root of other problems,” to those who think the most important benefit of work camps was “what happens to persons not problems. The work camp is merely a technique of things happening to persons and we should use the technique around any specific problem in which what happens to people creates community.” Nevertheless it is fascinating to
see that six years after Eunice Pyfrom pressed him into service as Director of the first student-in-industry work camp, Lex Miller’s role has become part of the legend even though his participation and leadership was fortuitous, rather than planned.

The suggestion of having a senior student-in-industry work camp was adopted, and it took place at Bathurst St. United in Toronto in 1953 with Bob Miller, National SCM Study Secretary, as Director. Dick Allen reports that there was an expectation going into the work camp that it would evolve into a permanent Christian community engaged in factory work and intentional Christian communal living. Muriel Anderson remembers that members of the work camp looked for a house that summer and agreed to buy 105 Howland Ave. This purchase enabled the establishment of Howland House by Bob Miller in the Fall of 1953, whose story is another example of the effort on the part of those transformed and radicalized by SCM work camps to create a more permanent and sustained means of collectively engaging as Christians with the realities of industrial workers’ lives.

**The Work Camp Legacy**

As the 1945 Welland work camp drew to a close, Lex Miller recognized the life-long impact of the work camp experience when he asserted that “social and political, industrial and economic, rural and urban life is wholesome (healthy = holy) only when it too belongs to God . . . to act out what (this) means will be a lifelong business.” Many work campers of this period and those which followed made the commitment to be the church in the midst of the working class, a lifelong business.

Some ran repeatedly for political office and were elected municipally, provincially and federally. Others took their leadership into the universities, still others to the church and theological education. Serving the church in partnership with churches in other countries was the choice of many, while others chose the domestic mission field, including life-long presence in working class communities and work places. Those who participated in Howland House over its twenty years found themselves reflecting this variety.

The SCM work camps gathered together and reinforced the radicalism that existed in the McGill SCM, a direct inheritance of the tradition of the FCSO through RBY Scott and J. King Gordon, and influenced by the contacts with students from Queens and Emmanuel,
inspired by Gregory Vlastos, John Line and others. They were a Canadian expression of the worker-priest movement in France, which transferred their connections to workers and their movements from the forced labour camps of World War Two into a mission among the working class of France.\textsuperscript{60}

The presence and participation of Lex Miller was a key factor, but the 1951 return of Bob Miller (no relation to Lex) from studies with Karl Barth and others in Basel, Switzerland after the war sealed and empowered this direction. Bob Miller, as SCM Study Secretary from 1951 to 1957, travelled across the country sharing the theology, challenges and vision of a post-war ecumenical church with students through books, speakers and the opportunity to experiment and explore provided by summer work camps. He helped solidify the connection of this Canadian SCM innovation to movements like the German Ecumenical Lay Academies and Kirchentag,\textsuperscript{61} emerging in Germany after the war; the worker priests in France and Belgium; and the great emphasis on the laity as the presence and ministry of the church in the world, receiving focus and emphasis with the establishment of the World Council of Churches in 1948.

In the midst of changing political, theological, economic and social times, work camps gave the SCM a programmatic strategy and model which was community-building, theologically-stretching and provided experiential learning that was socially and politically radicalizing. With the Canadian universities expanding dramatically,\textsuperscript{62} the work camps provided a consistent focus while other elements of SCM on campus began to change.

Far from withdrawing from the struggle to change the basic social order, the SCM work camps provided a formative and transformative experience of the material conditions of working people, and a theology which affirmed God’s transforming presence in daily work. The urgency as well as the ambiguity of this engagement with the realities of workers’ lives is expressed in Bob Miller’s reflection on the 1951 Toronto work camp at St. James Cathedral, which he co-directed:

We worked. And made new kinds of friends in a terrible and wonderful new world. Our capacity for sharing the life and lot of labouring people wasn’t very great, but we were there with them, and have carried a little bit of them and their world away with us. We aren’t the poorer for it . . . We tried to relate our Christianity, the Church and the Bible. None of us really did succeed. Likely we were not even much further in our understanding of how to do it, but we
were “in the world”, really – and the seed of a sobering realism can flower for us in a new Bible, a concrete Gospel, a reformed Church and our “relating” should never again be abstract. It won’t be easier, but it will be “realer.”\textsuperscript{63}

Through the years of SCM work camps, students of successive generations grappled in local and national contexts with what the demands of the gospel mean for the social engagement of Christians and the Church in Canada. Many of them made this a lifetime vocation, both within and outside the church. In doing so they contributed to and helped fashion channels where the continuing streams of a socially-incarnated Christianity in Canada and around the world could flow.
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Solitudes in Shared Spaces: Aboriginal and EuroCanadian Anglicans in the Yukon and Northwest Territories in the Post-Residential School Era

CHERYL GAVER
University of Ottawa

Truth and Mercy have met together
Justice and Peace have kissed (Psalm 85:10)1

According to John Paul Lederach, known for his pioneering work on conflict transformation, reconciliation is achieved only when truth about the past has been made public, justice for perpetrators and reparation for victims have been accomplished, forgiveness of perpetrators by victims has been offered and peace through the establishment of transformed relationships has begun.

Using the residential school issue as a window onto the current relationship between Aboriginal and EuroCanadian Anglicans in the Yukon and Northwest Territories (NWT), I explored reconciliation within the Anglican Church of Canada (ACC) at the congregational level by focusing on three questions: (1) how could the past relationship be described? (2) what changes had occurred since the closure of residential schools in 1969/1970; and (3) how could the current relationship be characterized? In other words, had anything changed at the local level since the residential school era? During my research, I uncovered the existence of three narratives: (1) the dominant narrative of a destructive and dehumanizing colonialism; (2) a secondary narrative of positive experiences and personalized relationships; and (3) a third narrative of cultural collisions.

Historical Papers 2011: Canadian Society of Church History
This essay summarizes the findings of archival research and three fieldtrips to Canada's North where I visited seven communities and spoke with eighty-one individuals between 2005 and 2008. A more detailed account is presented in my thesis.

The Anglican Context

The context for my project came from the ACC itself. During the residential school era, the ACC operated twenty-six of the one-hundred-thirty residential schools. Aware of problems in its relationship with Canada’s Aboriginal peoples, the ACC commissioned a study of the situation in the late 1960s. The findings, published in 1969 as The Hendry Report, uncovered the existence of a “Jekyll-and-Hyde” relationship. Among its many recommendations was the suggestion that the ACC move towards partnership with Aboriginal peoples. In 1969, the ACC officially withdrew from the residential school program, and began implementing many of the Report’s recommendations.

By the 1990s, the residential school issue had come into public consciousness and to the forefront of Aboriginal concerns. The ACC formally apologized at a Sacred Circle Conference in 1993 and committed itself to living the Apology. One product was the creation of the (Anglican) Aboriginal Healing Fund where communities, organizations, and dioceses can apply for grants up to $15,000 for healing or reconciliation projects. As of 2007, the Anglican Healing Fund had distributed over $3 million.

Working with the Federal Government, Aboriginal representations and other denominations, the ACC searched for ways to resolve past injustices. In 1999, the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) program began; this was followed in 2003 by the Indian Residential School Settlement Agreement (IRSSA). An agreement worked out with the Federal Government limiting ACC liability to $25 million reduced the risk of bankruptcy; the Federal Government would pay any amount awarded by courts above $25 million. In 2005, the IRSSA was replaced with the Common Experience Payment (CEP) program.

From the perspective of the national Church, the ACC had successfully moved beyond the paternalistic nature of its earlier relationship with Aboriginal peoples. My question was how much had changed at the local level in a region where, between 1895 and 1970, the ACC had operated ten of its twenty-six residential schools.
The Dominant Narrative

The first narrative – the one most commonly mentioned in the media, by many Aboriginal peoples, and by the ACC itself – is a narrative of a colonialism that manifested itself in efforts to deliberately destroy Aboriginal peoples and cultures, stripping away any power they had, and marginalizing them from the dominant society. According to this dominant narrative, the by-products of this colonialism were the dehumanization of, and the physical and sexual abuse experienced by so many, Aboriginal people.

Evidence exists to support this narrative. Much has been written about the impact on northern Aboriginal peoples of what can be understood as institutionalized colonialism. Kiawak, a participant of mixed heritage, stated that hunting regulations which made sense in southern Canada would have led to famine situations had people not ignored them and later fought them. No participant, however, shared personal experiences of sexual abuse in the residential schools although one told about a local ACC priest having sexually abused a family member in the NWT community, and Kiawak only talked of being “smacked” on occasion. Archival research did confirm that physical abuse had occurred in at least some schools. No participant confirmed that children were forcibly removed from home, but some shared how parents were pressured into sending them to residential schools.

This does not mean that northern residential schools were “good” but rather that the situation and colonialism in the North differed from that in other parts of Canada. Most important in the northern narrative are the traumas that many experienced being removed from their families and communities and sent to schools that were sometimes thousands of kilometres from home; and that resulted from so many children dying in the schools without families ever being told. Still haunted by the past when she spoke with me, Aqpik shared how her sister was five or six when she went to Hay River Residential School. So scared was she that her parents sent along her younger brother even though he was only three or four. Both died there. Neither the school nor local clergy told the parents they had died or why, and no personal items were returned. “Dad said one day he heard of the boy passing away. The girl grieved so much she passed too.” A few years later, another sister went to a different residential school. She was there “September, October, November, December, January, they flew her body (home), but none of her clothing and no explanation of how
or why she died.” Aqpik’s story reveals colonialism within the northern ACC in which Aboriginal people were seen and treated as dehumanized objects rather than as human beings with human feelings.

This inability to attribute human emotions to Aboriginal peoples is perhaps best exhibited by (Bishop) William Carpenter Bompas who worked among many different Aboriginal peoples in the North between 1865 and 1901. Writing after over twenty years in the region, Bompas was still unsure whether Inuit mothers loved their children, and had no understanding of how or why children were sometimes given away.15 His inability to recognize anything in Aboriginal cultures that challenged notions of English superiority was displayed when he noted that the Gwich’in language had a “conjugation of the verbs [that was] more elaborate than in the Greek . . .” but could not admit “that the language [was] the invention or elaboration of the people who [spoke] it.” Bompas preferred to believe that, “the only alternative [to their having developed it themselves] seems to be that their language is to each race the gift of their Creator.”16 God's intervention was easier for him to accept than the possibility that Aboriginal people might not be as primitive or backwards as Bompas believed.

The Second Narrative

Despite evidence supporting the dominant narrative, by day three of my first fieldtrip, I had run into a challenge. Almost as soon as I walked into Kiawak's office and before I could sit down (let alone begin recording the interview), Kiawak thundered, “We were NOT taken away by force!”

That statement was reiterated by EuroCanadian and Aboriginal participants in both the NWT and the Yukon. Kavik refused to be interviewed and several other Aboriginal participants were unsure about being interviewed precisely because they had not been taken away by force nor had they suffered physical or sexual abuse in residential schools. Todd and other EuroCanadian participants in Yellowknife asked what had really happened in northern residential schools precisely because the dominant narrative contradicted what Aboriginal friends and co-workers were saying. In fact, no lawsuits have been filed against the Diocese of the Arctic as of 2008 when the project ended.

My assumptions about the dominant narrative were being challenged. I was discovering a second, more positive narrative. In some NWT schools and in some years, Aboriginal languages were taught, bilingual
children identified and used as translators for monolingual students (e.g., Hay River) and traditional skills passed on by Aboriginal elders (Shingle Point, Coppermine). Some participants said that religious services in the schools had been trilingual. Records showed that residential schools – often the only schools available – included Aboriginal, EuroCanadian, or mixed-heritage children and, at Hay River, adult students.

Research revealed a number of missionaries who demonstrated respect for the people, sensitivity to Aboriginal traditions, and willingness to not only develop relationships with Aboriginal peoples but also learn from them. Arriving in the NWT in 1935, the Rev. Henry George Cook found himself teaching children from “some few Indian families resident all year in the settlement, the sons and daughters of R.C.S. and RCMP personnel, the local Doctor-Indian Agent’s son” and others. He adapted to the situation and the need to accommodate how Aboriginal children learned, writing in 1979:17

I had trouble with the younger Indian children getting them to work with figures. The little rascals used to bring a deck of cards to school and during lunch break they played some card game I never did figure out. I played them a dirty trick however – taught them to play cribbage – it was phenomenal how their mental arithmetic improved.

During that same era, Archibald Lang Fleming, bishop of the Arctic from 1933 to 1949, displayed a similar openness to learning and adapting. Although he began his career with a colonialist perspective that considered Aboriginal people to be primitive and in need of being brought into the light of Christianity and European civilization, Fleming ended it quite changed by his time in the North, writing in 1965:18

I loved [the Inuit] because I soon discovered that they were real people, men and women and children just like the rest of mankind . . . As I lived with them away from the mission house, either as a paying guest with a family in an igloo or in my own tent pitched among theirs, I came to understand and to appreciate their fine characteristics – their courage, generosity and patience; their outstanding love for their children; and their utopian socialism as far as the sharing of food is concerned . . .

Time and time again they went out of their way to help me, an ignorant foreigner, and so I changed from holding the typical
superiority attitude of the white man towards the native and I came to see him truly as an equal. Whatever superior knowledge I possessed about some things, the Eskimo had superior knowledge about other things. I lacked many of their fine attributes and I became grateful for the privilege of knowing them, for all that I was learning from them and for all that they were doing for me . . . even regarding the inner meanings of some of the great truths which I had been sent to teach them. I received not a little inspiration from them. And some of my ideas had to be radically changed because of what I learned from trying to help them to understand what I thought I knew so well.

The relationship Fleming developed with the Inuit eventually earned him the nickname "'Inooktaukaub,' or 'One of the Eskimo.'"19 Succeeding Fleming as bishop in 1950 was Donald Ben Marsh. Marsh, who came from Great Britain, established schools where the Inuit could train as catechists, and even ordained several to the priesthood.20 His view on the importance of Aboriginal languages differed from that held by the Canadian government of the period as his writings reveal:21

The Welsh language has been spoken since childhood in almost every family . . . The Welsh language is vitally alive and of importance, for it is not only taught and used in school, but is the language of the people and they are proud to be Welsh.

[It is] obvious that unless they [the Inuit] have a pride in their own race and their own people, they will feel themselves second class citizens, and this will be a direct result of the educational system. That they have to live among their own people later is obvious, and there would seem to be no future for them anywhere in numbers. What they have a real need to feel is to be one with and to have a great respect for their parents and elders. It seems to me that we face the task of making the Eskimo feel that the very wonderful quality of their forefathers are things to be treasured and practised. To do this it is vitally necessary that there should be some presentation of their parents’ qualities and old way of life during school hours and through school channels.

How widespread such attitudes were among EuroCanadian Anglican clergy in the NWT and Yukon is unknown but their existence may well explain why lawsuits against the ACC in the NWT have not been filed, and why so many participants shared a different narrative than the
dominant one.

The situation in the southern Yukon differed significantly from that in the NWT. In fact, one former residential school staff who had substituted at the Carcross residential school in the Yukon for a short time refused to say anything about her time there although she readily shared experiences at her own NWT residential school. Among the Gwich’in, whose territory spans both the northern Yukon and NWT, a somewhat positive history is found, perhaps because, as one participant put it, the Gwich’in became Christian before the white men came and messed things up (Alariaq). They were converted by the Rev. Robert McDonald, a contemporary of Bumpas. While the Gwich’in of the time considered him “White” because of his ties with the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC), the Church Missionary Society (CMS), which had appointed him to the region, considered him to be “Other.” McDonald’s father had worked for the HBC but his mother was of mixed blood: part Ojibway, part “White” and part “mulatto.” McDonald’s background gave him an advantage: he understood Aboriginal people in a way non-Aboriginal missionaries did not. McDonald married a Gwich’in woman (Julia Kutug) and, with her help, translated portions of the Bible and the Anglican prayer book into Gwich’in. He trained Gwich’in elders to serve as missionaries; they trained others. During my second fieldtrip, a number of EuroCanadian and Aboriginal participants spoke of McDonald’s on-going influence as the Gwich’in continue to play an important role in the Anglican Church in both the Yukon and the NT.

What becomes evident from this very brief overview of the relationship between Aboriginal and EuroCanadian Anglicans during the residential school era is the complexity of that relationship. Not only do you find missionaries with a firm belief in their own superiority and in the need of Aboriginal people to become more like EuroCanadians, but also you find missionaries who deeply respected the people and their traditional wisdom, and who valued and worked to preserve traditional languages and ways. Not only do you find the dehumanization of Aboriginal peoples, but also you find missionaries and Aboriginal peoples getting to each other as “real human beings” and developing personal relationships.

To speak of Aboriginal-missionary relations in Canada’s North as “colonialistic” is too simplistic. It dismisses too many personal experiences and encounters, and too much evidence of Aboriginal agency. The 1969 Hendry Report, characterized the relationship as “Jekyll-and-Hyde” which seems to be more accurate of the northern situation. If Aboriginal
people encountered the “Jekyll,” then they were fortunate and likely had good experiences and memories; if they encountered the “Hyde,” then they likely had bad experiences and memories.

The Third Narrative

Before the research project began, and sprinkled throughout the project, were clues to a third narrative that suggested the relationship – both in the present and historically – was influenced by something else . . . but what?

The first clue came in Oakville, Ontario in 2003. A local Anglican Church hosted a presentation on the residential school issue, the need for local congregations to contribute to the IRSSA, and the agreement that had been negotiated between the ACC and the Federal Government limiting ACC’s liability to $25 million. Aboriginal representatives talked about wanting to withdraw from the entire process as a result of that agreement. What became evident was that Aboriginal and EuroCanadian people were operating from two completely different understandings of the issue.

From the EuroCanadian perspective, the residential school issue represented an adversarial situation with plaintiffs (Aboriginal people) on one side and defendants (the ACC and Federal Government) on the other. Since the agreement that had been negotiated between the defendants would have not affect any amount judges might award to the plaintiffs, there was no need to involve the plaintiffs in the negotiations.

From what I came to believe represented the Aboriginal perspective, the residential school issue represented a weakened relationship in which all parties had been damaged. In order to repair and strengthen the relationship, all parties had to be involved. By excluding Aboriginal peoples from the debate surrounding the possible bankruptcy of the ACC, EuroCanadians were again demonstrating that nothing had changed; Aboriginal people were still excluded from situations that affected them.

This difference in perceiving what the problem is continues to play out in the North where the residential school issue is too often seen as an “Aboriginal” problem. One ACC clergy asked why I wanted to visit his congregation since his was a “white” congregation. EuroCanadian participants wondered what they had to contribute; many simply referred me to an “Aboriginal person over there” who might have something to say – as though they had absolutely nothing to do with a relationship. Many Aboriginal participants referred me to others who had attended residential
school or had been abused in residential schools, as though the issue had no influence on their own relationships with EuroCanadian peoples.

During one service I attended, a bishop’s letter was read in which the bishop asked for donations for schools in Africa. EuroCanadian Anglicans at the service seemed interested in the project and wanted to know more. Aboriginal Anglicans present were notable by their silence and lack of interest. Nowhere in the letter did the bishop acknowledge any similarity between what he was requesting and what other bishops had requested during the residential school era. Nowhere did he specify how the African school project differed from the residential schools.

The differences went beyond different perceptions about the residential school issue. Other differences also emerged during the fieldtrips. In one congregation, the EuroCanadian priest had unwittingly created tension among the Aboriginal members. Gary ensured that welcome cards were put into pews for people to complete if they wanted him to visit them. He used a baptismal information package that included a form to be filled out by parents interested in having their child baptized. He involved the laity (i.e., non-clergy) in worship services in traditional ways: as greeters at the door, as readers of Scripture lessons, and as intercessors offering prayers. Being of a rather high church temperament, Gary introduced chanted responses during services. None of these endeavours – from Gary’s perspective – reflected anything other than the traditional, albeit on the high church side, form of Anglican worship. His style of ministry was also fairly traditional. He tended to function as priest-as-administrator rather than as priest-as-pastor; this led to a tendency to distance himself from parishioners, leaving them to take the initiative to contact him. From Gary’s perspective, he respected Aboriginal peoples, was aware of the history in which EuroCanadians had sometimes controlled every aspect of Aboriginal life, and saw himself as giving space to Aboriginal people to do things for themselves. What he did not see was how everything he did antagonized many of the Aboriginal people in his congregation.

Aboriginal people did not fill out the baptismal forms. Word began to spread that Gary refused to baptize their children. Aboriginal people did not chant, nor did they volunteer for the functions Gary saw as open to laity. Sometimes, an Aboriginal member took over the service by making special announcements or offering additional prayers. Sometimes an Aboriginal choir performed during services without his having been notified. Gary came to accept such behaviour as part of the Aboriginal
culture. He saw EuroCanadian members of the congregation reaching out to their Aboriginal confreres at coffee hour and welcomed their initiative, but never talked about taking the initiative himself.

Gary’s high-church practices were generally accepted by EuroCanadian members, but not by Aboriginal members. That difference extends beyond Gary and affects the relationship in other congregations in the territories. Most missionaries who introduced Christianity to Aboriginal people in the North were of low church, conservative, evangelical persuasion. Many Anglican immigrants who come from other parts of Canada are high church and/or liberal. Not only do worship styles differ between the two, so does the selection of music. Several Aboriginal participants said the hymns were “unsingable” while one EuroCanadian criticized the over-use of evangelical choruses instead of more substantial hymns. Anglican wardens and lay readers, coming from liberal congregations in southern Canada that accept same-sex marriage, discover they are no longer permitted to function in any official capacity in northern congregations, expressing feelings of alienation.

The dominant narrative of a profoundly destructive colonialism which must be mitigated if the relationship between Aboriginal and EuroCanadian peoples is to improve simply does not go far enough in recognizing how different the groups are. While Gary knew some of the colonialist history and tried to affirm what he saw as cultural practices among Aboriginal people, Gary did not realize that his own style of ministry and his own understanding of his role as priest-as-administrator were very much indicative of his own culture. What he considered to be normative was, in reality, normative only from a EuroCanadian perspective. While he recognized differences that he assumed were cultural, he did not understand their significance. He never understood how important personal relationships were among his Aboriginal parishioners. He never recognized their refusal to complete forms as an invitation to him to visit at the time and place of his choosing. He never recognized their refusal to perform functions generally assigned to laity as a request for a more meaningful relationship and participation in the service. He never saw his own distance as a rejection of any relationship with Aboriginal people. Gary did not recognize signals Aboriginal parishioners were sending him; many of them misinterpreted Gary’s actions. Gary is no longer with that congregation.

Alice shared a story of cultural differences and how they affected one’s perceptions of the residential schools. She told how a friendship had
been destroyed. An Aboriginal friend from residential school days filed a lawsuit claiming she had been abused at the school. She asked Alice to be a witness in her case. Alice refused; she had not seen any abuse. Her friend said, “But we had chores to do.” Alice replied, “That’s part of being a family.” What neither Alice knew nor, in all likelihood, staff at the residential school either, was that Aboriginal children were given chores only once they reached puberty in some cultures. To ask a pre-pubescent child to do chores in such a culture would be understood as abuse, so while her friend saw abuse; Alice saw what she considered to be normative.

Such differences between Aboriginal and EuroCanadian peoples go beyond the dominant or even the secondary narrative. They go further than many assume when talking about cultural differences. Such differences show up not only in practices and interpretations of events and situations, but also in the deeply rooted centre of one’s being: as reflections of how people perceive and organize reality itself.

What happened in residential schools and the historical relationship between Aboriginal and EuroCanadian peoples represents a negotiated space of cultures in collision. Colonialism shifted the weight of that space towards a preponderance of EuroCanadian practices and values. Those practices and values continue to shape the relationship in the present despite initiatives to empower Aboriginal peoples, support Aboriginal languages, and respect Aboriginal cultures.

The problem: how does one negotiate values and practices fundamentally opposed to one another? For example, how does one define who is related to whom? Canadian society, based on a EuroCanadian worldview, tends to be patriarchal yet defines relationships bilaterally, based on blood. The Inuit traditionally were bilateral but had a different understanding of family in which relationships were as much defined by names as by birth.25 Among Athabaskan peoples, relationships traditionally were defined by clans with some groups being matrilineal and others patrilineal.26 How can these different systems accommodate one another in our society today?

What happens when a marriage relationship accepted by one culture is rejected as incestuous by the other? This is the situation in Canada’s North. According to Athabaskan tradition, a person should marry someone from a different clan: for example, Jane (Crow) could marry Mark (Wolf). Since clan membership is determined by the mother, their children, Jenny and Michael, would both be Crow; both would have to marry Wolf. The problem comes in the next generation. Jenny’s daughter, Julia, would be
Crow. Michael’s son, Murray, however, would be Wolf after his mother. According to Athabascan tradition, Julia (Crow) and Murray (Wolf) are free to marry each other. According to European tradition, they cannot because they are related more closely than permitted by law. On the other hand, according to European tradition, Julia can marry Jim, who is also Crow but not related to her by blood. According to Athabascan tradition, however, Julia cannot marry Jim since he is of the same clan. For Julia to marry Murray, she runs into penalties from Canadian law; for her to marry Jim, she effectively renounces her Athabascan culture.

A third example revolves around names. In EuroCanadian societies, children are often named after their parents or grandparents. In some Athabascan societies, however, it is the parents who are re-named following the birth of their children! How does a EuroCanadian Canada, with its insistence on “legal” names, deal with Aboriginal societies in which names are routinely changed over the course of one’s life?

For many EuroCanadians, such examples have nothing to do with colonialism. Colonialism is a thing of the past; all people, regardless of cultural background, are free to play important roles in Canadian society. Other cultures may be accepted, respected and accommodated to some extent, nevertheless, there is also among many a sense that EuroCanadian values and practices are the norms of Canadian society.

For many Aboriginal people, however, such examples are very much indicative of an ongoing colonialism. Colonialism continues in laws that emphasize degrees and certificates while devaluing personal knowledge and experience. Cree in Northern Quebec / Ontario have to hire non-Cree to take tourists on boat trips in their own territory because they cannot pass the tests EuroCanadian governments have developed for certification. To be certified, guides must know “how to get back in the boat once you fall out.” To be judged an expert guide among the Cree, however, one must know “how never to fall out the boat.” Colonialism continues in the business world which often tries to accommodate cultural differences but enforces compliance to standardization, and which values productivity and the bottom line over and against relationships and individuals. Colonialism continues in education systems that promote logic and reason while devaluing spirits and dreams. The result is, as Bishop MacDonald (Métis) pointed out in one presentation, the “bifurcation of body and soul.”
Participant Views on the Relationship

Many participants felt that the overall relationship between Aboriginal and EuroCanadian Anglicans in northern churches was good or, at least, better than in the old days. Gary pointed out that it would have been unthinkable to incorporate Aboriginal symbols or customs into Anglican services a few years ago but now such practices were accepted as natural. In fact, several Anglican congregations either held services in the local Aboriginal language or included portions of their service in that language. Outside of Whitehorse and Yellowknife, Aboriginal people held prominent positions within congregations. Frank elaborated on one difference between northern and southern congregations: in the South, power-sharing seemed to be built into the structure to ensure both Aboriginal and EuroCanadian representation in the diocesan power structure; in the North, however, power-sharing simply worked out that way as dioceses searched for people who were best qualified – their faith mattered; their ethnic background did not. Kudloo (Aboriginal) held a similar view. In her community, ethnicity was irrelevant. When something needed to be done, she simply called whomever was best qualified to do it.

At the same time, cautionary remarks were expressed by some Aboriginal and EuroCanadian participants. Aqpik, and others, wondered if anything would change after Harper’s apology. Kevin wondered how much had really changed: if the price of gas and oil increased enough, would EuroCanadian Anglicans respect Aboriginal land ownership. Arthur talked about increased tensions between EuroCanadian and Aboriginal peoples because of Aboriginal people asserting their rights and power. Gary wondered how often he would have to apologize for the residential schools; the Apology had already been offered at the National level (Kyle and other clergy, however, felt it was very important to apologize at a personal level to whomever needed to hear the Apology, saying that frankly what happened in the south was too far away to matter in the North). Darien felt that Aboriginal people would be happier having their own place to worship (though it is unknown whether he was referring to segregation or tensions that had developed with the recent closure of the “Old Log Church” where Aboriginal people used to worship). Janet and others wondered why so few Aboriginal people attended their services. Alistair felt that there was no future for EuroCanadian people in the NWT while Joanne believed the residential school issue was only the “tip of the
iceberg” (Joanne).

Referring to the relationship that existed between Aboriginal and EuroCanadian peoples in the NWT, Lyle said:

> There is a very strong pride in the Northwest Territories that “we got it right.” Now, that doesn’t mean that “we got it perfect” but it does mean “we got it right” in terms of how we do things. The way that Aboriginal / non-Aboriginal people work together, the kind of respect that we have for each other, the different cultures and different ways of doing things and so on – there’s a real strong pride in that and it’s bought into by everybody.

And yet, the Yellowknife Anglican Church had no Aboriginal people at its services and, in several other congregation, Aboriginal parishioners were present and involved in services yet somewhat separate and distant from the EuroCanadian parishioners during coffee hour.

**Conclusion**

The ACC approached reconciliation with its Aboriginal members in 1969 from a EuroCanadian perspective, focusing on Aboriginal empowerment, power-sharing initiatives, and moving from paternalism to partnership. Changes, while gradual, have been sustained over the years. As an institution, the ACC has moved beyond a EuroCanadian understanding of colonialism. This may explain why a number of participants felt the relationship between Aboriginal and EuroCanadian peoples was fairly good and why there seemed to be less interest in reconciliation, particularly in the NWT where the majority of clergy and bishops are Aboriginal. After all, how meaningful would an apology be coming from an Aboriginal bishop who had attended residential school? The relationship is less positive in the Yukon.

In other ways, however, the ACC, particularly at congregational and diocesan levels, has forgotten lessons that some missionaries recognized: the importance of developing relationships. In other words, the way to stop colonialism’s dehumanization of Aboriginal peoples is to humanize them by creating environments where relationships are fostered and nurtured. The ACC has yet to deal with the cultural divide that continues to be found in many of its congregations and that continues to affect its relationship with Aboriginal peoples in Northern communities where Aboriginal and EuroCanadian people worship together yet remain separate.
How far along the road to reconciliation are Aboriginal and EuroCanadian Anglicans in Canada’s North? Lederach identified four qualities essential for reconciliation. Mercy is demonstrated by those Aboriginal Anglicans who have found healing in their faith and in forgiving. Truth is revealed as people tell their experiences – both good and bad, and historical records come to light. Justice occurs as the ACC confesses its guilt, accepts responsibility for its past, and makes reparations. Peace is found among parishioners and congregations. Much has been done. And yet – much remains to be done. If Aboriginal and EuroCanadian peoples in the NWT and Yukon cannot agree about the interpretation of the past, miscommunicate when talking in the present, and do not understand how different each other really is, then has reconciliation really begun at all?

Endnotes


2. The term “residential school” first appears in the 1920s (Alan Hayes, Anglicans in Canada: Controversies and Identity in Historical Perspective [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004], 31); the schools, regardless of what they were called, existed earlier. When “residential schools” first appeared is debated. For purposes of my research, the residential school era began in 1820 with the Rev. John West’s arrival at Red River (Manitoba), and ended in 1969 with the withdrawal of the ACC from the residential school program.

3. How many residential schools existed is also debatable. According to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (DIAND) website in 2006, one hundred thirty schools were officially recognized as residential schools or hostels. Of these, twenty-six were run by the ACC. The list, recognized in the Residential Schools Settlement, is a living document with more schools added as more information is uncovered (Residential Schools Settlement Fund, “Responses by Canada to Requests Made Pursuant to Article 12 to Add Institutions to the Settlement Agreement,” List of Residential Schools: Residential School Settlement: Official Court Notice, last accessed 7 August 2010, http://www.residentialschoolsettlement.ca/SchoolsEnglish.pdf).
4. The final report, known as the Hendry Report and published in 1969 (reprinted in 1998), summarized the interaction between Aboriginal and EuroCanadian peoples as a situation:

\[\ldots\] where a group of people, already buffeted by drastic social change and disorganization, were placed in an administrative straitjacket by an authoritarian or paternalistic government and deprived of the power and desire for independent action.\[.\]

The system was paternalism – a harsh and also stingy paternalism (Charles Hendry, *Beyond Traplines: Does the Church Really Care? Towards an Assessment of the Work of the Anglican Church of Canada with Canada’s Native Peoples* [Canada: Ryerson Press, 1969], 27).

While critical of the ACC for its destructive attitudes (e.g., paternalism, arrogance, and racism), the report also recognized a positive dimension to its relationship with Aboriginal peoples:

On the one hand (missionaries) have smashed native culture and social organization. On the other hand they have picked up the pieces of an indigenous way of life which had been smashed by other Europeans – traders, soldiers, administrators – and have helped the people put the pieces together in a new shape (Hendry, *Beyond Traplines*, 21).

According to the report, and as mentioned at the beginning of this section, this mixed package in which “missionaries have been both a disruptive and an integrative force” (Hendry, *Beyond Traplines*, 21) reflected a “Jekyll-and-Hyde” history. The report concluded that, for the ACC to improve its relationship with Aboriginal peoples, the ACC would have to change its attitudes and move from paternalism to partnership (Hendry, *Beyond Traplines* [1969], 79; [1998], 101).

5. In 1969, the ACC withdrew from the residential school program, and began implementing the report’s recommendations: In 1972, the ACC hired the Rev. Ernie Willie, who became the first Aboriginal person at the national office. Later, the ACC established the Subcommittee on Native Affairs (Joyce Carlson, *Dancing the Dream: The First Nations and Church in Partnership*, [Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1995], 32), which eventually evolved into the Anglican Council of Indigenous Peoples. More Aboriginal people have since bee ordained as clergy and even as bishops, including the current Bishop of the Arctic, Andrew Atagotaaluk (Inuit). A number of theological and training schools for Aboriginal people have been established, including the Arthur Turner Training School in the Diocese of the Arctic. In 2007, the Rt. Rev. Mark MacDonald (Métis) was appointed National Indigenous Bishop. For more information on the initiatives see the *Living the Apology* section of
the ACC website (http://archive.anglican.ca/rs/index.htm).

6. Other denominations also dealt with the residential schools issue, and offered apologies.


11. This project focused on the present. Specific details of residential school experiences were not sought but some participants offered their stories.

12. It is impossible to elaborate on all the differences between the northern and southern contexts in this paper, but some are worth noting: First, geographical realities of the Arctic and Subarctic precluded widespread efforts to turn Aboriginal peoples into farmers. Secondly, while the Indian Act was passed in 1876, little effort was made to implement it in Canada’s North; until WWII, government policy towards Aboriginal people in the North tended to be “best
left as Indians” which translated into less support or involvement in northern schools.

13. An exhibit sponsored by the Legacy of Hope Foundation in 2008 was entitled: *We were so far away: the Inuit experience of residential schools.* Its opening statement read simply: “We were far away from home, very far away; emotionally, geographically and spiritually.”

14. Another exhibit, launched at the National Archives of Canada and supported by the Legacy of Hope Foundation in 2009, was entitled: *Where are the children?*


20. By 1967, four catechist training schools had been set up. During the Marsh era several Inuit catechists were ordained as priests: among them, Armand Tagoona, ordained in 1964 and the first “ordination to the Priesthood of any Eskimo”; Gideon Kitsualik in 1966; and Noah Nasook (no date given). Because of initiatives taken by the Inuit themselves, European/EuroCanadian missionaries, upon arriving in a new region, sometimes discovered that converts were already waiting for them (Marsh, *Arctic History*, 11-14).


22. Among the differences are historical events such as the Klondike Gold Rush and the attitudes towards Aboriginal peoples by the more influential missionaries.

23. Bompas refused to serve as an assistant priest under Robert McDonald who had been in the region longer because he could not accept that McDonald “though [his] superior in missionary ability” should have authority over him given that he was “a Native of this country” (Frank A. Peake, “From the Red
River to the Arctic: essays on Anglican missionary expansion in the
nineteenth century,” *Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society* 31,
no. 2 (October 1989): 87. This may have been one reason why the CMS
consecrated Bompas as Bishop rather than McDonald who had seniority and
ore success in his missions. It was shortly after Bompas’ consecration that
McDonald married Julia Kutug, performing the marriage himself rather than
inviting Bompas to officiate.

24. Patrick Moore, “Archdeacon Robert McDonald and Gwich’in literacy.”

25. Among Inuit peoples, names and gender are not connected. Names include the
*atuq* or “soul-name” (which includes personality), carried over from a
deceased person to a newborn named after the deceased. The *atuq* binds the
newborn to relatives of the former carrier and to the social network of all who
carry the same name. For more information see Alia, *Names*, 1994.

26. Athabascan societies tend to be matrilineal but, as Sharp discovered,
matrilineality or patrilineality may depend on where the group is located
(Henry S. Sharp, *The Transformation of Bigfoot: Maleness, Power, and Belief
Among the Chipewyan* [Washington: The Smithsonian Institute Press, 1988],
xiv).

27. Among Athabascan peoples, parents were traditionally renamed after their
children (Marie-Françoise Gudon, *Fieldnotes on the Nabetes*, unpublished,

28. Among the Inuit and other Aboriginal nations, names were traditionally
changed when they failed in some way or one’s identity changed significantly.
For example, if a person became sick and was not responding to treatment, his
or her name was showing itself to be lacking in power. Changing the person’s
name became a way to attach itself to stronger spirits (or, in the case of the
Inuit, *atuq*) who might be able to effect healing (Alia, *Names*, 1994; Marie-

29. The example was provided by Cree participants at the Tuktu-Poro-Aiihk
Workshop in Ottawa in 2009 which I attended. More information on the
workshop can be found at http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~icul-ture/projects/tuktu/in-
dex.html (last accessed 15 August 2011).

30. Remark made by Bishop Mark McDonald during his presentation, “Self-
determination & governance,” in *Educational Series on Aboriginal Issues
(Oakville: St. Simon’s Anglican Church, 21 October 2009).*
The cup of anguish and sorrow has been put to the lips of the Canadian people and we must try and drink this cup with calmness, self-control, prayerful love for our own, courage, endurance, and Christian faith in the life to come. We are made to realize the deeper unity of the whole Dominion. Private sorrow has become public property and it calls for a fresh determination to destroy the machine of scientific frightfulness. Without the shedding of blood there can be no deepening of national life and no real progress. We must learn to suffer hardship, bereavement, and sorrow with a deep and stern joy.1

As he stood in the pulpit of Toronto’s St. Paul’s church and spoke these words, Archdeacon Henry John Cody was facing people that were, for the first time, experiencing the human cost of being at war. It was 2 May 1915 – the fifth Sunday in Eastertide – and the Great War was nine months old. On 22 April 1915, barely more than a week earlier, the Canadian contingent had faced history’s first successful gas attack at Ypres. It had been their first sustained combat operation, their baptism by fire, and the extent of the casualties they had suffered were being felt in homes across the Dominion as telegrams were delivered to next-of-kin and newspapers printed casualty lists.

In his 1968 article on Canadian Methodists and the First World War, historian J.M. Bliss suggested that only the churches possessed the
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necessary ideological resources to comfort the population during the critical period of the war. He considers it questionable whether Canadians could have weathered the emotional upheaval caused by the war without the comfort and sustaining belief provided by the churches. Although I do not intend to engage this thesis in this short essay, the idea is nonetheless one which is helpful. The movement in much modern historiography away from top-down histories can obscure the importance of messages being received from those in positions of authority. The common assumption by historians has been that clerical support for the war was jingoistic, idealistic, and ill-informed. It is my hope to provide a more nuanced view of the message that Anglican congregations were receiving from their priests and to begin to show why the ideological resources of the churches may have been so important. The paper that follows is divided into two sections. The first, and longest, deals with the story of the Second Battles of Ypres as it played itself out in Canadian Anglican churches in the spring of 1915. The second section is a reflection on the first, attempting briefly to establish a rhetorical context and inquiring as to what the story can tell us about Canadian identity and society during the first year of the Great War.

What is conventionally known as the Second Battles of Ypres began the evening of Thursday, 22 April 1915, when German troops released chlorine gas on trenches being held by Canadian and French colonial troops. As the African troops fled or were overcome, it fell to the Canadians to plug the gap in the line and prevent the Germans from exploiting the situation. That same Thursday, readers of the evening edition of Toronto’s The Globe newspaper could read headlines announcing “British Holding Fast in Desperate Struggle,” but it would take two days for further details about the situation that had been faced by the Canadian soldiers at the front to filter back to Canadians at home. As fighting continued in Flanders, headlines such as “Desperate Fighting Is in Progress in Flanders / Poisonous Gases Are Used by the Enemy” did little to ease people’s worries. Just as they had in August, nine months earlier, when they were waiting to hear if war had been declared, people congregated at newspaper offices across the country, this time desperate to hear the latest news from Belgium and learn the fate of individual soldiers. They had been warned to expect heavy casualties. But how many? And who? There would be no further news until Monday.

Speaking at Montreal’s St. Matthias’ church on that tense Sunday, 25 April, John Cragg Farthing, Bishop of Montreal, said,
This is a time of crisis, not only in the Empire, the physical struggle taking place in Europe, but also in the church. We are all suffering in the present war, but what is pressing upon my mind... is the question, “What if this suffering should be in vain? What if people turn a deaf ear to God, and when the war is over go back to worldliness... and unrighteousness?”

While Farthing’s main subject were allegations of graft and war-profiteering coming out of Ottawa, his question ‘What if this suffering should be in vain?’ was asked at precisely the time when many were waiting anxiously, knowing that there had been a battle but not yet knowing the number of dead and wounded. Farthing’s answer, that the suffering would bear fruit if people were to remain righteous and turned toward God – the “deepening of national life” that was spoken of by Cody – is a dominant theme in sermons from this early period of the war. Britain, and through it the Empire, was engaged in a righteous war, a war that needed to be waged by a righteous people. As one of the collects authorized for special use in the war’s first days entreats:

Grant that, in the present time of warfare and distress of nations, our people may know thy presence, and obey thy will: Remove from us arrogance and feebleness; give us courage and loyalty, tranquility and self-control, that we may accomplish that which thou gavest us to do, and endure that which thou givest us to bear.

It was believed that the war, with its attendant suffering and required self-sacrifice, would bring Canadians to realize their national faults and draw people closer to God.

On Monday, 26 April, the same day Canadian troops were withdrawn from the firing line in Flanders, the first list of officer casualties was released. It contained sixty-eight names. New lists, containing further names, continued to be released daily, and estimates of the total number of casualties that had been suffered were revised dramatically upward as the week went on and more information became available. On Wednesday, 28 April, the projected total was two thousand casualties. The full list would not be available for a further week, and the official tally would be nearly six thousand dead, wounded and missing. But regardless of the exact figure and despite the slow release of official casualty lists, it was clear early on that the “gallant stand” made by the Canadian units had exacted a heavy toll. As Cody had told his Toronto congregation that
anxious 25 April: “The terrible experience that has come to us in Canada, bringing with it sorrow and anguish to many, has made us realize the grim fact that we are at war.”

Public memorials and parish services acknowledging the sacrifices that had been made by the Canadian troops were swiftly organized. In Calgary, the services held throughout the day on 2 May at the pro-Cathedral of the Redeemer were “of a Memorial character for those who fell.” Bishop James Fielding Sweeny of Toronto requested that churches throughout his diocese hold memorials. In Montreal’s St. John the Evangelist, Monday, 3 May marked the beginning of a series of requiem celebrations for the war dead to be held on the first Monday of every month. Among the large public memorials organized were one on Parliament Hill on 29 April and another in Halifax on 9 May. Speaking at the Halifax memorial, addressing an estimated ten thousand people, Archbishop of Nova Scotia, Clarence Lamb Worrell, said, “We have come together as Canadians, and therefore as citizens of the greatest empire the world has ever known, and we are proud to declare ourselves citizens of that empire, not only in times of prosperity, but of adversity as well. We have the privileges . . . We are ready to bear the responsibilities . . .”

Through their service and self-sacrifice, Canadians soldiers would become something more than mere individuals – John McCrae would famously give them voice in his poem “In Flanders Fields” as the Dead. In a similar fashion, the tens of thousands who gathered across Canada to commemorate the achievements and losses of the Canadian troops would be united as Canadians, as citizens of the British Empire, and as mourners. This applied to equally those in deep mourning with loved ones who had been killed, to those with no immediate connection to those serving overseas, and to those who would themselves sail as later troop contingents. As Cody said, “...this sorrow has made the Empire more closely akin. The private sorrows of individuals become the common sorrow of the people.”

Stepping back from the series of events of late April and early May of 1915, it is clear that looking at sermons in this way is always looking at reactions to an event. I have tried to present not only the words of clergymen, but something of the information world they inhabited. In preparing their sermons, Canadian clergymen were faced with an ongoing situation, about which they had received little notice, only incomplete information, and little opportunity to consult with one another. Individual differences in wording and emphasis are apparent between the different
clergymen, something which is only to be expected, but more important are the thematic commonalities. The three that I have tried to point out – the idea that the war would deepen national life, the righteousness of Britain’s cause, and the communal aspects of both the war effort and commemoration – are the dominant themes in the early war period and come out particularly clearly during the period of crisis following the Second Battle of Ypres.

Sermons themselves are an interesting type of text, bridging the divide between document and oration. They are intended to be heard, usually within the context of a religious service. This fact, which may seem obvious, impacts both their subject matter and the type of language used. The “high diction” that Paul Fussell draws attention to in *The Great War and Modern Memory* is the expected tone, and is combined with a particular conservatism and formality of language and form. Words like righteousness and duty are therefore extremely important and are used without any sense of irony. The series of sermons presented here, drawn from a two week period in the spring of 1915 further fit into a broader genre of sermons preached on what are called “national events.” Analysis of these national sermons has been used to provide insight into religious attitudes toward the state and culture during times of national upheaval, including the War of American Independence, the Napoleonic Wars, and the Boer War, when such attitudes are more likely to be in a state of flux. During the Great War, as during these previous conflicts, days of public humiliation, prayer, and fasting were held and provided occasions for clerics to preach on national or political events. Sermons of this type were not invariably associated with wars as the opening of Parliamentary sessions and the dedications of public buildings also served as occasions for national sermons, nor were they necessarily preached on organized days or at special services. Clergymen could, and did, decide to address events of national and political importance on their own, whether from a sense of national duty or recognition of the pastoral opportunities created by events in the wider world. Aside from a Day of Prayer organized on 3 January, Canadian war sermons preached during the first year of the war were of the “unorganized” type, with clerics making their own decisions about which events to address and when. While the voluntary character of the sermons regarding the Second Battle of Ypres and other war-related events makes it difficult to assess how widespread this type of preaching really was, it is nonetheless impossible to make local evaluations regarding the importance attached to these national events within Anglican
populations. The widespread acknowledgement of the Second Battle of Ypres in Anglican churches across Canada speaks to the perceived importance of the battle at the time that it was fought.

While it was not uncommon for national sermons preached during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to be published in pamphlet form, both in Britain and in Canada, comparatively few Anglican sermons from the First World War period in Canada have been preserved in this way. The survival of sermon texts, in whole or in part, outside personal papers residing in archival collections, is largely dependent on reporting in secular and religious newspapers. Of course, this does introduce the problem of editorial selection bias, but in the multiple instances of duplicate publication – where a text appears in two or more places, usually one religious and one secular – the fidelity of transmission is extremely good for the sermon texts themselves. Leaving aside the potential problems involved with relying on newspapers, there are several advantages to this approach. As Gordon Heath points out in the introduction to his study of Canadian Protestant churches during the Boer War, the importance and value of newspapers as sources of information, both to the historian and the contemporary reader, makes them impossible to ignore, despite their pitfalls. Not only were they essential sources of information in a world before radio and reliable long distance telephone lines, but the ephemeral nature of newspapers also means that the sermons chosen for publication were considered topical to either events or to the liturgical season. While these contemporary accounts may rely heavily on well-known or particularly well-spoken preachers, the surrounding commentary can help indicate the reception the statements received. In addition, S.F. Wise suggested in a 1968 article that unpublished sermons may, in fact, be better gauges of public opinion than those preached on organized events and later published in pamphlet form, which are more inclined to be carefully edited and adhere to semi-official sentiments.

So what do these sermons say about Canadian identity and society at the beginning of the Great War? First, it is clear that Canadian Anglicans thought positively of themselves as citizens of the British Empire. Given the institutionalized imperialism of even the name of the Church of England in Canada, this is perhaps unsurprising, but it is nonetheless worth mentioning as Canadian nationalism is often said to have been born during the war. With this in mind, it is also clear that, even at this early point in the war, there is a clear pride in the actions and place of Canada as a distinct part of the Empire. To quote one of Farthing’s
statements briefly, “The achievements of our men have brought Canada into a new and more honourable place in the Empire.”27 Second, it is clear that Anglican clerics were active and important interpreters of national and political events during this period. The lack of comment and the amount of press regarding their activities indicates that this involvement was neither surprising nor unwelcome to the population. How influential these clerical statements actually were is still a question of speculation, but the historical importance of clergymen as local figures during this period is clear despite broader questions of secularization and religious attendance.28 Finally, and particularly telling, is an observation about what is absent from sermons of this first period of the war; although they unfailingly offer support for the war effort and belief in the righteousness of Britain’s cause, the clergymen are not at this point unthinkingly jingoistic. To give a clear example from the short period presented earlier, during the uncertain waiting period before the first casualty lists from the Second battle of Ypres were published, Farthing contrasted the encouragement that could be drawn from the self-sacrifice of the soldiers with the problems of graft that seemed to be rampant in Ottawa. There is clearly a strong trend of patriotism, but it is tempered by reflection and a tendency to critique the faults apparent in Canadian national life.

The lack of systematic attention paid to clerical rhetoric during this period has led to several serious misrepresentations in the historical record. As is hopefully clear from even this brief survey, the conflict was not one between “good” and “evil” nor was it portrayed as a “just war,” both of which are common assumptions regarding the views of the churches. The Great War was, however, a righteous war that could be justified, not only on the basis of international law, but because it was seen as a fight to preserve all that was good about British civilization. The themes apparent in this small group of sermons are in many ways characteristic of the earliest period of war preaching. The level of thematic agreement amongst the various clergymen speaking about the battle is high. Perhaps more important to note, however, is that an even higher degree of thematic agreement is present if the sermons from the first year of the war, rather than from a period lasting little less than a month, are taken as a whole. For a church with an established prayer book, whose words were repeated throughout Anglican Canada, this strong agreement demonstrates an appeal to a shared linguistic heritage. But it also speaks to a shared mindset about Canada, its relation to the Empire, and the duty of Canadians with regard to the struggle overseas. The language, although formal,
is rarely formulaic at this early stage, suggesting that, at least for the first year of the war, the calls to prayer and service – calls which were not always separable – were not merely pro forma, but something felt more deeply by the clergymen. The responses of the congregations, both in terms of enlistment figures and patriotic efforts, further suggests that the sentiments voiced by the clergymen were not falling on hostile or unreceptive ears. For a large number of Canadians it was clear that they, who enjoyed the privileges of belonging to the Empire, were not only duty-bound but also proud to do their part in defending the Empire and its values – democracy, liberty, fair play, justice, etc.

In conclusion, I would like to circle back to where I started, the aftermath of the Second Battle of Ypres. From this point in the spring of 1915, the war changed for Canadians both at home and abroad. The use of gas at Ypres and the civilian casualties caused by the sinking of the Lusitania on 7 May 1915, changed people’s conception of the enemy they were facing and how the war would proceed; this is reflected back in Anglican sermons. Sam Hughes, the Minister of Militia, announced that a further two troop contingents would be raised for overseas service – Canada’s third and fourth divisions – in answer to news of the fighting and losses at Ypres. In response to this further need, clergymen would become recruiting agents. Their support for the cause of the Empire would not waver, but the coming hardships – fuel and food shortages, influenza, division over conscription and continued casualties, among others – would increase the Church’s concern for social problems, encourage a new ecumenism, and begin to forge a new conception of the Canadian nation and the Church’s place in it. As the war lengthened without an Allied breakthrough and victory began to seem elusive, the nature of their appeals would change, but not their faith that the cause would triumph or that the sacrifices were worthwhile. The Second Battle of Ypres had but the cup of anguish and sorrow to the lips of the Canadian people for the first time, but not for the last time, and it would require calmness, self-control, prayer, courage, and, perhaps most of all, endurance to see them through the trials that were still to come. By the end private sorrow would indeed have become public property.
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A United Church Presence in the Antigonish Movement:  
J.W.A. Nicholson and J.D.N. MacDonald
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The Antigonish Movement, centred around the Extension Department of St. Francis Xavier University, represented a particular response to the poverty gripping much of the rural Maritimes even prior to the onset of the Depression. Moses Coady and Jimmy Tompkins, the two key leaders, were Roman Catholic priests; most of the next echelon of leaders and key workers in the Movement were also Roman Catholic. However, some clergy and lay members of other denominations either supported, or played an active role in, the Antigonish Movement, including two United Church ministers – J.W.A. Nicholson and J.D.N. MacDonald. This essay will briefly examine these two individuals, their motivations, the nature of their involvement, and the way in which they were perceived within the United Church, both during and subsequent to their direct involvement in the Antigonish Movement.

J.W.A. Nicholson (1874-1961) was a contemporary of Coady and Tompkins. Born in 1874 in Cape Breton, as a young man he attended Pine Hill Divinity Hall in Halifax, then a Presbyterian college serving the Maritimes. After completing his B.D., he did post-graduate study in Edinburgh, followed by a period of study at the University of Berlin. After an initial pastorate in the Saint John area, Nicholson served at Inverness in Cape Breton from 1905-1911. He then took a call to St. James Presbyterian Church in Dartmouth, where he stayed until 1927. Following a two year period of study at Columbia University in New York, Nicholson returned to Canada, where he served at North Bedeque, PEI, a rural,
multi-point pastoral charge until his retirement.

Nicholson was an ardent social activist, much influenced not only by liberal theology in general but also by social Christianity or the social gospel in particular. While, it is difficult to weigh the particular influence of various factors in his life, various influences both theoretical and experiential are evident: for instance, he studied with Adolf von Harnack in Germany; and the minister whose congregation Nicholson attended after his retirement judged that Nicholson’s time in Inverness was likely a factor in his involvement in social action. It was there that he gained first-hand experience with coal mining in Cape Breton and with the appalling conditions in which the miners and their families lived. During this time he developed a close relationship with the local Roman Catholic priest; this pattern of a close relationship with local Roman Catholic clergy remained a feature throughout his ministry. Nicholson also devoted the remainder of his life to involvement in various social causes designed to better the lives of common folk. While he manifested pacifist sympathies throughout his life, he became an ardent pacifist following World War I. He was the key leader of the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order in the Maritimes and was one of the contributors to the Fellowship’s 1935 publication, *Towards the Christian Revolution*.

Nicholson’s involvement with the Antigonish Movement took several forms. He was a good friend and correspondent of both Coady and Tompkins. The Movement clearly had his moral support, a support that grew stronger as the Movement gained authority. During his time at North Bedeque, he followed the Antigonish Movement practice of establishing study groups as a prelude to other initiatives. He also played a role in establishing credit unions, both in the general rural area where he served as well as elsewhere in Prince Edward Island. He was also active in the establishment of co-operatives on PEI. After his retirement from North Bedeque, he moved to Halifax, where he helped to organize study groups. After retiring to Halifax, he again played a key role in the still young credit union movement in Nova Scotia and also promoted co-operatives in the province. In 1938, when Moses Coady was putting together a ten person committee to do fund-raising in order to provide a financial base for the Extension Department at St. Francis Xavier, Coady approached Nicholson to serve on the committee. As Coady noted in his letter to Nicholson soliciting the latter’s involvement: “The idea is to be able to say that this Movement is Maritime-wide, non-denominational, and non-political in character.” In his response, Nicholson noted his current involvement as
a rural representative on the Carnegie Library Commission and also his hope that some well-to-do Maritimers might be persuaded to support Coady’s initiative, something Coady himself considered an unlikely prospect. Nicholson continued to be a strong supporter of the work of the Extension Department. He was particularly appreciative of the decision of the Department to establish the Bulletin, a publication he regarded as well worth the annual subscription fee of one dollar.

On a personal level, Coady and Nicholson had a close and strong friendship. They wrote with some regularity to one another, among other things recommending books each had personally found helpful. A 1951 letter from Nicholson to Coady offers insight into Nicholson’s approach toward ecumenism and to his cooperative spirit with clergy of other denominations. He noted that he had “some good friends within my own church with whom I differ strongly on the proper Christian relations between our own and other churches, especially your own. I have always cultivated friendship and brotherly intimacy with these in my own long ministry, with most happy relations in nearly every case. It is one of the features of my ministry which gives me the richest satisfactions.”

How was Nicholson regarded in the United Church at the time? He was definitely viewed as a radical. By many, he was admired and respected, not least for his unswerving faith in the worth of every individual he met. He was also viewed by many as a “bit of a kook,” and was feared by some for his ideas and his potential influence. His involvement in the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order and also in the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation made him persona non grata in some circles, especially among those who judged that clergy should have no part in worldly affairs in general and political affairs in particular. His close relationships with a number of Roman Catholic priests also netted him significant opposition from some United Church clergy. As well, in the post-World War II era, he became somewhat lionized by a number of younger clergy. It may also say something of the way he was viewed, initially in the Presbyterian Church and later in the United Church, that though he had studied at two prestigious universities in Europe and had an earned M.A. in Theology at a time when such an accomplishment was relatively rare, he was never offered a teaching position at Pine Hill or any other Presbyterian or United Church theological institution. It is also noteworthy that when he returned from his studies at Columbia University in the late 1920s, urban congregations were not interested in his services, notwithstanding his reputation as a brilliant thinker, a good preacher, and
J.D.N. MacDonald grew up on a small farm in Cape Breton. His parents had moved from the American east coast shortly before his birth. Although not raised in a church-going family, he became involved in the church in his teens and, after a brief teaching career, studied for the ministry, being ordained in the United Church in 1926. His first pastoral charge was in the mining community of Dominion, Cape Breton. Following that, he served briefly in a rural area before developing, as a very young man, a heart condition that nearly killed him. He spent almost two years convalescing in a hospital in North Sydney run by the Sisters of Charity. While his hospital stay was not the beginning of his appreciation for Roman Catholic leadership in an age that was far from ecumenical, it certainly cemented his appreciation for the readiness of the Catholic Church to care for individuals who had few material advantages. Following that period of convalescence, in 1931 he went to serve a rural, primarily agricultural, pastoral charge near Baddeck, Nova Scotia. In 1932, Moses Coady came to Baddeck and addressed a meeting attended by MacDonald. Much impressed by Coady, MacDonald began to organize study groups in each of the four communities he served. Each study group began to collect money from its members, and the resulting Thrift Club was the forerunner of a credit union in the area. The study groups and the Thrift Club also led to the development of a small cannery in the area. He also began to help the farmers in the area to market their produce in Sydney and the surrounding mining towns. The Thrift Club provided capital to bring in chicks and to increase the poultry flocks as well as to bring in good breeding stock in order to improve the quality of the animals raised by local farmers.

With the Movement growing in influence, Moses Coady approached MacDonald in 1936 to see if he would become a full-time field worker. MacDonald refused, commenting in his memoirs that it was the only time he had ever refused Moses Coady. For MacDonald, his own sense of his call to ministry meant that he needed to continue to work actively in parish ministry. He did, however, agree to do part-time work as a field worker for the Extension Department, although confiding in his memoirs that while he did his best to accommodate Coady’s requests, he also thought that Coady’s demands on what constituted part-time work were strenuous. MacDonald also did extensive work with the credit union movement in Nova Scotia, especially after his move in the 1940s to serve a multi-point pastoral charge on the eastern side of Dartmouth, Nova Scotia.
In 1937 MacDonald received an invitation from students at Pine Hill Divinity Hall, the United Church theological college in Halifax, to come and talk with them about the Antigonish Movement. He rightly viewed this opportunity as one way to influence younger clergy who might be willing to offer leadership in the congregations they would serve. From that point onward, other United Church ministers became more actively involved in aspects of the Movement, though the overall number remained relatively small.

MacDonald travelled through various parts of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia during the late 1930s and early 1940s. Occasionally it was at the request of a local United Church minister who wanted him to address a congregational meeting on organizing study groups as a first step toward other co-operative ventures. More often, it was at the request of Moses Coady or A.B. MacDonald, Coady’s key assistant in the early days of the Extension Department. During his later years, J.D.N. MacDonald continued to organize study groups, but much of his energy went into developing credit unions in the province.

How were MacDonald and his work viewed within his own denomination? When I was a theological student at the Atlantic School of Theology in the mid-to-late 1970s, I interviewed MacDonald and asked him that question. He recounts that when he began, some of his colleagues thought he was a bit of a crack-pot, though most of them were “more puzzled by me than anything.” Some of his colleagues serving rural congregations, particularly in Cape Breton, might have shared some of his ideas but, he judged, they were fearful of becoming involved because of opposition that they would have faced within their congregations. It was often the case, particularly in the fishing communities of eastern Nova Scotia, that the local fish merchants and store owners were Protestant. Certainly one often risked opposition within one’s congregations, and the opposition was likely to come from those with a capacity to be strong financial supporters. MacDonald also faced questions from some colleagues about his close association with a movement whose key leadership was Roman Catholic. In his memoirs, he noted that he did not meet as much opposition of that type as he would have expected, but it was still present. One wonders, though, how much of it remained unstated.

During the 1950s and 1960s, his earlier work came to be more appreciated by others within the denomination. The relative success of co-operative stores and the credit union movement, and their value in rural
communities, led to greater appreciation of the work of those who had been the early leaders in the Movement. Both credit unions and co-operative movements had gained increased “respectability.” As these aspects of the Antigonish Movement became more normative, more open expressions of appreciation for those involved followed.

In 1958, St. Francis Xavier awarded MacDonald an honourary LL.D. for his work in the Antigonish Movement. That honourary degree – in a United Church Maritime culture that very much valued not only formal education but also such recognition by a university – heightened MacDonald’s profile within his own denomination. Subsequently, in the 1960s, he was elected President of the Maritime Conference, a position that, in those years, went only to “valued elders” in the region. United Church laity and ministers who, in the 1960s and 1970s, endeavoured to give leadership to rural life and rural congregations within the Maritime Conference, judged MacDonald to have been an important pioneer in trying to help rural communities develop local resources ways that benefitted the local community. It is perhaps even more telling that, in the challenging times rural communities currently face, there has been a renewed interest in the Antigonish Movement, as well as in the life and work of some of its key leaders.
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Faith in Development: Donald K. Faris’s Path to a New Mission in the Postcolonial Era
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After the Second World War, Western nations, multilateral agencies, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) began providing development assistance to newly emerging nations in Asia and Africa. Their engagement reflected the great need for humanitarian assistance in those nations and the pragmatic stimulus of the Cold War. The pace, at first halting, accelerated dramatically in the 1960s, which the UN proclaimed the United Nations Development Decade. Far from perceiving this trend as a threat to their historic roles and their influence in the non-western world, many mainstream missionaries embraced it, either by serving with secular development agencies or by encouraging the mission organizations of their churches to make multi-faceted assistance to the developing world a priority. In the course of the 1960s, the mission organizations of many mainstream churches did in fact make this transition, in effect becoming faith-based NGOs. For historians of western Christianity as well as for development studies specialists, much can be learned, I believe, by investigating intersections between secular and faith-based approaches to international assistance in the postcolonial era.

For the past several years I have been researching a secular NGO, CUSO, originally called Canadian University Service Overseas. Established in 1961, the same year as the US Peace Corps, CUSO was the first
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distinctively Canadian non-governmental organization to undertake development work from a secular stance and in a postcolonial and decolonizing world. In a paper at the CSCH conference in Vancouver in 2008, I dealt in a preliminary way with some of the links between Canadian mainstream missions and CUSO. A substantially different version of that paper has since been published under the title “When Missions Became Development: Ironies of ‘NGOization’ in Mainstream Canadian Churches in the 1960s.” In the published article, I focused mainly on the United Church of Canada during the 1960s and in doing so referred briefly to the man whose career I consider here, the Reverend Donald K. Faris (1898-1974).3

Faris began his overseas career as a United Church missionary in China but worked after the Second World War for several different United Nations agencies and thus, in a broad sense, illustrates a secular approach to development. Through his book To Plow With Hope, published in 1958, Faris was a significant, albeit indirect, influence on the founding of CUSO. I’ll highlight briefly how that came about near the end of the essay. The main part of the paper outlines the stages in Faris’s career so as to show the unfolding of his own new mission. Faris came to believe strongly that humane, small-scale, locally sensitive technical assistance that enabled the world’s poorest to help themselves could both improve the quality of their lives and contribute to the growth of international friendship and understanding. That aspect of his faith journey began early on in his career as a missionary. I will focus mainly on his postwar years. As well as outlining his UN work, I suggest that his understanding of mission and his youthful Christian faith both informed his approach and underwent change as he moved out of the orbit of his church’s mission board and into the not always congenial new world of UN agencies and large-scale secular development. By focusing on a cross-culturally engaged individual like Donald K. Faris who made this kind of transition, one can, I believe, get a richer understanding of how such major international phenomena as decolonization, the Cold War, and secularization were experienced at a personal level as well as a better sense of the missionary legacy in development. Before turning to Donald Faris, however, we need briefly to revisit the early days of Canadian Protestant overseas missions and their evolution through to the Second World War.

The mainline Protestant denominations of Canada, including the three denominations that came together in 1925 to form the United Church of Canada (Congregationalists, Methodists, and most Presbyterians), had
all established overseas missions by the late nineteenth century, missions that were vitally important to their sense of denominational identity and international engagement. Almost from the beginning, like their American counterparts, these denominations established social service and institutional components as adjuncts to their proselytizing, particularly in the form of education and medical work. The home-base committees of these missions were, on the one hand, intensely proud of these elements in their mission outreach and, on the other, anxious to have their missionaries remain mindful that educational and medical work and other forms of non-preaching activity were meant to be merely aids to the evangelization of non-Christians. In general, the missionaries agreed with this emphasis. But not always. In the case of Presbyterians in India around the turn of the century, for instance, specific local circumstances led some prominent missionaries to justify medical work and famine relief even when those activities did not necessarily serve as conduits to conversions. During the interwar period of the twentieth century, as with mainline mission bodies in the US and Britain, the institutional and social service aspects of Canadian church missions became increasingly important and diverse (agriculture, literacy work, etc.), more ecumenical, and often much more professionalized, despite the fact that in most cases these agencies had not proven to be particularly effective tools for making converts. As for evangelizing, it was increasingly left in the hands of indigenous Christians, although for purposes of fundraising the mainline missions continued to employ a discourse of evangelization, a practice for which, especially in the US, they were sometimes strongly criticized by their more conservative counterparts.

The types of non-proselytizing activity that these mainline missions were practising in the interwar period anticipated much work that would later come under the rubric of development. Nevertheless, from the perspective of missionaries and former missionaries at mid-century who favoured more in the way of service-oriented mission work, or who looked back with regret on the colonialist context of missions and the emphasis on making conversions, the churches still had a long way to go. This kind of perspective became increasingly characteristic of the World Council of Churches (WCC), inaugurated in 1948. In the United Church of Canada, an enthusiastic founding member of the WCC, the new mood appeared strongest among missionaries who had served in China and whose careers there had ended with the triumph of Communism.

Donald K. Faris was one such missionary. One of four children born
to a farm family near Bradford, Ontario, Faris obtained a degree in Arts
and Theology at Queen’s University in 1923. As an undergraduate he was
in on the early days of the Student Christian Movement and attended a
Student Volunteer Movement (SVM) conference in Des Moines, Iowa, in
1919. Designated as a missionary to China in 1925, he first served in a
challenging mission field north of Kamloops, British Columbia. It was
there that he met Marion Fisher, the minister’s daughter and public health
nurse whom he married before leaving for China and who, despite frequent
periods of ill health, outlived him by twenty years and herself underwent
diverse spiritual journeys.6

Faris was appointed to the United Church of Canada’s North China
mission (formerly the North Honan Mission of the Presbyterian Church in
Canada). While attending the SVM conference in Des Moines he had
become acquainted with a prominent India-based agricultural missionary,
Sam Higginbottom. Early on in China, agriculture likewise emerged as a
strong interest for Faris notwithstanding his ordained status and his
appointment to evangelistic work. Political and social upheaval in interwar
China (contending Nationalist and Communist forces, anti-foreign
agitation, ongoing banditry, Japanese invasion) exacerbated the routine
poverty and malnutrition that marked the lives of the rural masses among
whom the North China missionaries worked. Although he was stung when
he saw his name included in a printed diatribe against foreigners during his
first term, Faris was led to ponder whether it was appropriate to preach
God’s love and Christian brotherhood to people experiencing starvation.
As the son of an innovative farmer, he had seen the difference that careful
seed choices and other sound agricultural practices could make in
improving crop yields. Thus, in 1931, “as a hobby I started growing a few
imported fruit trees in China.” Back in North America on furlough in
1932-33, he visited the Dominion Experimental Farm and audited courses
at the Ontario Agricultural College. He also attended an agricultural
seminar at Cornell, where he met John Reisner, the well-known head of
the Agricultural Missions Foundation.7

During the furlough, like many other missionaries at this period,
Don had a strong religious experience through the Oxford Group
movement, though the introspection and elite associations often associated
with the movement and deplored by its critics was far from typical of his
personality.8 Once back in China, agricultural experimentation and work
for rural community improvement, broadly conceived, became his priority,
notwithstanding the constraints placed on all mission work by the
Depression. In a 1934 letter to J.H. Arnup, Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions, he reported encouraging early outcomes from initial experiments on two small farms using “already improved seeds” from North America to compare crop outputs with yields from native varieties. He also told of a work-study initiative for eighteen boys (more than fifty had applied) to equip them with training for agricultural extension work in nearby villages. Faris’s detailed account of his work was a prelude to asking Arnup for help in contacting Canadians willing to donate money and equipment. Improved crop yields had the potential to fend off the risk of starvation facing thousands in the area, Faris wrote, but he had exhausted the resources of his personal salary, and in the current state of the mission’s finances “new work just has no look in.”

Two years later in The New Outlook, Faris wrote in enthusiastic terms about achievements and future prospects for the mission’s now multi-faceted programme of Rural Reconstruction. Though they had had successes with improved yields on a wide variety of crops, they had decided to focus on fruit production and to that end were beginning a canning and bottling initiative through a farmers’ cooperative. A farm fall fair, the first in Honan, had been visited by some ten thousand people and had received strong official support. The Church of Christ in China, having become aware of the mission’s agricultural initiatives, had asked Faris and his colleagues to research and present a report on measures for rural reconstruction that could extend beyond the region. Especially in view of the “continuous over-emphasis on revival” within the Church, Faris was gratified by this turn of events. “In our programme,” he wrote, “love seeks to face the realities of every-day life and find its fulfilment in practical service in the rural communities.” Although Japanese forces occupied Honan in 1937, the mission’s rural work carried on until the mission was evacuated in 1939. Amidst the chaos, the grafting of some 1500 peach trees onto local stock and their distribution to village cooperatives was perhaps its most enduring physical legacy.

Following the evacuation, Faris was invited to be Director of the Rural Institute established earlier as an extension of Cheeloo University in Tsinan. Some programmes at Cheeloo and at other universities initiated by missionaries were relocated to West China (so-called Free China) when Japanese forces took over. But the rural extension programme remained in Japanese-occupied territory, and despite the uncertainty of the political situation Faris became absorbed in his new work and its future possibilities. As had been the case back at the mission, he was deeply interested at
the larger Cheeloo experimental farm in trying out new means for improving the diet of malnourished peasants (here experimenting, for instance, with breeding poultry and hares as cheap sources of protein). He was initially less comfortable with Institute plans for training agricultural workers at three different levels of expertise, including a graduate level. In the past he had favoured “a village-centred” approach to training and for a time was concerned that institutionalizing rural training on a large-scale and over a prolonged period would produce graduates alienated from village life. Although Marion and their three sons returned to Canada in March 1941, Faris stayed on and was able to continue working at Cheeloo even after Japan and the Allies were at war and he became a detainee. His return to Canada in June 1942 in an exchange of wartime detainees proved to be the end of his career as a missionary.

Faris spent most of the last two years of the war as an RCAF chaplain in British Columbia, the province that was home to him and his family when they resided in Canada. He had turned to chaplaincy work, since, as explained in the memoir, “ordinary pastoral work didn’t appeal to him after what he had been doing in China.” A reluctance to take on a pastoral role was to be a recurring theme in his postwar life. Then, even before the war was over, in January 1945, Faris applied for a position with UNRRA, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. That fall after briefing at UNRRA headquarters in Washington and a short period of training at the University of Maryland he was on his way back to China to work on a major UNRRA rebuilding project on a portion of the Yellow River in Honan. UNRRA’s historian called it “perhaps the best known among all the specific rehabilitation enterprises sponsored by UNRRA.” The project occupied Faris for the next two years. Like other missionaries who were hired by UNRRA and other similar UN agencies in the immediate postwar years, he was probably hired mainly for his language skills and local cultural expertise. The first part of the project involved rebuilding dikes on a stretch of the Yellow River in order to restore farmland that had been deliberately flooded by Chiang Kai-shek’s Nationalist forces as a means of holding back the invading Japanese (a strategy that had killed or displaced millions of Chinese peasants). The original job description called for engineering expertise, but Faris functioned principally as an expeditor of supplies for the thousands of labourers employed on the project and as a liaison between the Nationalist and Communist forces who controlled different parts of the region and who had agreed when the project began to cease fighting in order to allow
the work to proceed. As the months passed and the agreement broke down, Faris frequently found himself caught in crossfire between the rival forces: a Shanghai newspaper called him “the most shot-at man in UNRRA.” His main personal frustrations, however, seem to have arisen from tense relations with his mercurial American supervisor and other uncongenial western co-workers and from his own insecurity about his fitness for some aspects of the UNRRA assignment. 15

Faris would serve on three more UN projects, all of them involving varying degrees of challenge and frustration before working in India on his final and most satisfying UN assignment. Shortly after his UNRRA job ended there was a UNICEF refugee-feeding project in Hankow, China, closed down just ahead of a Communist takeover of the region; some two years of work in Korea with the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency (UNKRA); and almost four years in Thailand, 1955-1959, on the staff of the Thailand-UNESCO Fundamental Education Centre training workers for community development leadership in rural areas, an assignment similar in some ways to one part of his wartime work at Chee-loo.

Meanwhile, however, in 1949-50 Faris sought to return to China under the Overseas Mission Board (OMB) of the United Church. This period is worth considering in some detail, since it shows how the immediate Cold War context and Faris’s views about the need for a wholly new approach to missions in the postwar world strained his relationship with the OMB. Faris hoped that in spite of the Communist triumph in China, he would be able to go back to agricultural extension work at Chee-loo University and to that end sought authorization from the mission board to return. 16 His expectation was not as naive as it may seem in retrospect, for as Jessie Lutz, the US historian of China’s Christian colleges, explains, the period 1948-1951 was “a transitional era” in which it still seemed possible that the Communist Party might permit some of the colleges’ previous roles to continue. 17 Still, there were several things working against Faris’s plan. Mission Board secretary Jesse Arnup and Faris had had tense relations in 1948 when Faris, then recently back from his UNRRA work and giving addresses to various non-church groups, had seemed to Arnup and some other concerned observers to be unduly critical of Chiang Kai-shek, and vulnerable to charges of being soft on Communism like fellow China missionary Jim Endicott. One man had accused Faris of being “a Communist masquerading in a UNRRA uniform.” For a brief period, suspicions about his political leanings would even result in
his being refused entry to the US. As for Arnup’s recently retired predecessor at the OMB, A.E. Armstrong, he had written to Faris in January 1948 from Toronto, saying “I do plead with you to refrain from any further speeches of a political nature . . . I hope that you will talk about the church in China.” Armstrong confessed that he was concerned about “the effect [of political discussions] on the missionary spirit, and practical expression of it in support of the work.” For his part, Faris believed that he was being censored by Armstrong’s letter and by the OMB, which, in contrast to secular organizations, had provided him with few speaking opportunities following his return to Canada from his UNRRA assignment.

In 1949, having returned from his UNICEF relief work in Hankow, where he had seen much that was troublesome about the ruthlessness of the Communists’ tactics as they extended their control, Faris was more conciliatory in writing to Arnup than he had been earlier and anxious for OMB sponsorship to return to Cheeloo. There was temporary work for him at the United Church’s new lay training centre at Naramata, he explained, but he was mindful of his and his family’s uncertain future. His preference, he now declared, had always been to work in China under church auspices, and he had taken the position with UNRRA only to have employment. Still, he was concerned that the church’s mission policy was not in keeping with new world conditions and that the approach to overseas work that he favoured would put him out of step with the home church. “These are days of great and drastic changes in the world and there must be matching changes in mission policy and concept of mission work,” he wrote. Several months later, again writing to Arnup, he declared, “leadership in World Brotherhood has passed, in large measure, out of the hands of the Church. Almost everywhere in our communities we find that the majority of the active key persons with this vision are not in the Church.”

Faris did get to China at the end of 1950. Along with OMB sponsorship, he had support from Vancouver-area ministers and their congregations in obtaining audio-visual equipment and other supplies for his work, and he had obtained numerous fruit trees from the Dominion Experimental Farm in British Columbia as well as assistance in preparing these and other plant materials for shipment. But any hope that the door to mainland China would reopen was dashed when China entered the Korean War. Faris seems not to have got beyond Hong Kong. With no possibility of getting back to Cheeloo, he sailed to India at his own expense, arranging to leave his cherished fruit trees at the Allahabad Agricultural
Institute. This highly regarded ecumenical institution, founded by Sam Higginbottom, was evidently the place where Faris most wanted to find employment, but he also travelled elsewhere in India and Ceylon vainly seeking an agricultural assignment, whether under mission, UN, or Colombo Plan auspices.\textsuperscript{22}

This Hong Kong-India period (early 1951) was a low point in Faris’s career and effectively the end of his working relationship with the OMB. The United Church’s mission in India, described by Arnup as probably the most conservative of all the church’s missions, would probably not have been a congenial work site, but Faris evidently believed that the OMB could and should have done more to find or create a mission niche in line with his vision. In a letter to his son Ken early in 1951, he wrote that there seemed to be no place in the church for that vision. The kind of work that he had the experience and desire to do was, he said, “something that the church has no machinery or thinking prepared to use. It forces me to a conclusion that is none too happy a one[,] that my best contribution to the world now, perhaps is outside the church organization . . . This exodus from China and growing sentiment in all countries of the world has in it factors that make the older concept of missions a complete impossibility.” Declaring that he had “no beef against the church,” he went on to express the hope that as younger men with new ideas and ideals got into service, the church would face its mission with “new vision and courage . . . As the church makes such adjustments so will the church be powerful and living.” The task of aiding the world’s poor was far too vast for the church alone, he wrote, but “[i]t must always be in the forefront in the inspiration of such programs.”\textsuperscript{23}

Faris’s belief that the Christian church could be in the forefront in international aid work by providing inspiration and support for new kinds of secular aid programmes and non-traditional missions would be expressed again in the mid- and late-1950s in proposals that he put to the United Church constituency outside the framework of the mission board and for which he found some support, particularly among lay and clerical members of the United Church in British Columbia. What Faris and this group had in mind was something similar to the Unitarian Service Committee or the Friends Service Committee, that is, an aid programme that had church support but that was not “church centric” and not under the umbrella of the OMB. Such a programme, he told Observer readers, would help people “right at the level where they are” with simple needs: “food, shelter, health, education, community activity, planned families.”\textsuperscript{24}
At the same time, in the early 1950s Faris was also urging the Canadian government to support such multilateral agencies as those of the UN, the Colombo Plan, and the International Labour Organization and making the argument that it was only by making “radical changes of policy” that the west could head off Communism in other parts of Asia now that China had fallen. Faris’s emphasis on the Communist threat at this time was probably partly a pragmatic strategy for encouraging support for international technical assistance in the underdeveloped world, but it also seems to have reflected the chastening experience of having been targeted as a Communist sympathizer in the late 1940s. Correspondence with his son Ken warning him about the risks of being inadvertently drawn into Communist-linked organizations makes this concern clear.  

Meanwhile, following his disappointments in China and India in 1950-51, Faris was not long without work. En route home from India he had called on officials in UN agencies in Rome and Paris and then, back in Ottawa, on Lester Pearson, Canada’s Minister of External Affairs. The result was offers of several positions in UN agencies, including the one he took with UNKRA, arranged through Chester Ronning, a former China missionary like Faris and now with the Department of External Affairs. The Korea assignment began on an optimistic note but ended unhappily in the fall of 1953, when, like a number of other senior staff in the agency, Faris suddenly found his position terminated. As Susan Armstrong-Reid and David Murray observe in their recent history of Canadians’ involvement in UNRRA, the pioneering nature of these postwar aid and reconstruction agencies and the conditions of upheaval and uncertainty in which they functioned made them sources of intense frustration as well as exhilaration for staff. In the case of UNKRA, partisan politics in the US and in Syngman Rhee’s Korea, the dominant role of military decision-makers, and concerns about Communist infiltration all contributed to frequent and unexpected changes in broad programming plans as well as in staff. There were three major reorganizations in just over a year.  

For Faris, there were additional complications related to his own professional and personal background. Professionally, Faris’s strong interest and inclination, based on his years as a missionary in China, was, as shown, hands-on, grass-roots outreach to peasant communities to assist in improving their agricultural productivity through relatively simple, locally feasible techniques, arrived at by trial and error. In UNKRA he found himself in a series of senior administrative positions, beginning with the title Director of Technical Assistance Development, and while this was
initially flattering, he worried early on, as he had done in the UNRRA position in China, that he might be beyond his depth. He also found that support for a multi-faceted programme of rural and community development work within the Bureau of Rural Services, of which he was made Director and about which he was briefly hopeful, effectively ended after a new UNKRA administrator took over, a military man who favoured a top-down industrial model for rebuilding Korea. At a personal level, there was the discomfort of a cultural milieu very different from that of the close and homogeneous mission community that had formed Faris’s interwar world. As in the UNRRA assignment, he was not at ease with the heavy drinking and other aspects of socializing that took place, nor with many of the westerners with whom he was associated, who seemed to him to lack sympathy with and a desire to understand local cultural values.

Faris’s dilemma was somewhat like that of Homer Atkins, one of the unglamorous small heroes in the 1958 bestseller The Ugly American. In that book, set in the fictional Southeast Asian country of Sarkan, aid workers like Homer Atkins do hands-on work with villagers to develop low-tech solutions to their immediate problems and thereby win their friendship. But Atkins and his ilk are derided rather than valued by senior aid officials and diplomatic staff, who instead favour showy aid projects and urban settings and by their insensitivity to “the natives” inadvertently abet the cause of Communism. December 1953 found Don Faris once again seeking employment with a UN agency or through the Colombo Plan.

Nevertheless, the unhappy end to his Korea assignment proved to be the opening of a door to Faris’s most productive venture: the research that resulted in To Plow With Hope. Faris did not set out with a book in mind; he simply wanted to improve his own knowledge and understanding of possibilities for technical assistance in the developing world. He was particularly interested in learning more about community development, since that was the approach to technical assistance for which he had had high aspirations in Korea. Living first in Vancouver and using the resources of the university library and then moving back to Naramata, he threw himself and drew his family into this research. It was still ongoing when he took up his UNESCO assignment in Thailand in 1955. He obtained a contract with Harper and Brothers, the New York firm that, over the years, had published many works on missions, but the editors wanted extensive cuts and revisions to the manuscript. Marion Faris made a return trip to North America to update the research, while Ken, who had
recently done graduate work in the School of International Studies at Johns Hopkins University, largely wrote the chapter on Soviet aid programmes.\textsuperscript{32} Published in 1958, \textit{To Plow With Hope} illustrated the extent to which Faris’s interest in development both reflected and superseded his Christian and mission background. The first part of the book employed a literary device familiar to anyone acquainted with didactic mission literature: the use of an individual character to personify a “before” and “after” experience of change among impoverished non-western peoples. But whereas in the traditional mission genre the redemptive agent for transformation was conversion to Christianity, to which dramatic physical and cultural improvements were ascribed, in Faris’s book the character “Old Man Peasant” and his family suffer from poverty, sickness, illiteracy, and other problems, none of them attributed to a particular faith identity. In the Epilogue, “Old Man Peasant” is shown to have made modest improvements in his family’s well-being with the assistance provided by two friendly development workers who come to his village and help him to acquire functional literacy. He can now read simple but helpful manuals, and he can check the records of the money-lender. He is also hopeful that he can spare his one surviving son to attend school rather than work full time on the land. In introducing the designation Old Man Peasant in the Preface of his book Faris is careful to explain that “Old” is used as “a term of respect,” chosen deliberately “to represent that group whose life expectancy in many instances does not exceed thirty years or at most forty.” Part II of the book provided factual information about the range of national, multilateral, and voluntary agencies engaged in what Faris called “the whole international technical assistance movement.” As in the section on Old Man Peasant, population control received significant attention.\textsuperscript{34}

The final and most personal part of the book, written with the Cold War context in mind, urged the value of assistance to underdeveloped countries as a better investment than armaments and as a compelling obligation for “the 800 million people who call themselves Christian.” If even a tenth of them meant it when they talked about Christian love, why, he asked, had they so far proven so impotent in the face of such obvious need. Jesus’s parables “spoke of the fruits of a man’s living as the one way of judging whether his life was good [and] . . . as the ultimate criterion for entering the Kingdom. Only thus does our religion come alive – not in words but in deeds.” While this part of Faris’s message was addressed to a Christian readership, he made it clear that what he called “the forces of regeneration” in Asia and Africa were not exclusively Christian forces;
they also included Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims, and others working alongside Christians, “all in their own way obeying the imperative of love. In this brotherhood of man all barriers are down; no lines are drawn.” Thus expressed, “our own religious insight becomes adult.”

By the standards of much subsequent writing on development, *To Plow With Hope* was unsophisticated and unspecialized; Faris called it “a kind of primer.” Yet with its straightforward mix of empathy, practical information, and idealism, it appeared at the right moment. The book struck a chord among many people for whom practical idealism rather than either religious duty or calculating Cold War pragmatism was the chief motivation for assisting the decolonizing world. Faris was pleased that Sir Julian Huxley, the first Director-General of UNESCO, agreed to provide a blurb for the British edition of the book, pleased, too, that it was put on a list of five or six essential readings in UNESCO’s publication about its Freedom from Hunger Campaign, and that it was well and widely reviewed.

Even more gratifying in terms of the book’s impact within Canada and on Faris’s personal life was the role that it played in inspiring the students who became the first wave of CUSO volunteers. In the final pages of *To Plow With Hope*, Faris had issued a special call to young adults: “Our youth possess a tremendous potential of energy, idealism and enthusiasm just waiting to be tapped. The one reagent needed is the challenge that life’s fullest expression is found in serving others.” The young aid workers he had in mind would not replace but rather “supplement the older and more seasoned men and women” and “after an intensive period of orientation . . . go into any country where they were invited . . . to work with indigenous leaders in the world’s needy villages.” After drawing a parallel with the youth whose idealism had led them to serve in the recent world war, Faris added, “If, in addition to technical skills, these junior experts were equipped with humility and courage, with sincerity and wisdom, they would be able to transmit not only physical satisfactions to the needy but also lasting values such as friendship, goodwill and understanding.”

Faris was still living in Thailand when *To Plow With Hope* came out. Back in Canada one of the book’s most ardent admirers was Keith Spicer, a young political science graduate student at the University of Toronto. It was Spicer who organized the pioneer group of volunteers who came to be considered the first CUSO cohort. In his 2004 memoir, Spicer recalled that the call to youth in Faris’s book “seized me and wouldn’t let
me go.”38 Writing to Faris in India in 1960 with a view to obtaining his help in placing volunteers there, Spicer had told him, “[y]ou may be sure that you now have several hundred fervent disciples throughout Canadian universities.” He had recommended the book to the federal government “for distribution to every outgoing technical expert,” he told Faris, and it would certainly be used in orientation with all of the student volunteers. Fred Stinson, the Toronto MP who was Spicer’s most indefatigable ally in seeking to stimulate interest in and raise funds for the sending of volunteers, bought 150 copies of To Plow with Hope for distribution.39

Not only did Faris get to know that his book had been a source of inspiration to Spicer and other young Canadians – and this before the founding of the US Peace Corps; he also got to see the volunteers in action. In India for his UNICEF assignment from 1960 to 1966 he and Marion played host, sometimes for weeks at a time, to dozens of CUSO volunteers who came to their New Delhi home to recuperate from illnesses, during holiday time, and on many other occasions.40 This richly rewarding experience of engaging with the CUSO volunteers came as a bonus on top of the fact that, in his India assignment with UNICEF, Don Faris was finally able to do over a sustained period the kind of work that reflected his decades-long interest in assisting rural people. After a brief initial period of feeling insecure – his recurring difficulty as a non-specialist in development work – he came to realize that he had the confidence of western and Indian superiors and colleagues.41 The Applied Nutrition Programme (ANP), as the project was called, proved to be the most satisfying of all Faris’s overseas assignments. Sponsored by UNICEF but conducted in conjunction with India’s Planning Commission, the ANP aimed to improve the diet of villagers by increasing the growth and availability of suitable crops, especially with a view to improving maternal and infant health. To that end Faris travelled to hundreds of villages to win local support and determine the kinds of supplies that would be most useful in a given region. By the time the Farises sent out their Christmas newsletter for 1963, the ANP was operating in ten of India’s fifteen states. And in Orissa, where it had started, it was said to have strong support from women’s committees in several villages.42 Immensely challenging physically as well deeply satisfying, the assignment probably worsened the health problems that should logically have prevented Faris from undertaking this final overseas assignment.

In fact, it almost hadn’t happened. Following his return from Thailand in 1959 and worried that there would be no further opportunities
to work overseas, Faris, by then in his early sixties, had applied for and was about to accept a church placement in Vancouver. He had put his name forward to a Settlement Committee with reluctance, since, in the words of the memoir, “my faith had been slipping, although I found that hard to admit even to myself.” Clearly, the idealistic Faris was acting pragmatically with a view to the need to prepare for retirement. But then had come more overseas offers, including the offer of the UNICEF position in India through Newton Bowles, a fellow Canadian, the son of China missionaries and for many years the programme manager for UNICEF International. Despite medical problems so serious that they delayed his departure from New York – the UN medical clinic had recommended against his appointment – Faris had been determined to take the assignment, correctly anticipating that it would be “a real climax to my overseas career.”

Conclusion

Don Faris arguably remained a missionary at heart, not in the sense of a desire to proselytize for his own Christian faith but rather in his zeal to contribute to humanitarian work in the developing world. I suspect that it would have made little difference to Faris whether his years of service in Asia had been undertaken under mission or secular auspices so long as he had been granted the freedom to do the kind of village-focused work that he saw as of most direct and immediate value to the poor. While he certainly became critical of what he regarded as the outdated perspectives of his church’s mission board, he was equally uneasy with the kinds of large-scale, top-down approaches to development favoured by many senior western aid officials and leaders of indigenous governments. Newton Bowles, writing to Marion Faris following Don’s death and recalling a friendship that went back to the days of the Yellow River project, remarked that through his work in India on the ANP Don had been able “to steer that programme into more emphasis on what was within the reach of the villagers . . . it is a tribute to him and his insight that, at last, within the past year or so, the policies which he advocated so many years ago have been adopted as the official guiding principles for this programme.”

It is noteworthy that, within Canada, Faris’s ideas about development had a more direct influence on CUSO, a secular NGO, than on the mission programme of his own church. His alma mater, Queen’s University, awarded him an honorary doctorate of divinity degree for his overseas
work in 1955. And in 1958 an official with the church’s Board of Information and Stewardship, writing to acknowledge a copy of To Plow With Hope, warmly endorsed the book’s message and assured him that it was being heard: “We need so much to supplement the rather restricted character of our overseas undertakings with the kind of programme to which you are presently giving leadership. Many more people in the Church than you think are cheering because of what you have contributed.” Yet I have failed to find evidence that either Faris or his book had any direct influence on the deliberations of the lay and clerical officials who orchestrated the major changes to the church’s approach to mission that came about in the 1960s. The comprehensive Report of the Commission on World Mission, published in 1966, made no reference to To Plow With Hope even in the extensive bibliography. When Faris died of Parkinson’s Disease in 1974, the church did provide a warm acknowledgement of his career, describing him as a “[p]ioneer in the field of Technical Assistance” and a “forerunner of the new practical missionary.” By then, of course, the church had come to share his faith in development and was demonstrating its enlarged understanding of mission by engaging in diverse forms of human rights activity with international and ecumenical partners. The last decades of Don Faris’s life had been marked by distance from the denomination and then increasing enfeeblement. But to the extent that he was aware of the broadened global concerns of what the United Church now called the Division of World Outreach he could feel gratified.
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47. “Donald Kay Faris.”
The Remains of the Freeman-Froude Controversy:  
The Religious Dimension

IAN HESKETH
Queen’s University

When historian James Anthony Froude published a series of articles on the twelfth-century Archbishop Thomas Becket totalling less than seventy pages in 1878,² he knew that he could expect a response from his long-time nemesis and fellow historian Edward A. Freeman. A few months after his articles appeared, he wrote to his wife that he had yet to see a response from Freeman but assumed that “he will soon open his batteries.”³ Froude expected as much because he had been the victim of Freeman’s violent pedantry for almost two decades. Freeman had previously reviewed successive volumes of Froude’s History of England for the weekly Saturday Review. In these reviews he established a template for all later anti-Froude criticism, that Froude was “careless and [made] unintelligent use of documents,”⁴ that he had “natural” and “incurable defects” rendering him incapable of accuracy, and that he lacked “that calm and judicial intellect” necessary of historians. According to Freeman, Froude simply “has not the stuff in him that could ever guide him to . . . un failing accuracy and unswerving judgment.”⁵ Freeman also reviewed Froude’s collection of essays, Short Studies on Great Subjects, a work that if anything established that Froude could not do justice to great subjects, and that he was “really the most simple-minded of men.”⁶ About his historical work, Freeman concluded that “Mr. Froude is a memorable example that a man may write twelve volumes of so-called history without showing a glimpse of the historical spirit, and without ever letting us feel quite certain whether the whole thing is or is not a gigantic joke.”⁷
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Not only, then, was Froude expecting Freeman to review his articles on Thomas Becket, he must have known that such a review would in all likelihood be outrageously negative and hurtful. Surprising in all of this, however, is not that Freeman lived up to such expectations but that he somehow exceeded them. His review of Froude’s “Life and Times of Thomas Becket” would appear in not one but four instalments in the *Contemporary Review* and would total ninety-nine pages, exceeding Froude’s original articles by thirty. In the review, Freeman laughed at the many howlers Froude had made in transcribing his sources coming to the conclusion that Froude suffered from an “inborn and incurable twist” that makes it impossible for him to tell the truth on any matter for “[t]he evil is inherent, it is inborn.” With all the inaccuracies and false interpretations added up, Freeman concluded that Froude’s work was actually a fiction, a construction of his own fantastic imagination. But Froude had come to expect such insults from Freeman; it was rather the very personal nature of some of Freeman’s remarks that had Froude fuming. In the review, Freeman mused as to why it was that Froude, a sixteenth-century historian, would be rummaging around in the twelfth-century world of Thomas Becket. The answer for Freeman was simple: he was out to ruin the memory of his long-dead older brother, Richard Hurrell Froude, who, as one of the early leading members of the Oxford Movement, had also written a history of Becket. What was worse, according to Freeman, was that the younger Froude had hidden his true intentions by not even mentioning his brother by name but rather by attacking him with wild “stabs in the dark.” Froude was not only a charlatan, he was a back-stabbing coward.8

There was a vast methodological gulf that separated the two men that certainly goes some way toward explaining Freeman’s continuous attacks on Froude, for Froude believed that history was best understood as a genre of literature and as a form of art whereas Freeman believed that history was an autonomous discipline of study, not just separate from literature, but an empirically based science.9 But the nature of Freeman’s review of Froude’s “Becket” – particularly about his argument concerning Froude’s “unbrotherly” motivations – suggest that there was something deeply personal at the core of Freeman’s dislike of Froude’s histories, originating not in a methodological dispute but in theological debates that embroiled Oxford life while both Froude and Freeman were students and later fellows there almost thirty years before.

James Anthony Froude (1818-94) was Freeman’s senior by just five
years and while at Oxford he would leave in his wake a series of scandals that the younger man clearly abhorred. Froude’s Oxford life, however, was initially very promising. When he entered Oriel College in 1836, it was believed that he was following in his greatly respected older brother’s footsteps. But it was difficult to live up to the example set by the older Hurrell. When Hurrell was an undergraduate and later fellow of Oriel College, he became close friends with classmate John Henry Newman and his Oriel College tutor, John Keble. The three young men shared fundamental beliefs about the Anglican faith and they sought to purge it of all decidedly Protestant practices and teachings in order to return the faith to a period that preceded Henry VIII’s reforms that privileged State over Church. They put forward their Anglo-Catholic views in a series of “Tracts for the Times” that would eventually help spread a local Oxford debate amongst clerics to one that would take hold of the entire religious establishment while posing fundamental questions about the Church of England.

When Hurrell died of consumption in 1836, Newman christened him as the first saint of the Oxford Movement and sought to have his writings on various topics posthumously published as the *Remains of Richard Hurrell Froude*. The first of the four-volume work included, for the most part, extracts from Hurrell’s journal and letters, illustrating the painstaking trials and ceremonies the devoted young man had put himself through. To modern readers, Hurrell can sound deeply troubled as heanguished over countless unnamed sins seeking redemption through acts of self-flagellation and fasting. To Newman, Hurrell’s thoughts and anxieties very much read like “a sacred [Christian] text” and he believed it was “the testimony of the first Tractarian saint, the revelation of one of God’s ‘Angel’s in disguise.’” But, as Owen Chadwick points out so well, Newman read Hurrell’s extremisms “in the correcting light of friendship while the world judged Froude by the book.” And that judgment tended to be one of shock and horror. Indeed, to most contemporary readers, Hurrell sounded more like a Catholic monk of the Middle Ages and his *Remains* convinced many liberal and Low Church Anglicans that the Oxford or Tractarian Movement (as it was often called) did not lead to a more devotional Christianity but rather straight to Rome. The Evangelical *Christian Observer*, for example, became suddenly hostile toward Tractarianism commenting upon the publication of Froude’s *Remains* that “[t]he battle of the Reformation must be fought once more.” Indeed, instead of broadening the appeal of the movement, the *Remains* worked to unite
opposing forces against it.

James Anthony’s well-respected archdeacon father, however, disagreed with the criticism and felt the Remains gave evidence of Hurrell’s saintliness of character. James Anthony could never live up to the expectations set by his brother while he was alive; it was impossible for him to do so now that he was a martyr. James Anthony was viewed by his father as both weak in mind and spirit. What is more, the younger Froude began to accept his role as the feeble son, believing himself to be a liar and a coward, terrified of his hateful home, but equally terrified of public school where he was bullied. His father often demanded that James Anthony “re-read Hurrell’s Remains” in hopes that the saintly brother might provide an example for the weak one to follow.17 It seemed like that just might be the case when James Anthony went to Oxford and began to be mentored by Hurrell’s old friends.

Both Keble and Newman took the younger Froude under their wings and perhaps not surprisingly Froude began to accept their faith. Newman even asked Froude to help him with a series he was editing devoted to the “Lives of English Saints,” a project that was in part spurred on by the fourth volume of Hurrell’s Remains on the “History of the Contest” between Thomas Becket and Henry II. In that work Hurrell sought to rescue the memory of the fallen saint against received opinion that he had been a mere instrument of the so-called religious party and was therefore deserving of his untimely fate.18 James Anthony was to write on both Saint Neot and Saint Patrick but he quickly found it difficult to speak of miracles as recorded facts. “Saints who lighted fires with icles, changed bandits into wolves, and floated across the Irish Channel on altar stones,” according to Lytton Strachey, “produced a disturbing effect on [Froude’s] historical conscience.”19 He was able to complete the sketch of Saint Neot, writing a sort of “poetic justification” for his existence by concentrating on the legends themselves. He had a much more difficult time with Saint Patrick, however, and he wrote to Newman about his concerns. Froude had also clearly begun to harbour anxieties about Newman’s true intentions with the “Lives of English Saints,” intentions that were clear enough to many readers. As one critic put it in regard to the volume on Saint Augustine, “[t]he evident aim of every page is to set forth Rome as the source of all saintship, the centre of all unity, the mother, from whose embrace we have wandered, and to whom we must return.”20 Upon learning of Froude’s concerns both with the series in general and his troubles with Saint Patrick in particular, Newman wrote to him in 1844
that “I think the engagement between you and me should come to an end.”

Not only did his research into these English saints turn Froude decidedly against more Tractarian extremes, he also began to question fairly fundamental beliefs of the Christian faith. He had even thought about leaving Oxford but he had already accepted a fellowship at Exeter College which required him to take deacon’s orders effectively cutting him off from any other English profession. As an outlet he began writing confessional autobiography that was masked as fiction, perhaps the result of reading his brother’s Remains too many times.22 His first novel was published as Shadows of the Clouds (1847) under the pseudonym “Zeta.” It was the story of a boy absolutely brutalized at home and at public school and was so clearly the life of James Anthony Froude, that it was difficult for him to deny it. What was perhaps worse was that the punishing father was obviously the well-respected archdeacon Robert Hurrell Froude. Two years later Froude would publish The Nemesis of Faith, also a supposedly fictional account about a Church of England cleric much like Froude unconvinced by the Thirty-Nine Articles of faith and openly sceptical of Christ’s divinity.23 This time he did not hide behind a pseudonym but signed the book. “J.A. Froude M.A., Fellow of Exeter College.” While this was the great age of crisis of faith literature, it was unusual for a Church of England cleric to write so openly about doubting Anglican articles of faith, even if presented as a fiction. As a result the book caused an absolute scandal. Just about everyone seemed to feel abused by the book but particularly Tractarians whose credulous doctrine of faith is blamed for the protagonist’s fall.24 The book was famously burned at Exeter College Hall and Froude was forced to resign his fellowship. Needless to say, he was no longer welcome at family events.

By writing and publishing The Nemesis of Faith, Froude suddenly found himself barred from the only profession he was allowed to enter, making a reality out of one of the main fears of the book’s protagonist who lamented, “But if I decline my living, what is to become of me? I shall finally offend those whose happiness I value far more than I do my own.” Rather than condemn himself “to an inert and self-destroying helplessness,” Froude’s protagonist muses that perhaps he could instead write for a living. “The men that write books, Carlyle says, are now the world’s priests, the spiritual directors of mankind.”25 Unfortunately Markham is not convinced that he has enough talent to support himself as a writer, and as a result condemns himself to live out his miserable life as an unhappy
cleric. Froude, on the other hand, would take the chance Markham could not, and leave behind his previous life that was now amongst the ashes of his book scattered throughout Exeter College Hall, and he would take up the pen more seriously, beginning a fairly radical reconsideration of the English Reformation that would be contained in his twelve-volume *History of England* (1856-70). If he could no longer accept a position in the English Church, he hoped that he could make a living as one of Carlyle’s spiritual priests of literature.

Unlike Froude, Edward A. Freeman (1823-92) had a much less contentious experience at Oxford. He entered Trinity College in 1841 and met there a group of scholars who embraced, in the words of his biographer, the “principles and spirit of the Tractarian Movement” and this was very clear in the daily practices and habits of the members of the College. For instance, Friday fasts were encouraged, while the consumption of wine was greatly discouraged. This kind of lifestyle at Trinity worked to deepen Freeman’s already well-entrenched High Church beliefs. His diary at the time speaks of twice daily visits to chapel and the weekly observance of Sabbath. Interestingly, while his time at Oxford overlaps with perhaps the most contentious period of the Oxford Movement, with the publication of Tract 90 (1841) and Newman’s defection to Roman Catholicism (1845), he does not seem to have been terribly moved or anxious about what was going on. He certainly had no crisis of faith or of doubt for that matter. This is perhaps because Freeman himself claimed that he had already come to many of the same theological conclusions as had Tractarian leaders such as Newman, Keble, and Hurrell Froude, an argument which helps explain why he never felt the need to refer to their writings when questioning, for instance, the laxity of practice in the Anglican Church. Unlike Newman, however, he never considered converting to Catholicism, believing that a kind of naive loyalty to the Church was better than what he perceived as Newman’s artificiality.

Freeman came to this conclusion about his own loyalty to the Church after he read an article about Newman’s defection by the Tractarian James Mozley in the *Christian Remembrancer*. In the article, Mozley compared Newman’s state of mind about the English Church with that of Hurrell Froude. He argued that whereas Newman seemed to commit himself to a point of view about the English Church and almost inevitably followed it to its logical conclusion, Froude

had the real intrinsic feeling of belonging to his Church, as a
branch belongs to a tree . . . In this way, he had very strong feelings about different portions of her history; keen likings and dislikings, vigorous sympathies and disgusts; equally genuine and natural both. He felt against the Reformers; he felt with the Caroline divines. These two sets of feelings did not represent two different stages of a mental progress, but one and the same.  

The thrust of Mozley’s argument was that the nature of Newman’s critique of the Church of England inevitably led him to Rome, whereas Froude’s critique was very much from within “a deep, loyal, genuine, natural Church-of-England faith and feeling.”  

Froude very much related to the image of Froude presented by Mozley, a comparison also pointed out to Freeman by his friends. “[Samuel] Wayte compares me with the description of Froude there,” Freeman wrote in a letter, “and I think he is right.”  

Unlike Newman, Freeman had a genuine feeling towards the Church of England, a feeling that he believed he very much shared with the figure which appears so brutally honest and genuine and natural in the Remains of Richard Hurrell Froude.

While Freeman related with the loyalty exhibited by Hurrell Froude in his Remains, he was clearly disgusted by the scandals caused by the younger Froude at Oxford in 1847. Freeman rarely let an opportunity pass when reviewing Froude’s historical work to remind his readers that Froude was the author of The Nemesis of Faith, and that, sounding very much like Froude’s father, The Nemesis of Faith was clearly the product of an individual with a weak character. It was therefore impossible, in Freeman’s mind, for Froude to be a disinterested historian. As he noted, “[t]hat burning zeal for truth, for truth at all matters great and small, that zeal which shrinks from no expenditure of time and toil in the pursuit of truth – the spirit without which history, to be worthy of the name, cannot be written – is not in Mr. Froude’s nature, and it would probably be impossible to make him understand what it is.” According to Freeman, Froude’s “disease is innate and incurable.”

While Freeman had quite a bit of fun reviewing Froude’s works on the English Reformation, particularly his supposedly laughable theory of Henry VIII’s infallibility, Freeman believed that Froude’s papers on Thomas Becket clearly unmasked the subjective historical motives of the younger Froude. He was not interested in writing an objective analysis of the twelfth-century world of Thomas Becket but of rather attacking the Tractarian party “which once numbered its author among its members.” As
Freeman explained, many older medieval scholars will “not fail to remember a time when the name of Froude reminded them of another, an earlier, and I have no hesitation in saying a worthier, treatment of the same subject. And some of those who go back so far may be tempted to think that natural kindliness, if no other feeling, might have kept back the fiercest of partisans from ignoring the honest work of a long-deceased brother, and from dealing stabs in the dark at a brother’s almost forgotten fame.”

But, of course, such a motivation might be expected from a man who had so clearly demonstrated a “fanatical hatred towards the English Church at all times and under all characters,” a hatred “peculiar to those who have entered her ministry and forsaken it, perhaps peculiar to the one man” who turned from legendary hagiography to write ‘Shadows of the Clouds’ and the ‘Nemesis of Faith.’

When Froude learned that Freeman had finally “opened fire,” he wrote that he “shall not read the thing unless I must.” He even told his wife to “get a Contemporary and amuse yourself with it as you come up [from Devonshire to London],” as if to suggest that the likely negative review would be more amusing than hurtful. He would, of course, be wrong. When Froude eventually read the review he was shocked that Freeman could somehow outdo his previous assaults. There was no question that he would have to respond to Freeman’s very personal attacks. In his “A Few Words on Mr. Freeman,” he not only found himself defending much of his earlier writings but also his actions that led him to abandon his Oxford fellowship and clerical profession. Froude was very irritated at the suggestion that he somehow hated the English Church and that such hatred was “peculiar to those who have entered her ministry and forsaken it.” As Froude explained, he had not forsaken the Church but rather abandoned his fellowship. He found himself “unfitted for a clergyman’s position” and therefore “withdrew into the position of a lay member, in which I have ever since remained.” But giving up the fellowship was no easy decision because that essentially meant he was giving up his “profession with the loss of my existing means of maintenance and with the sacrifice of my future prospects.” Froude suggested that he had in fact made a very difficult decision that was not only the right one, but one that put him and his future employment in distress. “Is it a reproach to leave at such hazards a profession for which a man finds himself unqualified? Would it not be an incomparably greater reproach to have yielded to the temptation and remained in it? Is it not enough that the existing prejudice on this subject bars a man’s way to every regular
employment which he might have looked for otherwise? Is it fair, is it tolerable, that Mr. Freeman . . . should avail [himself] of that prejudice to point to my Deacon’s orders as if they were an ink-blot and a mark of shame?”

Froude was most concerned with responding to Freeman’s comments about his motivation for writing about Becket in relation to his brother’s earlier work. “How can Mr. Freeman know my motive for not speaking of my brother in connection with Becket, that he should venture upon ground so sensitive?” questioned Froude. He admitted, however, that he did not like the way in which the Tractarians sought to rehabilitate Becket and what is more he particularly disliked the way in which the memory of his brother was used to further establish the Tractarians’ political goals. “My brother’s Remains were brought out by the leaders of that school after his death as a party manifesto,” argued Froude, and he deemed the “publication of the Remains the greatest injury that was ever done to my brother’s memory.” Indeed, the Remains would have reminded Froude of the side of his older brother that he wanted to forget, of the supposed Tractarian saint who watched “with approval while his father flogged him,” of the sadistic young man who often held his younger brother’s “heels over a stream and his head under water.” The Remains and the Oxford Movement more generally would have reminded Froude of that horrible family prison that confined his youth. He argued in his response to Freeman that he looked back upon his brother as the most remarkable man he ever met, but there was another side of his brother that he wanted to forget, and perhaps publishing his own history of Becket would help erase the earlier history brought out by the Tractarian party that Froude found so offensive to his brother’s memory.

Froude admitted that he was “ashamed to have been compelled” to speak about his brother in connection with Becket but did so only because of Freeman’s “inexcusable insult.” Freeman was absolutely livid when he read Froude’s response, in part because it exposed his personal motivations in attacking Froude so clearly, and the press took notice clearly siding with the man who supposedly hated the English Church. Even Freeman’s close friends understood what was really at stake in his reviews of Froude. His friend William Stubbs suggested that Freeman simply let the matter drop not only because those already under the spell of “Froude’s conversational powers . . . will not be convinced by anything that you or anybody else may say” but also, and more importantly, because “you have amply justified yourself for what you have said, in the judgment
Stubbs understood that Freeman was not just motivated by a desire to expose a historical imposter; he was more importantly seeking to defend the memory of Froude’s brother and a movement for which he felt some sympathy.

Freeman could never forgive Froude for the scandals he caused during their Oxford lives, for his attacks on his father and brother in Shadows of the Clouds, for his suggestion that Tractarian doctrine led either straight to Rome or unbelief in his Nemesis of Faith, or for his supposedly fanatical hatred of the English Church. This was a period in Froude’s life that Freeman could not forget; it discoloured everything he wrote about Froude and justified the harshest of criticism. He clearly identified with the more saintly Froude who never wavered in his faith while James Anthony was just another weak soul who abandoned the Church to become one of Carlyle’s despised literary priests. It was an unfortunate irony for Froude, that in trying to write a history of Becket, and help displace that party manifesto that he so despised, Freeman drew so clear attention to it by arguing that one should not bother reading the younger Froude’s fictional account of Thomas Becket when one could simply re-read Hurrell Froude’s Remains.
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