

Wrestling with the Lesser Evil: Quakers and the Sons of Freedom in Mid-twentieth Century British Columbia

ROBYNNE ROGERS HEALEY
Trinity Western University

In 1954 the Kootenay region in the southeastern corner of British Columbia erupted into violence as the Sons of Freedom, a zealous group of Doukhobors, clashed with their neighbours, the RCMP, and the British Columbia government over the incarceration of Doukhobor parents and the forcible removal of their children to New Denver for education in a publicly-run residential school. Conflict with mainstream society had been an enduring aspect of fifty years of Doukhobor settlement in Canada. There had been ongoing disputes between the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood, as the Doukhobors were formally called, and the provincial and federal governments (as well as the Canadian populace generally) over a number of issues: communal land ownership first in Saskatchewan and then in British Columbia, the franchise, recognition of Doukhobor marriages, and the education of the sect's children. The methods Svobodniki or Freedomites used to protest their treatment was legendary in Canadian society (and indeed in Canadian history) and wherever it occurred it had garnered significant public attention and shock value. But the demonstrations of the mid-1950s went beyond the inflammatory (arson and dynamiting) and provocative (nude marches). Instead of being the objects of media scrutiny as they had been in the past, the Sons of Freedom made careful and strategic use of the media to publicize their plight and attack those they considered their "persecutors." "Open" letters of appeal called attention to the "persecution" and "unbearable suffering" of the Doukhobors in Canada. Most notable in this

Historical Papers 2006: Canadian Society of Church History

genre at this time is an open letter to North American Quakers, condemning them as responsible for the seizure and removal of Doukhobor children.

“An Open Letter-Appeal to the Society of Friends (Quakers) Living in Canada and in the United States of America from the Members of the Christian Community and Brotherhood of the Reformed Doukhobors in British Columbia, Canada,”¹ is hardly a letter at all. Rather, it is a fifty-one page professionally-produced (though not glossy) publication complete with photographs. It offered a stinging indictment of the Society of Friends generally and the work of American Quaker Emmett Gulley among the Doukhobors specifically. Accusing Gulley and the Society of Friends of dishonourable and disgraceful behaviour unbecoming a “religious society,”² the Sons claimed that they were forced to resort to the tactic of an open letter to achieve the recall of Gulley since two previous requests had been “ignored” by Friends and Gulley, and his continued presence in the area “together with the Government of British Columbia [is] continuing to cause us and our children, further, unbearable suffering.”³ The open letter was a vicious personal attack on Gulley and, by extension, the Society of Friends whom he represented. The Sons of Freedom were “convinced that Gulley and the government has [sic] conspired to destroy our sect,”⁴ and no amount of correspondence with Friends could convince them otherwise.

Gulley, an American Friend, had been sent to the Kootenays in 1950 as the representative of the Canadian Friends Service Committee and American Friends Service Committee in response to a request by the British Columbia government for Friends’ assistance in solving the “Doukhobor problem.” The RCMP believed that ongoing disputes with the Sons of Freedom “required an approach on a spiritual plane.”⁵ Considering Quakers as neutral and the spiritual kin of the Doukhobors (on the basis of mutual pacifist beliefs), they suggested that the government request Friends’ assistance to “find a fair and proper solution to the problem.”⁶ Quakers were delighted and eager to assist. They had a long-term interest in the welfare of the Doukhobors and had been instrumental, along with Leo Tolstoy, in their immigration to Canada in 1899. Their sympathy for Doukhobor principles and their own memories of persecution and suffering for the sake of their faith made for a strong philosophical and financial commitment to the difficulties Doukhobors faced.⁷ Friends’ involvement after 1950 did lead to solutions on several fronts and things appeared to be going very well. Imagine the disquiet among Quakers

throughout North America, then, when the entire situation erupted into greater violence and protest.

Blamed for colluding with the government by “stag[ing] a trap for [Doukhobors] in order to send them to prison and take their children away from them,”⁸ the Society’s name was publicly vilified by the very people they had set out to assist. The accusations levelled at Quakers caused great turmoil among Canadian and American Friends. They divided on how to address the allegations against them and how to resolve the painful situation created by the conduct of the Sons of Freedom, the actions of the British Columbia government and the decisions of their own representative, Emmett Gulley. What we see is a crisis of interpretation of the ancient peace testimony as Friends struggled to determine whether the ideology of lesser evil could have a place in the context of their belief structure. Resolution of the crisis (that there was no place for the lesser evil in Quaker theology) was neither straightforward nor inclusive. Nevertheless, the decisions that were made in this instance were foundational to further Quaker peace activism throughout the twentieth century.

Quakers’ response to the “Doukhobor problem” and to the Freedomite backlash took place in the context of the Cold War and newly forming ideas and attitudes toward non-violence and passive resistance. WWI had marked a noticeable shift among Friends to a more pro-active peace testimony, as opposed to an anti-war testimony. And, in the wake of WWII and its concomitant prospect of nuclear annihilation, Friends stepped up their efforts to bring about peace rather than just refusing to participate in war. This was a new environment with new ideas and Quakers were on a steep learning curve. They had lived for almost three centuries with the certain refusal to participate in military activity. Faced with ideas of passive resistance, civilian defence, and civil disobedience, the principle of non-violence was taking on a whole new shape. The problem for Friends was that they were not certain what its final expression would be. Flash points, like those created by the conflict with the Sons of Freedom, pushed Friends to define their limits within the context of their faith.

Friends’ longstanding relationship with the Doukhobors stemmed from a similar commitment to pacifism, the belief of God within each individual, and a commitment to freedom of religious expression. In 1895 many members of the Russian sect burned their weapons in protest against compulsory military service. The resulting intense persecution of the Tsarist government was brought to world attention by Tolstoy and

Quakers who advocated for the emigration of Doukhobors from Russia. It took years of negotiation with a number of countries before arrangements were made in 1898 for Doukhobors to immigrate to Canada. As part of Clifford Sifton's "open door" policy, the federal government offered them free land in Saskatchewan and exemption from military service. Approximately 7,500 arrived in Canada in 1899; over 12,000 remained in Russia.⁹ The Doukhobors settled in Saskatchewan near Yorkton. They lived communally and prospered; the arrival in 1902 of Peter Verigin (The Lordly), their spiritual leader since 1887, was considered a special blessing. In 1907, a change in government attitude toward Doukhobors led to the demand that they register and work their land individually and swear an oath of allegiance. Rather than contravene their religious principles and destroy their communal way of life, Verigin purchased land in West Kootenay near Grand Forks. Over the next few years, 5,000 Doukhobors moved west, although roughly 3,000 "Independents" complied with the law and stayed in Saskatchewan. Through the 1910s and 1920s, under the leadership of Peter the Lordly, the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood established forty-eight communal villages, eight sawmills, the famous KC Brand jam factory in Brilliant, the Kootenay River bridge, and extensive irrigation. They also accumulated a large debt to the tune of \$1.2 million.¹⁰

Conflict re-emerged in British Columbia after WWI when veterans in Nelson passed a resolution to appropriate Doukhobor lands for redistribution to soldiers.¹¹ Citizens of Grand Forks passed a similar resolution demanding that "all the members of the sect, known as 'Doukhobors,' be deported to Russia, being undesirable in this country."¹² "The community was saved," thanks to the intervention of a number of individuals and groups, only to have a new quarrel surface in regards to the education of Doukhobor children.¹³ In 1923, the school inspector in Brilliant levied \$300 in fines against the sect for keeping their children out of schools. The Supervisor of Schools in Doukhobor Colonies Samuel Vereschagin immediately fired off a letter to the minister assuring him that the sect would "not pay this fine voluntarily" and warned that "if the police take the fine by seizure, as they did in Grand Forks, then all the schools in the Doukhobor districts will be closed and I cannot guarantee that they will not be burned down."¹⁴ Sure enough, when in 1924 all the schools in the Doukhobor districts did burn down, the government demanded that Doukhobors replace them. According to the Sons of Freedom, when Peter Verigin and the directors refused to comply, "Peter

Verigin was murdered by a bomb in the train.”¹⁵

After his father’s death, Peter Petrovich Verigin (Chistiakov) came to Canada from the USSR in 1927 to lead the sect. He immediately applied himself to reducing the community’s debt and, by the time of the Great Depression, the debt on the sect’s property was about \$280,000.¹⁶ Even greatly reduced, the debt was unmanageable during the Great Depression with the result that the mortgage companies foreclosed on the community’s property. In 1938 the provincial government took over the land in order to save the sect from eviction, the community organization was liquidated, and the Doukhobors became tenants on their lands. An increasing number left their communal villages. Divisions within the sect that had been informal up to that point began to crystallize. The Independents in Saskatchewan had long since accepted Canadian laws. The majority in British Columbia who were known as the “Orthodox” Doukhobors tried to live peacefully within Canadian society and its laws. This signalled to the small, zealous group of the Sons of Freedom, who took the formal name Council of the Christian Community and Brotherhood of Reformed Doukhobors, that there was increasing assimilation of the sect into the Canadian way of life. They considered this intolerable and stepped up their protests against this behaviour within their community and the pressure from mainstream Canadian culture. Nude marches and the destruction of property through arson and explosive devices became a matter of course in Kootenay communities, much to the horror of those who did *not* belong to the sect. It all made for great press, but did nothing to elicit the sympathy of the authorities or Doukhobors’ neighbours who threatened vigilante action.¹⁷ Feeling that they would never get any satisfaction in BC, some Freedomites attempted to organize migrations to other countries, something their neighbours encouraged and would have welcomed. But their reputation preceded them and the Sons of Freedom discovered that their particular expression of their religious principles was not welcomed outside of Canada any more than within. It was at this point, as the situation rapidly deteriorated that the British Columbia government invited Friends to assist in finding a solution to the problems at hand.

When Emmett Gulley was sent to British Columbia in 1950 he worked to increase patience and understanding and to seek viable resolution to what seemed an intractable dilemma. As a representative of the Society, the service committees supported him financially for 18 months “as a contribution to this work of understanding.”¹⁸ In the fall of 1951, Gulley became a member of the Doukhobor Research and Consulta-

tive Committee set up under the auspices of the University of British Columbia. The committee was financed by a provincial government subsidy and Gulley became the committee's salaried secretary.¹⁹ There he was able to have great influence in recommending non-violent solutions to the Doukhobor problem. When W.A.C. Bennett's Social Credit government was elected in 1952, the Consultative Committee was superseded by a group in Nelson, called the Local Co-ordinating Committee, made up of the local administrative heads of the departments involved in Doukhobor affairs (public health, education, RCMP).²⁰ Gulley served as secretary of the Local Co-ordinating Committee and became advisor to the BC government on Doukhobor affairs. This is where the waters were muddied because Gulley's position raised the question of jurisdictional representation. When the Social Credit government decided to enforce its school laws and forcibly remove Doukhobor children and arrest their parents, Gulley appeared – to the Sons of Freedom at least – to be front-and-centre in the action as an agent of the hated government.

Was Gulley a representative of the BC government or of the Society of Friends? Throughout the conflict, Gulley maintained that he “[held] no position in the administrative pattern of this Government and [had] never been asked by the Government to do anything other than to perform the service of advice and consultation. . . . I am free to come and go, express opinions and criticize, and I feel exactly the same freedom from limitations as I did during the first year and a half of my stay here, when I was supported wholly by the Service Committees.”²¹ Friends faced an intensely embarrassing situation, much of which was caused by the tension between their heartfelt commitment to the plight of all Doukhobors along with their desire to have a representative on the frontlines, and the benefits of having someone else pay to keep that representative in the field. As one Friend said when the situation was at its nadir, “I am highly concerned about the margins on which Friends operate and feel increasingly that Friends should get their financial house much more in order than it is at present. That, I suggest is the real reason for the present horrible situation, i.e. we thought it cheaper to let the B.C. Government pay Emmett than to pay him ourselves. And we shall find more and more trouble unless we are honest with ourselves about it.”²²

Either way, Friends found themselves in terribly awkward circumstances as they tried to balance their deep commitment to social justice with their desire to live peaceably within society and to effect change from within. Writing in 1953 to Stephen Sorokin, the spiritual leader of the Sons

(who at the time was in Uruguay), the Canadian Friends Service Committee (CFSC) and American Friends Service Committee (AFSC)²³ urged compliance:

We feel that further progress depends on the willingness of the Sons of Freedom to strive towards a more sensitive understanding of Christian values . . . If a suitable arrangement cannot be made for emigration [to Uruguay] the Sons of Freedom will have to adjust to life in Canada. The Government is insisting on a reasonable program of law enforcement, including school attendance of school-age children. The Quakers have had a long-standing interest in education and have established many schools of their own without jeopardizing the peace testimony of the Society. We cannot sympathize with opposition to education laws.²⁴

Within the Society, there was great consternation and little consensus. The Sons of Freedom painted Emmett Gulley as a villain who conspired with the government to do violence to Doukhobor children and their families. The personal attacks against Gulley were scathing; when the Society refused to recall him, those attacks were extended to all Quakers. Consider “An Open Letter to Quaker Emmett Gulley,” written in 1955. The author, A. Gusskin, wrote from Italy where he sketched for his readers the terrible plight of children remanded in the residential school in New Denver. He then challenged Gulley:

In view of all this, have you a right to call yourself a Quaker? One of our Russian adages says: ‘A family is seldom free from a freak’ . . . [sic] However of late, there have been altogether too many ‘freaks’ in the Quaker family and the logical conclusion from this is that Quakers too have not escaped the general fate: became likewise subject to moral degeneration under the influence of our pseudo-culture and our pseudo-civilization. . . . Only the moral poverty of the Quaker Society can explain the systematic visits of your Quakers to the rapacious Red Mecca when before the eyes of the whole world true followers of the teachings of Jesus Christ (whom Quakers consider themselves to be) hob-nob with professional executioners, murder-maniacs, – and even recommend them to the world as . . . [sic] ‘makers of peace.’ . . . Is it proper for Quakers, as true christians [sic], to whitewash murderers and heinous tyrants – to guise them in the garb of peace-makers? For verily, this is no simple lack of comprehension, but a moral participation in the crimes of a godless, god-

resisting power, dominated by the truly authentic representatives of the pits of satan [sic].²⁵

Members of the CFSC Minorities Committee and the AFSC to whom Gulley reported were divided. Nevertheless, they were compelled to respond.

The Minorities Committee prepared a draft statement which they circulated among a select group of BC Friends. For publicity's sake, the draft statement did try to distance Friends from the actions of the British Columbia government.²⁶ This engendered further division within the Minorities Committee. Richard Broughton, a Victoria Friend, responded to general secretary, Fred Haslam,

Until I have actually seen the situation at Nelson, Crestova [sic] and Argenta I will try to avoid formulating any final opinion. But meanwhile Gordon Peter's opinion that Emmett Gulley "crossed a rubicon" when he became a salaried employee of the BC government has great force with me, and I do not think we can wash our hands of the matter by saying "the decision to implement its education laws was made by the BC government itself, etc."²⁷

One of the major problems for CFSC was the distance between Toronto and the Kootenays. Lacking in-depth knowledge of the situation, rumour and accusation had the service committees in Toronto and Philadelphia questioning Gulley's activities. As Haslam remarked to Gulley, "while many of the letters we have received indicate inadequate knowledge of the situation, the uneasiness, which is now fairly general in Canada, cannot be ignored."²⁸ Haslam then went on to suggest that the issues at hand came under four of the Quaker testimonies: regard for education which seemed to be "at fundamental variance with the Sons of Freedom"; respect for democratic law "when conscientious scruples are recognised"; the ideal of family "which is not confined to life within the family, but which prepares our children for the larger life in community, country, and especially with Friends, in the international scene"; and finally, the peace testimony. In this situation, Friends appeared to be most concerned about "the disruption of family life, notwithstanding the deficiencies which may exist in the family life of the Sons of Freedom," and "the danger of government action impinging on our testimony for peace and against violence."²⁹

Haslam's comments reveal the unease and underlying tensions

inherent in the Society's changing attitudes towards an active peace testimony. Gulley responded, that he was "startled" by parts of Haslam's letter. He indicated that "it was [his] understanding that the two Service Committees had reached a firm, joint decision . . . in regard to the handling of the 'Doukhobor Program'" and that Haslam's feeling of "embarrassment due to methods being employed by the Government and a possible responsibility for what is happening" appeared to reflect a change of policy in his [Haslam's] thinking.³⁰ Gulley reminded Haslam that to his knowledge there had been no change of policy on the part of the government and that "one needs to be cautious that he does not read into present methods the idea of violence which does not exist in fact. Coercion is not synonymous with violence, surely."³¹ Gulley was concerned that the removal of CFSC/AFSC representation at that time "might well jeopardize any future cooperation" with the government. Therefore, he suggested that representatives of the service committees should spend some time getting a "first hand 'feel' of the situation" before there was "any serious change in policy."³²

An investigative trip did occur in April 1955 in order to make recommendations on Gulley's position as representative of the service committees and future work among Doukhobors.³³ There is no doubt that Friends wrestled mightily with their decisions. Between the time of the visit and the presentation of the report in May 1955,³⁴ a number of Friends weighed in on the philosophical arguments. Particularly telling of the challenges to consensus among Quakers as a whole and the service committees particularly was a letter from Levi Penington of Newburg, Oregon, a member of AFSC. In his letter, worth quoting at length, he wrote that he was:

fearful that action may be taken by one or both of the Service Committees that will do injustice and injury to Emmett Gulley, the Orthodox Doukhobors, the Sons of Freedom and the British Columbia government, in addition to creating more division among Friends than it can possibly cure. I understand that both Service Committees are under pressure to require Emmett Gulley to withdraw from his connection with the British Columbia government and its program of enforcing the school law on the Sons of Freedom, as that law is enforced on the rest of the people of British Columbia, or to cease to be the official representative of the two Service Committees and thus, to whatever degree that involves, of the Society of Friends.

You will, of course, take into consideration the source of this pressure that is being put upon you . . . is not all spontaneous, but has been stimulated by [none] others than Sons of Freedom. You will not lose sight of the fact that in dealing with the Sons of Freedom, you have to deal with grown-up children, with some who are unquestionably insane, with some who are definitely criminal, with people who are unscrupulous liars, with people who have declared that their mission in life is to make trouble – whatever other elements there are among these Sons of Freedom, and whatever excellences they may have, these are the things that have to be dealt with in any effort to help them.

Pennington went on to say that he recognized that:

the two Service Committees, have no lack of appreciation of the great work that Emmett Gulley has done, in securing the restoration of the ballot to the Doukhobors, in securing the legalization of the Doukhobor marriage, in promoting the legislation that will enable the Doukhobors to recover their land, in improving the relations between the Doukhobors and their Canadian neighbors, and getting the latter to distinguish between the Orthodox and Independent Doukhobors and the radical split-off called the Sons of Freedom, who alone are nudists, incendiaryists, saboteurs – not to mention other offenses that must cast some doubt on the sincerity of their devotion to Christian ideals, and in many other ways in which Emmett has been of great service to the Orthodox Doukhobors and the government, and has offered service and sacrifice to the Sons of Freedom such as no other man has ever offered them.

This crisis was about much more than the reputation of a single Quaker. It struck at the heart of Friends' struggles to define an active peace testimony in the context of the Cold War world where peace activism and a commitment to non-violence frequently occurred in areas not clearly addressed by an anti-war testimony. Pennington's concluding statements are indicative of the sentiments with which Friends wrestled:

When I was a boy, I used to think that right was white and wrong was black, and that it was always possible to do the absolutely right thing. I know realize that sometimes we make the absolutely right thing impossible, and our highest achievement is limited to the best thing under the circumstances. In this situation as in many others there is no

solution possible that will not hurt somebody. May you be divinely guided to seek and to find the solution that is the best under the circumstances.³⁵

This was the acceptance of the philosophy of the lesser evil – a marked change of attitude from earlier attitudes towards the peace testimony.

The report of Canadian Friends issued in May 1955 indicates that while it was necessary to deal with the philosophy of the lesser evil that had been thrust upon them (i.e., the children had already been apprehended), they refused to embrace the course of the lesser evil. Even though the individual notes of their visit commented on the pleasant atmosphere at the school in New Denver (for instance, one delegate made note of the presence of puppies), Quakers who participated in the investigation remained terribly troubled by the forcible removal of children from their parents, even *if* their parents were nudists, arsonists, and dynamiters. Their report – which naturally recognized the valuable contributions of Emmett Gulley and his wife Zoe in the community – was firm that the relationship between the service committees and the British Columbia government had to change:

Without reflecting any criticism of the government we still believe that the Society of Friends cannot continue in partnership with it in its present policy. We recognize the need for government to compromise in meeting the demands of conflicting interest, and that any political body is sometimes forced to operate on the principle of the lesser evil. The present school program as applied to the Sons of Freedom is a case in point and we commend the British Columbia authorities on the patience, the restraint, and the skill with which its present program is being administered. / In thus sympathizing with the government's position, we still do not believe that a religious society can join with it. The Society of Friends is founded on the belief that there is that of God in every man. No one, however depraved, can be considered beyond redemption through the overcoming power of love. To admit any limitations in this philosophy is to destroy it, for faith is only valid if it is limitless. Thus the doctrine of the lesser evil can have no application for a religious society. Similarly, the government's admission that it is "playing percentages" in carrying forward its policy of enforced education, while entirely proper for government, is not proper for a religious society whose insistence is on the sacredness of every individual.³⁶

The service committees who directed the Society's peace work had spoken. Emmett Gulley resigned as representative of Friends in 1956 after the BC government returned the franchise to the Doukhobors; he remained in Nelson as a consultant on Doukhobor affairs to the provincial government,³⁷ a position from which he retired in March 1957.³⁸ The press release announcing Gulley's resignation was telling. The service committees expressed their deep appreciation to the Gulleys for "their six years' labour under difficult conditions, made more trying by the sharp divergence of opinion among Friends and the violent accusations of the Sons of Freedom."³⁹ Friends had weathered a storm that forced them to assess the extent to which they would or could make concessions on non-violence. Looking back, Friends acknowledged that "most important of all, perhaps, is the change of attitude on the part of the people of British Columbia to the Doukhobors and probably to some extent vice-versa. Herein, it is felt, lay the greatest value in the work of Emmett Gulley since he pointed out to the citizens of British Columbia that by their attitude to the Doukhobors they helped create the Doukhobor problem."⁴⁰ Regardless of the extent of the problems that continued to emerge in the Cold War era and the Society's evolving response to those problems, the situation with the Sons of Freedom in the 1950s pressed Friends to crystallise their interpretation of the peace testimony and to deny any place in the testimony to the ideology of the lesser evil.

Endnotes

1. "An Open Letter-Appeal to the Society of Friends (Quakers) Living in Canada and in the United States of America from the Members of the Christian Community and Brotherhood of the Reformed Doukhobors in British Columbia, Canada," 3; Simon Fraser University (SFU) Special Collections, Burnaby, BC.
2. "An Open Letter-Appeal to the Society of Friends," 6.
3. "An Open Letter-Appeal to the Society of Friends," 3.
4. "An Open Letter-Appeal to the Society of Friends," 50.
5. "Release to: The American Friend, Friends Journal, The Canadian Friends, The Pacific Coast Bulletin, The Friend (London)," 1; undated, CFSC Minorities Committee File, 1956, '57, '58, '59, Canadian Yearly Meeting Archives (CYMA), Newmarket, ON.

6. "An Open Letter-Appeal to the Society of Friends," 34.
7. The AFSC and CFSC paid Gulley a salary to take up his work in British Columbia.
8. "An Open Letter-Appeal to the Society of Friends," 5-6.
9. Koozma J. Tarasoff, "Doukhobors," 3, <www.multiculturalcanada.ca/ecp/contnet/doukhobors.html> (accessed 22 May 2006).
10. "An Open Letter-Appeal to the Society of Friends," 24, 32.
11. "An Open Letter-Appeal to the Society of Friends," 19.
12. "An Open Letter-Appeal to the Society of Friends," 24.
13. "An Open Letter-Appeal to the Society of Friends," 29.
14. "An Open Letter-Appeal to the Society of Friends," 30.
15. "An Open Letter-Appeal to the Society of Friends," 31. There is great debate on who actually killed Verigin. The standard explanation is usually that the Sons of Freedom killed him; they claim otherwise. The case remains unsolved and has recently become one of the Great Unsolved Canadian Mysteries located at <http://www.canadianmysteries.ca/indexen.html>.
16. "An Open Letter-Appeal to the Society of Friends," 32.
17. Draft Statement (Not for publication) – Friends' Service Committees and the Christian Community of Universal Brotherhood, (Sons of Freedom)," CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA.
18. "Draft Statement."
19. "Release to: The American Friend, Friends Journal, The Canadian Friends, The Pacific Coast Bulletin, The Friend (London)," CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA.
20. "Release to: The American Friend, Friends Journal, The Canadian Friends, The Pacific Coast Bulletin, The Friend (London)," CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA.
21. Letter, Emmett Gulley to Lewis M. Hoskins, 17 June 1955, CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA.
22. Letter, Richard Broughton to Dorothy Starr, 19 May 1955, CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA.

23. The Canadian Friends Service Committee (CFSC) and American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) act on the peace and social justice concerns of the Religious Society of Friends in their respective countries.
24. Letter, Stephen G. Cary, Secretary, American Friends Service Committee, and Fred Haslam, Secretary, Canadian Friends Service Committee to S.S. Sorokin, 1 December 1953, as in "An Open Letter-Appeal to the Society of Friends," 2.
25. "An Open Letter to Quaker Emmett Gulley,"(translated and released by the Fraternal Council of the Christian Community and Brotherhood of Reformed Doukhobors)," SFU Special Collections.
26. Letter, Fred Haslam to Alfred Lash, 10 January 1955, CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA.
27. Letter, Richard Broughton to Fred Haslam, 8 January 1955, CFSC, CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA.
28. Letter, Fred Haslam to Emmett Gulley, 25 January 1955, CFSC, CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA.
29. Letter, Fred Haslam to Emmett Gulley, 25 January 1955.
30. Letter, Emmett Gulley to Fred Haslam, 31 January 1955, CFSC, CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA.
31. Letter, Emmett Gulley to Fred Haslam, 31 January 1955.
32. Letter, Emmett Gulley to Fred Haslam, 31 January 1955.
33. See correspondence and planning notes in the CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955 and CFSC Minorities Committee File, July – December 1955, CYMA.
34. "A Report on a Survey of Friends' Work Among the Doukhobor People," 16 May 1955, CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA.
35. Letter, Levi T. Pennington to Lewis M. Hoskins, Executive Secretary , American Friends Service Committee and Fred Haslam, Executive Secretary, Canadian Friends Service Committee, 26 April 1955, CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA.
36. "A Report on a survey of Friends' Work Among the Doukhobor People," 16 May 1955, CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA.

37. "Release to: The American Friend, Friends Journal, The Canadian Friends, The Pacific Coast Bulletin, The Friend (London)," CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA.
38. "Restricted Report on visit to Western Canada in May 1957 to ascertain the present situation regarding the Doukhobors by Cecil Evans," CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA.
39. "Release to: The American Friend, Friends Journal, The Canadian Friends, The Pacific Coast Bulletin, The Friend (London)," CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA. The Gulleys remained in the area for quite some time and remained close friends with Orthodox Doukhobors. Laura P. Verigin and Zoe H. Gulley collaborated on the compilation of a cookbook – *Practical Cook Book: Selected Doukhor and Quaker Recipes* (Rossland: Miner Printing Co., 1972), SFU Special Collections.
40. "Release to: The American Friend, Friends Journal, The Canadian Friends, The Pacific Coast Bulletin, The Friend (London)," CFSC Minorities Committee File, January – June 1955, CYMA.

