Gilboa To Ichabod, Social and Religious Factors In The Fundamentalist-Modernist Schisms Among Canadian Baptists, 1895-1934

by

Walter E. Ellis

One hundred years ago, December 2, 1875, the carriages of Toronto's evangelical elite stood outside of the impressive new Jarvis Street Baptist Church. Inside the dedication sermon was being preached by the Rev. J. L. Burrows, D.D., of Louisville, Kentucky. Burrows chose for his text Psalm 45:16: "With gladness and rejoicing shall they be brought; they shall enter into the King's palace." Burrows spoke of how the Lord collected living stones and built them into a Spiritual House, some gathered "from the cottages of the toiling, from the mansions of the prosperous, from dens of dissipation, from saloons of fashionable revelry, [and] from the circles of self-righteous morality.... With post-millenial optimism he preached that "the king's palace, the house of God [was] the capital of the world, the seat of moral government for the whole race". Said Burrows:

> "The factory is up and the machinery is in. Has the joint-stock company completed the purpose for which it was organized? Why No! It is just ready to begin its proper work.

That "work" was to "irradiate the glory of the Lord", for it was God's purpose, through the Church, to renovate and purify the earth.[1]

If Burrows spoke of building in spiritual metaphors and with Bay Street language, the congregation may well have been forgiven if they drew more practical and mundane conclusions. Certainly the new Jarvis Street Baptist Church was a palace fit for a king. The gothic church of Queenston stone, erected at a cost of $103,000, boasted Ohio dressing and columns hewn of New Brunswick granite. The tower, spire and vane rose 165 feet in "altitude" above fashionable Jarvis Street. The interior was furnished with a copper

baptistry curbed with Italian marble, a pulpit desk of polished brass; pews of walnut and chestnut finished in oil. The seats were of damask, the floors covered with handsome carpet. The organ, with 2240 pipes and over fifty stops, was the finest in Toronto.[2] In many respects the church building was a concrete symbol of the rising status and power of evangelicals in Canada. The bitter struggles of the Baptists and Methodists against the Family Compact and the Church of England and their battle over the clergy reserves and in favor of political reform had ended in victory. The Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, a Liberal and a Baptist, had recently been elected Prime Minister, defeating Sir John A. MacDonald and the Conservatives.

However, if some Toronto Baptists basked in the glory of the King's palace that Thursday afternoon, there may have been others busy about their daily labors who remembered with discomfort the prophetic warning sounded by Dr. R. A. Fyfe, principal of Woodstock College and former minister of Bond Street Baptist Church at the closing service there the previous Sunday. In an historical survey of the history of Baptist work in Canada Fyfe spoke frankly of the lack of homogeneity, the hyper-individuality, the perfectionist piety, and the disruptive "Scottish" theology, related to the issue of open or close communion that had inhibited denominational cooperation and growth. He also recounted how the church had been forced to move from March Street in 1848 to escape a "vicious and miserable" environment and implied that similar considerations were involved in the move from Bond to fashionable Jarvis Street.

In contrast, since 1869 Baptist fortunes had improved. Membership in Toronto churches had grown 140 per cent, and in Ontario and Quebec had reached 23,000. Three new churches, the Yorkville, Parliament Street, and College Street churches had been formed bringing to six the number of Baptist congregations in the city. Decentralization was the key to growth and the future was bright for Baptists, but not without perils. Warned Fyfe:

> And if old Bond Street, about to enter into her fine new house, forgets for a single day her obligations to provide at the earliest possible day for the very large section of this city, which her removal leaves (more) destitute than ever of Baptist preaching, then she may expect, that her new house will be like the mountains of Gilboa on which no dew fell.[3]

The issue for Fyfe was basically how the denomination would deal with urbanization, how a church "strong in membership and wealth" would use those resources. With expansion in view he issued the following commandment:

> Thou shalt remember what God has so clearly shown thee, that the true way to strength [and to] extend the cause in the city is to plant Baptist churches, as many as possible, in the destitute localities, and sustain them until they can sustain themselves.[4]

Fifty years later an event of equal significance to Canadian Baptists also took place in Toronto. About 2:00 A. M. on the morning of October 20, 1926, several hundred persons emerged from the First Avenue Baptist Church, Toronto, and marched through the streets singing hymns. They were bound for an all-night protest meeting at Jarvis Street Baptist Church. The occasion for their demonstration was the exclusion of the fundamentalist leader, the Reverend Doctor Thomas Todhunter Shields, from the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec: this the culmination of ten years of bitter controversy between "modernists" and "fundamentalists" for control of the denomination. This was but one incident in the great convulsion that saw North American Protestantism bifurcated in the fundamentalist-modernist controversy. Among the Baptists the contention gave rise to schism from the Northern Baptist Convention in the United States, and from the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec and the Baptist Union of Western Canada.

Two basic historical interpretations have been forwarded to explain the fundamentalist-modernist contentions of the 1920's. The first stresses the socio-economic roots of religious differentiation and views the controversy as primarily the result of tensions which arose through urbanization and the impact of the agricultural

depression which followed World War I. The second stresses the ideology and deals with schism as the result of overriding theological differences. Specifically, Ernest R. Sandeen argues that the equation of nineteenth-century evangelicalism with fundamentalism leads historians to resort to sociological or psychological explanations when a closer examination of fundamentalism as a theological system reveals it to be the product of a coalition between new elements contributed by Princeton conservatives and the premillenarian dispensationalism contributed by supporters of the Prophetic Conference movement.[5]

Stewart Cole viewed liberalism as a positive attempt to mold doctrine in response to social and scientific change. Norman Furniss ridiculed the uneducated fundamentalists, characterizing them as fear-ridden men longing for certainty in an age of change. In his view the principal cause for the rise of the fundamentalist controversy was "the incompatibility of the nineteenth century orthodoxy cherished by many humble Americans with the progress made in science and theology since the Civil War."[6] Sandeen argues, however, that rural-urban tensions, biblical criticism and evolutionary theory existed for at least two generations prior to the explosion of the 1920's, and he flatly denies that fundamentalism "can be explained as a part of the Populist movement, agrarian protest, or the Southern mentality."[7] He correctly argues that fundamentalism and modernism developed in northern cities. But his uncritical assumption that the fundamentalist base of support was indistinguishable from that of the modernists--what Niebuhr called bourgeois culture, having its strength in the cities and in the churches supported by the urban middle class needs to be examined. Only by assuming social homogeneity has Sandeen been able to stress doctrine in opposition to Niebuhr's essentially sociological arguments.[8]

In many respects the issue of definition is crucial. If fundamentalism and modernism are defined in theological terms attention focuses there and predictable conclusions result. However, if

wider definitions are used, as in Everett L. Perry's "Socio-economic Factors and Fundamentalism", then the sociological argument is affirmed rather than denied. The latter view is taken by Dr. Mary B. Hill, who interprets the history of Canadian Baptists as the story of the gradual suppression of lower class American and Canadian churchmen, sectarian in theology and outlook, by a middle-class elite of British origin who gained control of the denominational machinery and used it to further church-type programs. Her data appears idiosyncratic, but Hill argues that high status Baptists utilized political skills and economic affluence to dictate church policy during the period of latent class struggle [1888-1910], but were unable to suppress conflict in the years following World War I.[9]

Time prohibits a detailed account of the controversies that led to schism among Canadian Baptists. Histories, most of which tend to be apologetic, are cited in footnotes. Briefly, tension surfaced first in Ontario and Quebec in Walmer Road Baptist Church in 1905, when the theology of the Rev. Oliver C. Horsman was challenged because of his introduction of A First Book of Christian Doctrine for use with young adults. Horsman resigned but schism ensued and an independent congregation known as the Tabernacle Church was established on Markham Street near Bloor.[10]

In May 1908 attention focused on McMaster University when Dr. Elmore Harris, a consulting editor of the Scofield Reference Bible, patron of the Toronto Bible Institute, and pastor emeritus of Walmer Road questioned the orthodoxy of Dr. I. G. Matthews, Professor of Old Testament. After investigation Matthews, like Horsman, was pronounced orthodox. However, Harris' supporters exacted a "statement of belief" from a reluctant Convention Assembly in 1910; a "canon" they would later attempt to enforce as "orthodoxy" Concurrently Dr. Albert Carman, Methodist superintendent and last bishop of the frontier-oriented Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, became embroiled with Dr. George Workman and Dr. George Jackson of Victoria College: the only significant instance of debate over biblical criticism in Canada outside the bounds of the Calvinist tradition.

The Great War interrupted but provided occasion to increase the heterogeneity of Baptists as men from various classes and religious traditions rubbed shoulders in trenches and denominationalism broke down under the influence of contact with the cosmopolitan world of Europe. In 1919 the dormant controversy surfaced anew when Dr. T. T. Shields, minister of Jarvis Street Baptist Church since May 1910, attacked The Canadian Baptist for a series of editorials favorable to such works as J. Munro Gibson's, The Inspiration and Authority of Scripture and A. H. Strong's Inspiration, Authority and Criticism. Ironically, the implied slurs and elitism reflected in P. T. Forsyth's Introduction to Gibson's book contributed to passage by the Ottawa Convention Assembly of a resolution which slapped the hands of editor, W.J. McKay and characterized as "new" and "vague" the doctrine of inspiration contained in the editorials.[11]

Tension surfaced in Jarvis Street Baptist Church in 1920, initially as a struggle over worship and liturgy between Shields and the organist, Dr. Edward Broome, then turned to church administration and a debate over the place of the diaconate and membership in Baptist polity. Finally, in February 1921, Shields preached his famous sermon, "The Christian Attitude Towards Amusements", interpreted as an attack on the "worldliness" of his opponents and raising the spectre of the notorious Dancing Deacon. In response a "Laymen's Committee" was formed to oust Shields.[12] Dr. Shields refused to submit a "requested" resignation following a resolution passed June 29, 1921 by a church meeting, retaliated with a summer crusade led by the New York controversialist Dr. John Roach Straton, added forty-six members irregularly that summer, and was sustained at the reconvened Annual Meeting on September 21, 1921. The "minority" came under censure; forty were excluded from church office, and 349 finally requested letters to establish on May 24, 1922 the Central Baptist Church, later Park Road Baptist Church, Toronto.

Historians have generally interpreted the contest from

within the context of their denominational commitments. For Dozois, a Convention historian, Shields turned "what was clearly a personality issue into a doctrinal debate, by charging his opponents with modernism, worldliness and heresy." For Tarr, the Plot that Failed was a concerted attempt to bring about "the downfall of one who was a recognized leader of the evangelical forces" in the hope that his defeat would "enable the liberal element to gain the ascendance."[13] Monistic theological or psychological interpretations fail to give serious consideration to the social characteristics of the factions. If social heterogeneity can be established, then the question becomes one of relating the differing theological emphases to their respective sociological constituencies.

Clearly in the Jarvis Street contest and in the wider struggle the contestants were conscious of social differences. Shields often complained that his "chief offense [was] that in these matters [he had] appealed to the people." He characterized his opponents as the wealthy, the worldly, and the wise. Convention supporters responded that "TOO MANY RICH MEN" was "another cry raised to becloud the issue," that most with a "moderate amount of this world's goods" opposed Shields on administrative and not on theological grounds. At this point a microcosmic study of the social characteristics of Jarvis Street members may shed light on the wider conflict.[14]

As early as 1875 Toronto was beginning to experience the growth of class-stratified dormitory suburbs and the idealized church where rich and poor shared a common religious and social life was beginning to disappear. Forty years later wealthy Torontonians were already beginning to abandon their palatial mansions on Jarvis Street and move north and west of Bloor Street into the districts around St. George Street and Walmer Road. Others moved across the Don Valley into the fashionable suburbs stretching east along Danforth. Still, in 1910, as Table I reveals, though power rested with the rich, Jarvis Street Baptist Church was a heterogeneous congregation. Although twenty-five

per cent of the members were merchant manufacturers and professionals, an equal number were blue collar workers and laborers. Significantly, however, many of the latter were printers or workers in the newspaper industry and their bosses were members of the church. Another twenty-five per cent were small entrepreneurs, managers or semi-professionals; approximately the same number white collar workers.

However, Fyfe's commandment of 1875 had not born the rich harvest expected among the blue collar workers. Baptist missions in working class areas of Toronto had not become self-supporting and Shields responded in 1912-13 by federating the Sumach and Parliament Street Missions with Jarvis Street, thus effecting an initial shift in the social characteristics of the congregation. Compare the occupational profile of the church in 1913, Table II, with the occupational profile in 1910, Table I. In three years the percentage of merchant manufacturers and professionals dropped from twelve to seven per cent. Blue collar workers and laborers increased from twenty-three to twenty-eight per cent. Significantly more single memberships, in contrast to family units, appear on church rolls and reflect recruitment from boarding-house areas located south and west of the church.

During and following the Great War the standard Baptist theology preached by Shields failed to produce a strong impact. Meanwhile the Jarvis Street elite were becoming critical of revivalist techniques and new members tended to be recruited from the "missions" and from lower segments on the occupational scale. However Shields discovered after 1920 that when controversy raged revivals flourished. For example, in 1922, following expulsion of the "minority", the Sunday School increased from 300 to 1000. Three prayer meetings a week were held that year and 182 new members were added. In 1923 recruitment increased to 384. The thesis that these additions reflect consolidation by Toronto "fundamentalists" cannot be supported, for the vast majority [253] joined by baptism, only 72 transfer of letter and 59 by religious experience. Data reveal similar pattern through 1925.

TABLE I

OCCUPATIONAL PROFILE JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH 1910

Occupations	Number	Percentage
Professionals	43	13.11
Merchants, Manufacturers Wholesale	35	10.67
Entrepreneurs, Business Retail	27	8.23
Managerial, Sales, Semi-Professional	58	17.68
White Collar--incl. Clerks, Barbers, Police, Bank Workers	88	26.83
Blue Collar--Printing, Foremen	39	11.89
Manufacturing--Industrial Workers	17	5.18
Laborers--Chauffeurs, Domestics	21	6.40
Totals	328	100.00

Number of Occupational Units in Church:	524	
Number Unidentified	196	(37.40)
Number Identified	328	(62.60)

NOTE: Appendix A constitutes a breakdown of the table by type of occupational units. It shows the more stable units, where both spouses were members, to predominate in the higher occupational categories.

TABLE II

OCCUPATION PROFILE JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH 1913

Occupations	Number	Percentage
Professions	49	10.94
Merchants, Manufacturers Wholesale	33	7.37
Entrepreneurs, Business Retail	49	10.94
Managerial, Sales, Semi-Professional	82	18.30
White Collar--incl. Clerks, Barbers, Police, Bank Workers	109	24.33
Blue Collar--Printing, Foremen	64	14.29
Manufacturing--Industrial Workers	32	7.14
Laborers--Chauffeurs, Domestics	30	6.70
Totals	448	100.00

Number of Occupational Units in Church: 715
Number Unidentified 267 (37.34)
Number Identified 448 (62.65)

NOTE: Appendix B constitutes a breakdown of the table by type of occupational unit and reveals the marked increase in absolute numbers of single working units and a drop in the number of widows in the congregation.

TABLE III

OCCUPATIONAL PROFILE CENTRAL BAPTIST CHURCH 1922
STATUS AS JARVIS STREET MEMBERS IN 1913

Occupations	Number	Percentage
Professions	18	16.83
Merchants, Manufacturers Wholesale	24	22.43
Entrepreneurs, Business Retail	14	13.09
Managerial, Sales, Semi-Professional	14	13.09
White Collar--incl. Clerks	22	20.56
Blue Collar--Printing, Foremen	11	10.28
Manufacturing--Industrial Workers	2	1.87
Laborers--Chauffeurs, Domestics	2	1.87
Totals	107	100.00
Number of Occupational Units in Church:	128	
Number Unidentified	21	
Number Identified	107	

NOTE: Appendix D constitutes a breakdown of the Table by type of occupational unit and reveals that the largest percentage of white collar persons were single women. A detailed methodological explanation of the procedure for comparing the data is also included.

A social profile of the recruits would provide a definitive test of the socio-economic hypothesis were such data available. Unfortunately, Dr. H.C. Slade, now deceased, resolutely refused access to the membership rolls of Jarvis Street Baptist Church. Nevertheless, Table III is a profile of the occupational characteristics of members of the Central Baptist Church. By incorporating data only on members dismissed who were members prior to 1913, the last year for which Jarvis Street data are available, it is possible to show conclusively that it was the rich and wealthy members of old Baptist families who were "exiled". Over thirty-eight per cent belonged to merchant-professional units while another thirteen per cent were retail entrepreneurs. Only fourteen per cent were blue collar workers and these were connected to elite families by employment or marriage.

When Jarvis Street Church granted letters of transfer to the minority Shields documented to his satisfaction the fact that most practised a churchlike pattern of piety, were irregular at communion, and inactive in the extended life of the congregation. The vast majority were members prior to his ministry and many were "aged and infirm". Of the 349 exiles 177 were members prior to 1910, most others life passage children of old Baptist families. Few, if any, were products of the pastoral or revival ministry of Dr. Shields. To summarize, Table IV, below, compares the occupation of members of the two churches, Jarvis Street and Central Baptist. Clearly, the schism resulted in isolation of old affluent Baptist families and in the capture of their church by a charismatic leader who instituted sect-type patterns and whose message and ministry produced differential class recruitment.[15]

TABLE IV
COMPARATIVE OCCUPATIONAL PROFILE
JARVIS AND CENTRAL BAPTIST
1913

Occupations	Jarvis No.	Jarvis %	Central No.	Central %
Professions and Entrepreneurs	89	23.23	56	52.33
Managerial, Sales	64	16.71	14	13.09
White Collar	93	24.29	22	20.56
Blue Collar-Labor	137	35.78	15	14.02
	383		107	
Unknown	199		21	
	582		128	

If occupation is the best single indicator of class assessed value of residence real estate is a significant indicator of status. Expenditure on housing is a major budget item and constitutes an important means through which income is transfered into status. Generally, home-owners tend to be more stable and less geographically mobile than renters. Thus, if status was a factor in the fundamentalist-modernist controversy one would expect more residence ownership and higher assessments among one group than another. Table V represents the 1913 assessed value of residence real estate for the total membership of Jarvis Street Baptist Church. Thirty-seven per cent were owners, sixty-three per cent renters. Twenty-five per cent had assessments over $6000, another twenty-three per cent assessments in the $4-6,000 range. Among renters fifty per cent lived in homes assessed at less than $3000. The Anglican Diocese of Toronto owned considerable poor housing not far from Jarvis Street Church and many Baptists rented these properties. The boarding-house phenomena among new recruits has been mentioned previously.

[1]Appendix E constitutes a breakdown of the Occupational Profile of Jarvis Street Baptist Church in 1913, after those units which founded Central Baptist Church were removed. It reveals a marked decrease in the number of family units in the membership of the church.

TABLE V

ASSESSED VALUE RESIDENCE REAL ESTATE - 1913
JARVIS STREET BAPTIST CHURCH
TOTAL MEMBERSHIP

Status	Assessments						
	-1000	-2000	-3000	-4000	-5000	-6000	over 6000
Owners % of Known	4 [2.07]	27 [13.85]	31 [15.90]	40 [20.52]	28 [14.36]	17 [8.72]	48 [24.62
Renters % of Known	21 [6.41]	81 [24.70]	63 [19.21]	60 [18.30]	37 [11.28]	32 [9.76]	34 [10.37

Total Number of Units	523	257 family units	[49.14%]
Number of Owners	198 [37.29%]	102 single males	[19.51%]
Number of Renters	328 [62.72%]	116 single females	[22.18%]
		48 widows	[9.18%]

In contrast,Table VI shows that almost sixty per cent of the Central-Park Road units were home owners and seventy per cent belonged to family as opposed to partial family membership units. Thirty-seven per cent had assessments over $6000; another twenty per cent were in the $4-6,000 range. The average assessment of the twenty-five homeowners with assessments over $6000 was $10,150.

TABLE VI

ASSESSED VALUE RESIDENCE REAL ESTATE - 1913
Members Joining Central Baptist Church - 1922

Status	Assessments						
	-1000	-2000	-3000	-4000	-5000	-6000	over 6000
Owners % of Known		7 [10.45]	9 [13.44]	12 [17.91]	9 [13.44]	5 [7.47]	25 [37.32]
Renters % of Known		8 [17.40]	8 [17.40]	13 [28.26]	2 [4.35]	5 [10.87]	10 [21.74]

Total Number of Units	113	79 family units	[69.29%]
Number of Owners	67 [59.30%]	7 single males	[6.20%]
Number of Renters	46 [40.71%]	15 single females	[13.28%]
		12 widows	[10.62%]

Another city where similar patterns prevailed was Minneapolis. In 1902 controversy in the First Baptist Church resulted in formation of Trinity Baptist Church. There William Bell Riley, founder of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association [1919] and a close collaborator with Shields in the Baptist Bible Union (1922), won control of the First church over the opposition of high status members. Changed urban residence patterns dictated that the Minneapolis elite isolated themselves in a dormitory suburb and established a church whose theology and religious practices reflected high status homogeneity. The dilemma of elite urban Baptists is well summarized by an observation made in different context on the changing political structure of the city in industrial America. Samuel P. Hays of Pittsburgh University writes:

> The urban upper class faced two ways at one; decentralist in residential institutions, it was integrative in its economic and occupational life. While it sought to separate itself from the city in one way, in another it was propelled back into the center of urban affairs.[16]

Wealthy Baptists responded in like manner in their religious life. On the way from a religious to an occupational reference group they moved away from the egalitarian sectarianism reflected in the small town parish model. Concurrently they were charged with having a stranglehold on the denomination, a charge easily documented and believed by workers and farmers threatened by the power and wealth of the Bay Street establishment. Increasing social heterogeneity was inimical to denominational unity.

In Canada the rural phase of the controversy did not begin in earnest until after the Jarvis Street schism. In 1922 fundamentalists attempted unsuccessfully to gain control of McMaster's Board of Governors. However, in 1923 they were sustained by the Convention in London in their protest against the conferring of an honorary degree on "modernist" President W.H.P. Faunce, of Brown University. Finally in 1925 came the appointment of the Rev. L. H. Marshall to the McMaster faculty occasioning protracted

and bitter charges of modernism. Shields utilized The Gospel Witness, which he founded in 1922 and edited, to announce in sensational headlines, "Ichabod"--the glory had departed. The denomination finally appealed to the federal Parliament for an amendment to their charter to enable expulsion of dissidents. Jarvis Street Baptist Church was expelled from the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec and fundamentalists met on October 19, 1927 to commence formation of the rival Union of Regular Baptist Churches of Ontario and Quebec.

Nothing indicates more clearly the fact that the fundamentalist-modernist contention was an urban conflict exported to the countryside than an examination of areas where the contention did or did not flourish. In spite of sporadic visits by contestants there was little controversy and no schism in the Maritimes, in rural Quebec, or on the Canadian prairies. In British Columbia, where fundamentalists founded the Convention of Regular Baptist Churches of British Columbia, schism occurred primarily in Vancouver in working class areas east of Granville Street and in contiguous rural areas on the "north side of the Lower Fraser Valley."[17] In rural Ontario districts proximate to Toronto such as Simcoe County and Middlesex-Lambton felt the full brunt of the controversy. Fundamentalists made use of anti-urban sentiment, pointed the accusing finger at city sophisticates and intellectuals, and flattered rural pride with the claim that only they could save the denomination from an insignificant aristocracy of bureaucrats, skeptical schoolmen, and rich philanthropists. Rural churchmen, perturbed by a squabble not their own, requested denominational support. Help had to come soon or it would be too late.

Class differences became increasingly evident at denominational meetings. For example, an American Baptist minister present at the 1926 Convention observed:

> I was impressed by the personnel of the majority. It included...nearly all the solid elements of the denomination. As the followers of Dr. Shields

> gathered about him at the close of the meeting, to join in their singing and other emotional manifestations, I could not but be impressed by the inferior personnel of the group. I am speaking of the general appearance.[18]

Collective biographical studies of Baptists in the towns of Orillia and Barrie, Simcoe County, confirm such reports. In 1927 the First Baptist Church, Orillia, split when the fundamentalists withdrew to form Bethel Baptist Church. In Barrie a dissident McMaster student gathered members from neighboring Convention churches and turned Collier Street into an Independent Baptist Church. For purposes of conciseness the occupational data are grouped, community characteristics being similar. Table VII shows a non-statistically valid, but strong tendency to support the thesis that Convention supporters were of higher occupational status than Unionists. Differences might well have been more pronounced had not events moved too rapidly for differential recruitment to take place before schism.

Convention supporters showed a significantly higher proportion of merchants and entrepreneurs, the Unionists more farmers. In Barrie Convention blue collar workers were primarily railroad foremen or tradesmen. Unionists tended to be manual laborers or workers from the local tannery. Lack of uniformity in assessment practice prevents grouping of residence data for Barrie and Orillia. However, Table VIII reveals that a larger proportion of Orillia Convention loyalists owned homes and that the assessed value of their residences was higher. Similar data are available for Barrie.

In Simcoe county the contest was between conservative evangelical Baptists loyal to the denomination and dispensational millenarian leaders who appear to have attracted marginal workers alienated from the prevailing culture and more susceptible to anti-urban and anti-educational rhetoric. On the other hand the data are not so clear as to support the monistic argument that the conflict was merely a socio-economic confrontation.

TABLE VII

OCCUPATIONS OF BAPTISTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE BAPTIST CONVENTION OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC AND THE UNION OF REGULAR BAPTISTS OF ONTARIO AND QUEBEC
SIMCOE COUNTY, ONTARIO, CANADA
(NUMBER AND PER CENT)

Occupations	Convention Baptists	Regular Baptists	County Town Sample*
Agriculture	9 (7.03)	13 (21.66)	5 (4.54)
Professionals, Merchants, Entrepreneurs	26 (20.31)	5 (8.33)	16 (14.54)
Managerial, Sales, White Collar Occupations	29 (22.65)	18 (30.00)	38 (34.54)
Blue Collar Manufacturing, Laborers	64 (50.00)	24 (40.00)	51 (46.36)
Totals	128	60	110

CHI SQUARED 12.786 (3 d.f.) significant at .05 PHI .068 Cramer's V .068

*County Town Sample includes 43 entries being the first entry on every fifth page, Town of Orillia--Assessment Record 1927 for taxation year 1928, and 65 entries being every fourth entry, column 1, each page of Vernon's, Barrie City Directory--1937.

Methodology: Membership lists for Simcoe county churches reflect low quality record keeping. Profiles for First Baptist Church, Orillia are on the basis of the roll revised April 1, 1933, in Church Minute Book and Membership Register, April 17, 1929-May 6, 1935; for Bethel Baptist Church, from petitioners listed in letters, November 25, 1927, November 11, 1927, the latter requesting removal from the Church roll, plus additions to membership to 1933 found in Bethel Baptist Church Minute and Membership Register #1. For First Baptist Church, Barrie, Ontario, Year Book and Church Directory, 1931 (n.p., n.d.); for Collier Street Independent Baptist Church, Church Roll and Baptism (Collier Street Independent struck out and Emmanuel written in), list of members through #78, entry dated August 30/31, June 14/33.

Occupational Data From: Vernon's, Barrie, Midland, Orillia (Ontario) Street, Alphabetical, Business and Miscellaneous Directory . . . 1930 (Hamilton, Ontario: Vernon Directory Ltd., 1930) or tax assessment records.

TABLE VIII

ASSESSED VALUE RESIDENCE REAL ESTATE
MEMBERS FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH (CONVENTION) AND BETHEL
BAPTIST CHURCH(REGULAR), ORILLIA, ONTARIO -- 1928

Assessments (dollars)	First Baptist		Bethel Baptist		Orillia*
	Owners	Renters	Owners	Renters	
over 4000	3	-	-	-	2
3500-3999	2	-	-	-	-
3000-3499	1	-	-	-	1
2500-2999	1	1	-	-	1
2000-2499	5	1	2	1	7
1500-1999	9	1	1	-	9
1000-1499	5	1	7	2	9
500- 999	8	-	1	1	12
0- 499	5	1	-	-	9
Totals	39	5	11	4	50

*Data Taken From: Town of Orillia Assessment Record 1927 for taxation year 1928, sample constitutes the first entry every 5th page.

Methodology: Orillia tax records provide no street addresses, only legal descriptions of property. However, religious designations for statistical and school tax purposes were provided. Checking Baptist designations if family name and street were correct it was assumed that the legal description was for this property. Eight Regular Baptists were listed as farmers-gentlemen. Six Convention Baptists fell in the same category. Thus, property owners in the county could have significant holdings, and the status of Baptists may be under-represented in this table.

What remains to be briefly explained is how two divergent social groups modified nineteenth century evangelicalism to produce new faiths for a new age.

The growing social heterogeneity of Baptists documented above had, during the period 1875-1910, produced divergent needs which could not easily be met within the bounds of traditional nineteenth century evangelicalism. One major concern was the issue of religious authority. In reality the impact of social and scientific change gave rise to three new authority systems in the period 1870-1895. The doctrine of Papal infallibility appeared in 1871, biblical inerrancy in 1881, and Pentecostalism in 1894.

Much has been made of higher criticism versus biblical infallibility in the fundamentalist-modernist controversy. Suffice it to say that if biblical criticism was new, so was the inerrancy doctrine espoused by the Princeton theologians. The inerrancy doctrine was founded on Scottish Common Sense philosophy, and pushed Calvin and the fathers of Westminster far beyond the assertion that scripture was "the only sufficient, certain, and infallible rule of all saving Knowledge, Faith,and Obedience."[19] Princeton asserted, contrary to orthodoxy, that "all the affirmations of Scripture of all kinds, whether of spiritual doctrine or duty, or of physical or historical fact, or of psychological or philosophical principle, [were] without error, when the ipsissima verba of the original autographs [were] ascertained and interpreted in their natural and intended sense."[20] It should be remembered that the original charges of biblical heresy were levelled by Charles A. Briggs of Union Seminary, New York against these Princeton innovations.

The second symbol modified related to the doctrine of the Priesthood of all believers;--in many respects the key to the fundamentalist-modernist controversy, though much neglected by historians. To the Toronto establishment it meant freedom from coercion and a buttress to an individuality which supported social

accommodation. To the urban workers and later to rural Baptists it came to mean the right of every man to interpret his Bible after the common sense hermeneutic contained in the Princeton formula. The professional urbanite was prepared for a professional clergy in a world of professionals, hence could entertain historical biblical study and higher criticism. In contrast, dispensationalists incorporated a laymen's form of higher criticism in their Scofield Bible, and scholars became fair game for the elitist charges levelled by Baptist democrats.

Finally, and most importantly, the needs of such a heterogeneous constituency could not be met by a single eschatology. If the comfortable found support in modern adaptations of post-millennialism, in the concept of historical progress, and soothed their drawing room consciences with the social gospel, such views touched a sour note among those Baptists undergoing the tensions produced by social dislocation and relative status loss. For the latter the theology of Doomsday, imported to America by the Plymouth Brethren and spread through the new laymen's Bible Institutes and by the Prophetic Conferences made more sense. Indeed, eschatological innovation was a major concern of Convention supporters as early as 1900, when Dr. Calvin Goodspeed of McMaster published his The Messiah's Second Advent, A Study in Eschatology. In the Education Day debate held at the Toronto Convention in 1926, Prof. L. H. Marshall voiced a common complaint when he pointed the accusing finger of Darbyism at his opponents. Marshall exulted:

> I am going to uncover the fire and let you see what it is. If I have to go back to England for it I will go. That is fair. There are many people in the Baptist churches of Ontario and Quebec who are not Baptists at all; they are Plymouth Brethren. [Hear, Hear, and applause.]
>
> A voice: Give us proof.
>
> Thomas Phillips once said that sometimes a Plymouth Brethren joined his church in Bloomsbury, and after a very short time the Plymouth was entirely gone and there was nothing but the brother left. Our experience in Canada is just the opposite; when a Plymouth Brethren joins a Baptist Church in Canada, in a short time the brother is entirely gone and there is nothing but the Plymouth left.[21]

Dean J. H. Farmer of McMaster likewise constantly claimed the question was whether "the Baptists [were] to forego the liberty of which they had always been the champions and accept a pre-millennial season of theology as indispensable to Baptist orthodoxy."[22]

Shields attempted to submerge the dispensational question but finally was forced to attack the Scofieldites, who withdrew from his Union and with independents of similar theology founded, in 1933, the Fellowship of Independent Baptist Churches of Canada. In short, "Christ Crucified, Risen, and Coming Again" was as new a symbolic package and as relevant to its constituency as anything to appear from Chicago, Crozer, Union Seminary, New York or Rochester. In America schisms and revivals have always gone hand in hand, and the fundamentalist revival could not begin until fundamentalist theology emerged full-blown with the publication of the Scofield Reference Bible in 1909. Only then did the differential class recruitment of members follow which altered further the social characteristics of the Baptists, precipitating the struggles for power that eventuated in schism. Indispensable to schism was the emergence of two divergent new theologies, both of which departed materially from nineteenth century evangelicalism.

Fundamentalism and modernism were not monolithic movements, and neither could claim to represent the "faith once for all delivered to the saints." However, fundamentalism produced a revival among recruits from the lower middle class, many of whom were migrants into urban centers. Later its missionaries spread out from the Bible Institutes to capture rural Canada with their new theology. The system offered security, recognition, and encouraged sectarian cohesion. Eventually fundamentalism found expression in the conservative Politics of Doomsday, Social Credit, and the new Middle American alliance.[23]

The controversy is dormant now but the scars remain. However, struggle left the Baptist denomination in Canada socially stratified and exhausted. Baptist churches associated with the

Baptist Federation of Canada find themselves locked in to a small upper-middle-class constituency where they compete with the United and Presbyterian churches for an increasingly narrow segment of the populace. It is as if through social mobility and urban stratification they had become what Fyfe feared, "The hills of Gilboa on which no dew fell". In contrast, the fundamentalists emerged to capture the natural Baptist constituency of Anglo-Saxon white collar and blue collar workers. With an aggressive spirit and new theology they have made impressive strides, especially since the merger in 1953 of the Fellowship of Independent Baptist Church and the Union of Regular Baptists of Ontario and Quebec in what eventually has become the nationwide Fellowship of Evangelical Baptist Churches of Canada.

Some ask if reunification of Convention and Evangelical Baptists is possible. Perhaps it is too soon to tell. Social mobility and education is gradually changing the attitudes of Evangelical Baptists. Certainly social and doctrinal pluralism would need to be recognized and a good place to start would be a re-examination of our common roots in Calvin and the Philadelphia Confession. Important also is an understanding of the social bases of the schisms; the changes in institutions and doctrines that created a high incidence of tension and potential for religious conflict in the 1920's. If this paper contributes to such a dialogue, if it enables various "Baptist" groups to move beyond rhetoric and historical apology, it will have done its work.

FOOTNOTES

1. The Canadian Baptist, Vol. 21 No. 49, p. 1.

2. Canadian Baptist Archives, hereafter CBA, Jarvis Street File, mut. man., The Dai.. (December) 3, 1875, p. 4.

3. Rev. R. A. Fyfe, A Forty Years' Survey from Bond Street Pulpit, (Toronto: Dudley & Burns, 1876), p. 26.

4. Ibid.,p. 27.

5. Ernest R. Sandeen, The Origins of Fundamentalism-Toward A Historical Interpretation (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968),p. 3; also, The Roots of Fundamentalism-British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970).

6. S. G. Cole, The History of Fundamentalism (New York: Richard R. Smith, 1931), p. 334 and elsewhere; Norman F. Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), p. 38.

7. E. R. Sandeen, The Origins of Fundamentalism, p. 26.

8. E. R. Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism, see preface, xii. For a critical discussion of Sandeen which points out the problems of definition and interpretation relating to the terms fundamentalism and modernism see, LeRoy Moore, Jr., "Another Look at Fundamentalism: A Response to Ernest R. Sandeen," Church History, Vol. XXXVII (June 1968), pp. 195-202; also R. T. Handy, "Fundamentalism and Modernism in Perspective," Religion and Life, XXIV (Summer 1955), pp. 381-394; H. Richard Niebuhr, "Fundamentalism," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, E. R. Seligman, ed., III (New York: MacMillan Co., 1938), pp. 526-7.

9. Everett L. Perry, "The Role of Socio-economic Factors in the Rise and Development of American Fundamentalism." Unpub. PhD. diss., Div. School of the University of Chicago, 1959; p. 5; Mary B. Hill, "From Sect to Denomination in the Baptist Church in Canada," unpub. Ph.D. diss., State University of New York, Buffalo, 1971, p. 11, pp. 155-7.

10. Walter E. Ellis, "Social and Religious Factors in the Fundamentalist-Modernist Schisms Among Baptists in North America, 1895-1934," unpub. Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1974, pp. 133-49.

11. Ibid., pp. 149-58.

12. T. T. Shields, "The Christian Attitude Towards Amusements," printed in, L. K. Tarr, Shields of Canada, pp. 208-218.

13. Literature relating to these schisms is considerable, and is primarily apologetic. For the Ontario and Quebec schism, material favorable to the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec see: W. G. Carder, "Controversy in the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, 1908-1929" (Unpublished B.D. thesis, McMaster Divinity School, McMaster University, 1950),and J. E. Dozois, "Dr. Thomas Todhunter Shields (1873-1955) in the Stream of Fundamentalism" (unpublished B.D. thesis, McMaster Divinity School, McMaster University, 1962). For the fundamentalist case see L. K. Tarr, This Dominion His Dominion (Willowdale, Ontario: Fellowship of Evangelical Baptist Churches, 1968); also, L. K. Tarr, Shields of Canada (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1967).

    Literature relating to schism in the Baptist Union of Western Canada, favoring the Union, see G. H. Pousett, "The History of the Regular Baptists of British Columbia" (unpublished B.D. thesis, McMaster Divinity School, McMaster University, 1956); for the fundamentalist case see J.B. Richards, "Baptists in British Columbia: A Struggle to Maintain 'Sectarianism'" (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia, 1964).

14. T. T. Shields, "McMaster's Approval of Dr. Faunce's Infidelity," Gospel Witness, II, No. 38 (January 31, 1924), p. 13; The True Story of the Jarvis Street Baptist Church Trouble: by its Retired Deacons, Toronto, October 7, 1921, p. 3.

15. Data is taken from: Jarvis Street Baptist Church Directory, 1910, 1913; Central Baptist membership from: Document of Dismissal J. S. B. C., in C. B. A.

16. Samuel P. Hays, "The Changing Political Structure of the City in Industrial America," (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh mimeo, June, 1970), pp. 2-3.

17. J. B. Richards, "Baptists in British Columbia," p. 150.

18. CBA, Whidden Papers, Letter, O. C. S. Wallace, Entaw Place Baptist Church, Baltimore, Md., to S. J. Moore (Toronto Millionaire), November 9, 1926.

19. Second London Confession, 1677, in W. L. Lumpkin, Baptist Confessions of Faith, (Valley Forge: Judson, 1969), p. 248.

20. A. A. Hodge and B.B. Warfield, "Inspiration," Presbyterian Review II (April 1881), pp. 238-9; also B. B. Warfield, The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible, Samuel G. Craig, ed. (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Reformed Publishing Co., 1949),p. 173.

21. CBA, Proceedings of the Educational Session of the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec Held in First Avenue Baptist Church, Toronto, October 19, 1926, p. 82.

22. CBA, Dean J. H. Farmer Papers, Letter Farmer to Rev. A. P. McDiarmid, Robson, B. C., April 29, 1927; to J. H. Hunter, Sherbrooke, Quebec, February 22, 1927; to Mr. A. Murray, June 17, 1927; for Shields against dispensationalism see, T. T. Shields, The Doctrines of Grace (Toronto: The Gospel Witness, n.d.), pp. 197-208.

23. Erling Jorstad, The Politics of Doomsday. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1970).