HISTORICAL PAPERS 2008
Canadian Society of Church History

Annual Conference
University of British Columbia
1-3 June 2008

Edited by
Brian Gobbett, Bruce L. Guenther and
Robynne Rogers Healey

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data
Main entry under title:

Historical Papers

June 2/3 (1988)-
Annual.
A selection of papers delivered at the Society's annual meeting.
Place of publication varies.
Continues: Proceedings of the Canadian Society of Church History, ISSN 0842-1056.
ISSN 0848-1563
ISBN 0-9696744-0-6 (1993)

1. Church History–Congresses. 2. Canada–Church history–Congresses. l. Canadian Society of Church history.

BR570.C322 fol. 277.1 C90-030319-0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Papers

CSCH President's Address

Addendum

Two articles that were accidently shortened during the editing process of* Historical Papers 2007 *are being republished here in their entirety. We sincerely apologize to the authors for any inconvenience.

Please Note

The following papers were presented to the Canadian Society of Church History in 2008, but were not made available for publication: Julia Rady-Shaw, "Church Front: The Case of Bloor Street United Church's War Effort, 1939-1945"; Gordon Heath, "When Friends and Neighbors Become Enemies: Canadian Baptists and the War of 1812"; Wolfgang Breul, "Martin Luther's Development as a Reformer in Light of His own Statement from 1518: New Light on an Old Question"; Douglas H. Shantz, "Pietist Autobiography and the Rise of Secular Individualism"; Sarah Bruer, "Unselfish Devotion: Deaconess Zaidee Stoddard and the Social Gospel"; Kristin Burnett, "Acknowledging the 'Unacknowledged Quarantine': Religion, Faith, and Nursing at the Blood Hospital, 1893-1930s"; Renée Lafferty, "The 'Spirits' of Religion: Evangelicals and Medical Care for Toronto's Dipsomaniacs, 1860-1890"; James Robertson, "'T.T. Shields and the Des Moines Affair': The Attempted Establishment and Subsequent Collapse of a Fundamentalist University in Des Moines, 1927-1929"; Ian Hesketh, "The Victorian Bible: Ecce Homo and the Manufacturing of a Literary Sensation"; Todd Webb, "'Popery is Evidently Nodding to its Fall': Methodism and Anti-Catholicism in British North America, 1837-1860." Papers from a joint session with the Canadian Historical Association not made available for publication include: Marguerite Van Die, "Practising Medicine and Spiritualism in the 1860s: The Encounters Between Drs. Moses Colby and Susan Kilborn as Problem and Possibility in the Writing of Religious History"; Pamela E. Klassen, "The Holistic Trinity: Body, Mind, and Spirit among Twentieth-Century Protestants"; and Ruth Compton Brouwer, "When Missions Became Development: The Churches and CUSO in the 1960s – Linkages and Tensions."

Air Wars: Radio Regulation, Sectarianism and Religious Broadcasting in Canada, 1922-1938

MARK G. MCGOWAN
St. Michael's College, University of Toronto

In the 1920s, radio was the rage in Canada. Whether it was a homemade receiving set made out of batteries and wire or a deluxe tube and battery set purchased from the local hardware store, each year tens of thousands of Canadians paid their dollar license fee and added their names to the growing list of "listeners-in." When they tuned in, Canadians heard the familiar sounds of their own world and the exotic sounds from places that they may have only known on a map: the screaming rifts of jazz, live from a club in Chicago, the thud of leather on skin from a prize fight in New York, soothing chamber music from a ballroom in Montreal, horse racing from Toronto, or the farm report from a 100 watt station in Saskatoon. Not to be left behind in the rush to own the new technology, Canadian religious groups quickly alighted to the fact that the wireless provided a new pulpit for the propagation of the Word and a new theatre for the masses to participate vicariously in divine services, from the comfort of their homes. Just as print had transformed the face of Christianity four hundred years before, so might the radio usher in a new era of evangeli zation.

In his recent book on morality, culture, and broadcasting, Robert Fortner has argued that while the Canadian churches regarded radio as "a means to continue a significant cultural presence in smaller towns and cities,"[1] that in the final analysis, "the role of the church as a champion of moral positions in the development of Canadian radio was largely irrelevant." He adds that, "there was no grand expectation of the medium"

and "no philosophers in Canada concerned enough to articulate a set of moral values it might fulfill."[2] He concludes that the church "was merely another interest group, little different from labour unions, women's organizations, or farmer's co-operatives."[3] Fortner's assumption underlying his analysis is that, in Canada, churches lacked effectiveness in asserting their power over the new medium because there were no constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech or the freedom of the press, and the central government remained cold to a religious presence on the publicly owned radio network.[4] Without such guarantees embedded in the political and legal culture, churches appeared to be in a more tenuous position in securing airtime in Canada, notably on the CBC.

Fortner's case, though tempting at first glance, perhaps underestimates the manner in which Canada's churches negotiated their share of the "air" in the early days of privately-owned radio and the advent of public radio. While there is little doubt that denominational relations in Canadian history could be characterized, at times, by tension, rhetorical jousting, open discrimination, and even violence, the churches also affected significant compromises with one another and the state on such issues as denominational schools, the military chaplaincy, pageantry and processions in the public square, social services, and the regulation of public morality. In the early days of radio, the churches had every opportunity to continue the patterns of past tensions, but in the end affected compromises that would make an important contribution to the presence and peaceful coexistence of religious contributors in Canada's public broadcast system. Born out of the controversy sparked by the Reverend Morris Zeidman and Father Charles Lanphier in Toronto, in the 1930s, the CBC would pour tremendous energy into its religious department, create regulations specific to religion on the air, and establish a national advisory body, that would effectively assist the Corporation regulate religious programming, while taking the initiative to create new religious programs to be broadcast free of commercials, for the benefit of all Canadians. Such privilege offered to religious groups by the "public broadcaster" provides a significant challenge to the notion that churches were simply just one of many interest groups, appealing to the CBC for a voice on the national airwaves.

Before launching into an analysis of the relationship between radio and the churches in Canada, it is important to establish the uniqueness of Canadian broadcasting in the English-speaking world. From the earliest days of radio Canada struggled between two models of broadcasting. In Britain, the government, through the agencies of the Post Office and the

British Broadcasting Corporation, took control over radio, its regulation, its financing, and its programming. In contrast, in the United States, radio evolved like any other commodity in a free market place; those with means and know how purchased the available technology and began broadcasting after receiving a license from the federal government. Except for the infrequent interference of the federal regulator, the FCC, American AM radio became a popular and highly competitive example of survival of the fittest on the airwaves. In time, two large privately owned networks – NBC and CBS – emerged and dominated broadcasting in the USA. Canadians developed a hybrid between the American and British practices. Between 1922 and 1932, Canada experienced a free market in radio, with licensing and regulation under the authority of the Federal Department of Marine and Fisheries. Only two significant networks emerged, one owned by CN Railways and the other by the CPR, which provided programming exclusive to passengers while passing through cities where their affiliates operated. In the 1930s, the federal government created the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission, which assumed the CN network stations, and provided publicly owned commercial-free broadcasting along side the private stations. The CRBC acted as both a provider of programming and as the regulator of all radio, both public and private. This unique "Canadian way" of delivering radio services was critical to the development of religious broadcasting.[5] While religious programming provided a catalyst for the creation of the CRBC, and its successor the CBC, in 1936, the presence of the government regulator and programmer ensured that religious groups in Canada might share a level playing field and be forced to work co-operatively, civilly, and responsibly, while they provided a diverse range of religious programmes to Canadians who chose to "listen in." In their responses to the air wars generated by Morris Zeidman and Charles Lanphier, in Toronto, from 1935 to 1938, the CBC created Canada's first significant radio regulation on religious broadcasts and a unique ecumenical steering committee that would be a force in the development of Canadian radio-television religious programming.

From the time it was first developed, wireless radio transmission became an electronic pulpit for inspirational programming and for the use of churches. As early as 1906, when inventor Reginald Fessenden sent the first voice radio broadcast from Brant Rock, Massachusetts, to the ships of the United Fruit Company, it is alleged that his selections were primarily Christmas hymns, including his own violin rendition of "O' Holy Night."[6] When commercial radio licenses were first issued by the

Canadian Department of Marine and Fisheries, in 1922-1923, religious programming began to appear in a variety of forms. In the 1920s, when Canadian radio was in private hands, churches were offered free time broadcasts of their religious services, live from their places of worship. The precedent was set in February 1923, when CKCK in Regina, set up the first remote Sunday broadcast from Carmichael Presbyterian Church.[7]

Other churches co-operated with local radio stations, offering their facilities for concerts, organ recitals, choral performances, and educational lectures.[8] Several churches were eager to lend their ministers and priests to local stations for the broadcasts of sermons, usually on Sunday evenings, with some of the most noted preachers including Protestant William Aberhart on CFCN Calgary, Anglican Canon JE Ward in Toronto, and Father FR Wood in Winnipeg. Several denominations went so far as to build their own stations and purchase their own broadcast licenses including, the First Congregational and later United Church in Vancouver (CKFC),[9] the Christian and Missionary Alliance in Edmonton (CHMA),[10] and the Wesleyans in St. John's (VOWR).[11] Phantom licenses, which allowed independent stations to use the facilities of another station for broadcasting, were issued to St. Michael's Cathedral in Toronto (CKSM), Jarvis Street Baptist Church Toronto (CJBC),[12] and the International Bible Students Association (Jehovah's Witnesses), who operated stations in Vancouver, Edmonton, Saskatoon, and Toronto. These phantom licenses were designed specifically for religious and non-commercial broadcaster and, in the case of churches, were intended for use only on Sundays.[13] If Canadians preferred, however, and many did, they could listen in to broadcasts from American stations, whose strong signal strength often bombarded the Canadian airwaves at night. Canadians had their choice of numerous Protestant preachers or the controversial broadcasts of Father Charles Coughlin, who transmitted his political and social talks from WJR, a CBS affiliate in Detroit.[14]

Although sacred music, church services, devotional hours, and Sunday evening preaching from all denominations became common fare on Canadian radio in the 1920s, there was little scandal, controversy, or complaint about broadcasts to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, Radio Division, the regulator of the airwaves in Canada. In 1927, this relative calm was shattered when there was significant public protest about broadcasts made by the stations owned by the IBSA, or Jehovah's Witnesses. The details of this controversy have been recounted elsewhere and will not be presented at length here (although it may be time for a

thorough re-examination of the facts of the case).[15] Suffice it to say that, while in Toronto for an ISBA convention in 1927, Judge Joseph F. Rutherford, the head of the Witnesses, made derogatory remarks about the Catholic and mainstream Protestant churches during a speech to his followers; the speech was covered live on local radio.[16] Many members of the listening public, regardless of denomination, were unimpressed. Nor were listeners in Saskatchewan enamoured with the Witnesses when IBSA station CHUC allowed J.J. Maloney, Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan to make speeches over their frequency. Similarly, some listeners in Toronto were outraged when local phantom ISBA station, CKCX, cut into the shared CFRB 580 frequency just as the Reverend William A. Cameron, one of Toronto's most gifted and popular Baptist preachers, was reaching the climax of his Sunday night sermon from Loews Theatre.[17] By 1928, letters of criticism of the IBSA stations from Vancouver, Toronto, Saskatoon, and Edmonton led to Fisheries Minister, P.J. Arthur Cardin, to refuse license renewal to all the Witness' stations;[18] other religious stations were permitted to remain on the air.

While Cardin was within his rights to refuse arbitrarily the renewals under the terms of the regulations for radio and in his capacity as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, his decision did not sit well with either opposition politicians or some clergy.[19] In the rather heated debate that took place in the House of Commons, 31 May to 1 June 1928, most speakers expressed no sympathy for the views of the Jehovah's Witnesses, but they were deeply troubled that the religious views of one group would be "censored" by the government, while other groups, seemingly to in the Minister of Marine's favour, were untouched. In a very well articulated address to the House of Commons, J.S. Woodsworth, appeared to speak for many of his colleagues in the House when he said:

> Now I am not a member of the Bible Student's Association. It does seem to me that a great deal of their theology is particularly grotesque. But I should like to ask, when did we appoint a minister of this government as censor of religious opinions? All down through history religious bodies have criticized other religious bodies. I think the great Roman Catholic church has sometimes spoken very harshly concerning heretics; I think the Anglican church in its Athanasian Creed utters some very strong things against those who do not believe in that creed. I think the Westminster Confession contains some very strong words against people who do not accept that particular creed; and I have heard evangelists telling people generally where they will

> go unless they believe the doctrines being preached to them. But when did we say that any of these bodies were to be silenced because other citizens did not agree with them? It is stated that the Bible Students condemn other religious bodies. Of course that is true of nearly all religious bodies. Why should we penalize the Bible Students simply because they follow in the footsteps of other bodies? . . . If Bible Students are to be put out of business because they condemn alike Catholics and Protestants, I do not see why the *Sentinal* and *The Catholic Register* should not be suppressed.[20]

Woodsworth and his colleagues appeared to see radio in the same light as the existing print media, where ideas were balanced and censorship was generally unnecessary. What appeared not to be mentioned was that this new technology was not completely voluntary; depending on the strength of signal, number of competing broadcasters in a region, and the quality of radio receiving sets themselves, stations like the IBSA ones might be the only ones received in an area, and there were no alternatives in a given timeslot. In print media, where available, if the consumer rejected the ideas offered by one newspaper, there were many others readily available. Nevertheless, the politicians, supported by letters and petitions from the public, seemed to wish for a more level playing field when it came to the ideas and controversy generated by religion on the radio.[21]

The House of Commons came to no particular resolution to the virtual censorship of the Witnesses other than to support Cardin's calling of a Royal Commission to investigate all of Canadian Radio. Cardin hoped that this commission could recommend procedures and regulations regarding more controversial broadcasting and the manner in which religion would be handled on the nation's airwaves. Although, it was religious controversy that had sparked the creation of the Aird Commission, in 1928, the finished report, one year later, described the relationship between broadcasting and religion in only a general way. The commissioners emphasized the importance of Canadian content on Canadian radio, while envisioning radio as a potential agent for national unity. They recommended the creation of a national publicly-funded network akin to that of the BBC.[22] When it was time to discuss religion they simply recommended that:

> The representative bodies . . . advise upon the question of programs . . . to deal with religious services, and it would be for them to decide

> whatever might be deemed expedient in this respect. We would emphasize, however, the importance of applying some regulations which would prohibit statements of a controversial nature and debar a speaker making an attack upon the leaders or doctrine of another religion.[23]

Despite this aspiration that the nation's religious groups would work in tandem with a new publicly-owned radio network, there was no such clause in the legislation that created the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission, in 1932, nor its successor the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, in 1936. Only Section 90 of the CRBC's Broadcast "Rules and Regulations" (1933) prohibited "defamatory statements with regards to individuals or institutions," which presumably included religion.[24] This lacuna had implications for both the new public network and the private stations, which were subject to the regulatory and licensing decisions of the CRBC and, later, the CBC. When Judge Rutherford of the Jehovah's Witnesses reappeared on several private stations, he could only be controlled by the Commission's provision that his scripts were to be vetted in advance by the CBRC.[25] When the Witnesses refused to submit to this censorship, they removed themselves from the Canadian airwaves, although it was made clear that the question of controversial religious radio had not been answered by the changes affected by the government from 1929 to 1933. Ironically, if Canadians wanted to continue to hear Rutherford, they needed only tune in to the available American stations carrying his sermons, uncensored.

The blind spot in Canadian radio regulations with regard to religion would soon be exposed, in 1936, shortly after the creation of the CBC. The new Board of Governors and the CBC's General Manager, Major Gladstone Murray, could not ignore the issue when the tempest emerged in southern Ontario, Canada's largest radio market, where the majority of Canada's nearly 800,000 radio sets were licensed.[26] The eye of the storm was Toronto, where there were three licensed private commercial stations (CFRB, CKNC, CKCL), one CBC-owned station (CRCT, later CBL), and the possibility of receiving signals from numerous American stations. Most religious groups had a champion on the air: Canon J.E. Ward for the Anglicans, T.T. Shields and W.E. Cameron for the Baptists, Morris Zeidman for the Presbyterians, Father Charles Lanphier for Roman Catholics, and Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath of Holy Blossom Temple, for the Reformed Jews. Morris Zeidman, a convert from Judaism, was a graduate of Knox College, founder of the Scott Mission, member of the Presbyte-

rian Mission Board, Treasurer of the Protestant Alliance of Ontario, and Deputy Grand Chaplain of the Loyal Orange Lodge of Canada West. His program, "The Protestant Study Hour," was heard every Sunday evening on CFRB, one of Toronto's most powerful transmitters. In 1935, Zeidman claimed (with some exaggeration) that his program regularly could claim an audience of 250,000 listeners, including thousands of Orangemen.[27] His arch-nemesis was Charles Lanphier, a thirty-five year old diocesan priest who had been broadcasting on radio for nearly a decade, and had already been fired from the Toronto Star station, CFCA, in 1926 for making controversial remarks. Lanphier first broadcast his "Catholic Hour," on phantom station CKSM and then on the CBC-owned CRCT (later CBL). The program, sponsored by the Radio League of St. Michael's, was transmitted live from St. Michael's Cathedral, and consisted of a broadcast of Sunday Mass followed by a weekly news and review program.[28] At its height in the late 1930s, it has been estimated that Lanphier drew between 400,000 and 800,000 listeners of the Trans-Canada CBC Network.[29] Together, he and Zeidman would create sufficient stir to force the CBC to come to grips with the religious broadcast policy and programming.

The first round of the Lanphier-Zeidman affair took place in 1936-1937 against the backdrop of the Ontario Government's concessions to share corporation tax revenues with Catholic separate schools. Under the plan, Catholic schools, which historically had little or no access to corporate and business tax revenue for school, would now share these revenues with public schools, based on a formula worked out by the Ministry of Education.[30] This "special privilege" for Catholics was new grist for Zeidman's mill, which had already been turning out criticism of the Catholic Church and support for government suppression of the Church in Mexico.[31] At that time, CFRB had threatened to suspend his broadcasting privileges because of the controversial tone and content of some his programs; such provocations only produced acrimonious counter attacks from the local Orange Lodges, who blamed Catholic lobbyists.[32] In retaliation to CFRB's threats, Zeidman appealed to have equal air time with Lanphier of the publicly-owned CRCT, claiming that it was inappropriate that a "Roman Catholic is allowed to spread propaganda and sometimes in insulting terms . . . and a Jew representing his faith, is allowed to emanate his propaganda," but a Protestant, who is part of the majority in Toronto and Ontario cannot speak on the public broadcaster.[33] In response, the chairman of the CRBC had told him that Protestants were already well taken care of on CRCT, with its broadcasts of the York Bible

Class, and the "Vesper Hour," conducted by Canon Henry D Martin from Winnipeg.[34] His rejection at the hands of the government station, made Zeidman even more determined as he continued broadcasts on both CFRB and eventually at rival CKCL.

In 1936, Zeidman weighed in heavily against the extension of business tax to Catholic schools, and when he claimed that there had been Catholic pressure to force him off the air, he engineered the creation of the Protestant Radio League, to ensure that he had both a lobby group and source of revenue for his program.[35] The controversy swirling about Zeidman's broadcasts became more electric in November and December, 1936, when a by-election in East Hastings, near Belleville, Ontario, proved to be a testing ground for only one issue: corporate tax support for Catholic separate schools. Zeidman was primed and ready to denounce the Catholic Church, separate school privileges, and the Liberal government in the period leading up to the election.[36] Gladstone Murray, the recently appointed General Manager of the CBC, was deluged with mail. Catholic letter writers denounced Zeidman for his "venomous way against Catholics" while Protestant correspondents upheld him as a champion of free speech and promoter of a true Protestant biblical message.[37] Although CFRB had decided to request Zeidman's scripts in advance of broadcasts, as had Murray at the CBC, on 7 December 1936, CFRB threatened to pull Zeidman from the air, citing Regulation 90, prohibiting abusive language towards institutions and individuals, and for his overtly political broadcast the previous week.[38] Zeidman was incensed that Protestants stood by as Catholics, whom he felt had become unrepentant supporters of fascism and its leaders – Mussolini, Franco, and Hitler – were clearly a menace to Canada, both theologically and politically.

For the CBC, Zeidman's comments constituted unacceptable behaviour on the air. In the midst of the controversy, Murray announced that he intended to "Stop the Air War on Religion" in Canada. In an effort to ensure that "sermons and religious talks" conformed to constructive and positive expositions of doctrine and not include attacks on the religious beliefs of others,[39] Murray helped to create radio regulation specific to religious broadcasting. On 23 December 1936, the CBC revealed Regulation 7c, which simply stated that no broadcast may contain "abusive comment on race, religion, or creed."[40] The regulation would take effect immediately and would be the measure by which Zeidman and others would have their scripts examined, and if not in conformity, banned from the air. The CBC was quick to indicate that there was no intent in the

regulation to dictate or censor the religious content of broadcasts, other than to prevent abuse. Regulation 7c would continue to serve as a yardstick of decency for religious broadcasts, surviving decades of regulation revision for both radio and television.[41] The regulation had been inspired by the on-air comments of Zeidman and, to a lesser extent, Lanphier.

In a month, the threat to act upon Regulation 7c became a reality, as a result of two of Zeidman's programs, of which Murray commented that he did not think "broadcasts of this nature, be permitted."[42] The final straw involved a program by Zeidman on Christ as mediator, when he said: "In heathen religions, there are found hierarchies of priests, witch-doctors and magicians who act as intermediaries between the people and their deity," which constituted a thinly veiled denigration of the Catholic ministerial priesthood.[43] A second controversial broadcast had been scheduled for the following week, which included condemnation of Catholic views towards birth control and an indictment of Catholic propagandizing the world through its missions: "There is no other sect or denomination," claimed Zeidman, "that contracts so much time on the radio as the Church of Rome."[44] He chided Protestants for being too passive and timid in their use of the new media, and he urged them to be less "lukewarm" and less "broadminded" in their approach to the world. According to Zeidman, Protestants had lost the martyr's zeal of such models as Latimer, Ridley, Cranmer, and Huss, all of whom were prepared to die for the faith. Zeidman was taken off the air until he conformed to the new regulation. The CBC action prompted a heated outcry from Ontario Orangemen and caused Zeidman to issue a flurry of telegrams to Prime Minister MacKenzie King and others.

Although Lanphier had escaped formal censure, his Sunday broadcasts on CRCT had not escaped the notice of the federal government's watchdogs of broadcasting. He used his broadcasts, he claimed, to defend himself and the Church against Zeidman's attacks, which proved only supplementary to his advocacy for separate Catholic schools and his castigation of Canadians, generally, for being too soft on communism. Like his nemesis Zeidman, Lanphier recognized the radio as a powerful agent of evangelization:

> God then gave mankind the printing press, and later steam; then electricity; then the telephone; then wireless; now the radio; and each in turn has been used for the extension of the Kingdom. But it does

> positively appear that the greatest of them all is the last, the radio . . . the living voice is far more potential and effective by far than the printed stereotype. The radio is undoubtedly the weapon of the future. In fact we are not exaggerating when we say it is the greatest weapon today. The pen may be and is mightier than the sword; but today we must add a new slogan to take the place of the old. It is "the radio is mightier than the pen."[45]

Lanphier had not lost sight of these comments over the ten years he had spent in broadcasting, with all the energy and adventurousness that his youthfulness supplied him. He had escaped his first major encounter with Zeidman without reprimand from the regulator. In late 1937 and early 1938, however, Regulation 7c would be applied more broadly, and he would not be so fortunate.

In mid-1937, the air wars in southern Ontario temporarily subsided. Zeidman, still smarting from his temporary prohibition earlier in the year, ceased his association with CFRB, and signed on with CKCL, a private station owned by Gooderham and Worts distillery and one, Zeidman claimed, had a stronger signal and wider audience. Harry Sedgewick, Zeidman's former station manager at CFRB, could comment privately to the CBC that he was finally rid of his "headache."[46] As for Lanphier, he continuously tried to distance himself from Zeidman, particularly when the two were compared in unfavourable terms by the press or by politicians. In April, for instance, during the course of a debate in the House of Commons, C.D. Howe, the Minister of Transportation, and the Privy Councillor ultimately responsible for radio broadcasting in Canada, compared Lanphier and Zeidman as examples of how the biggest problems and challenges created in Canadian radio were those that came as the result of religion.[47] For his part Lanphier publicly denounced the association with Zeidman, claiming that he was merely responding to the defamation of the Church by non-Catholic commentators.

Ironically it was Zeidman who would mount a similar defensive argument in the autumn, when the air wars broke out again. In October, Lanphier used the second portion of his CBC "The Catholic Hour," in which he related the news of the world from a Catholic perspective, in polemical fashion not heard previously in his broadcasts. Citing the reports of two British foreign correspondents, Lanphier took aim at what he claimed was the bias and misinformation inherent in the Canadian media when reporting on events in the Spanish Civil War, and insinuating it was the communists and their sympathizers in Canada who lay at the heart of

the manipulation of the facts:

> Never in the history of journalism of this 20th century, the great war included, have the reading public been the victims of so much outright propaganda, so much falsehood, so much complete distortion and so much suppression of truth and the facts as they have regarding this Spanish conflict.[48]

His questioning of what he considered to be a media bias in favour of the Loyalists flew in the face of the overwhelming sympathy of North Americans to the Spanish Government's struggle against Franco's Nationalist insurrectionists. While Lanphier appeared out of step with the majority of Canadians in his sympathies with Franco and his enmity of the Communists, who backed the Loyalists, he was in keeping with comments made by other radio priests at that time: C.J. Foran in Edmonton, Charles Coughlin in Detroit, and Monsignor Fulton Sheen in New York. All of these commentators brought to the air their fear of communism, its sympathizers within the political cultures of Canada and the United States, and the potential destructive effect communism would have on churches and religious life, if the persecution of the Church in Spain was any evidence.[49]

By November Toronto's airwaves experienced full scale warfare between Lanphier and his highly politicized newscasts, on the one side, and Zeidman with his anti-Catholic comments and his proclamations that Catholic leaders were in collaboration with the world's fascists, on the other. Meanwhile, Gladstone Murray, General Manager at the CBC, requested transcripts from each of the offenders, in order to monitor their broadcasts in the light of Regulation 7c, the "child" of the first air war. When each minister proved too incendiary, the CBC banned both from the air.[50] This now created a new assault – petitions and letters of protest to the CBC from loyal Catholic and Protestant listeners, each deriding the other's champion, while defending their own.[51] Typically, the pro-Zeidman faction was led by the Loyal Orange Lodge, the Ladies Orange Benevolent Association, the *Toronto Telegram*, the Social Service Council, and individual Presbyterian parishes in southern Ontario.[52] In general, these groups and individuals decried the government's censorship of what they held to be Christian truths, the defence against the propagandizing by the "papist" Lanphier, and the alleged Catholic pressure on the CBC to suppress free speech.[53] By contrast, the pro-Lanphier faction included the Holy Name Society Union, the Catholic Women's League, the *Catholic*

Register, the Canadian Convent Alumni, St. Jerome's College, parishes from across the Diocese of Hamilton and *Saturday Night* magazine.[54] The latter, a secular publication based in Toronto, but with a national distribution, supported the Catholic contention that Lanphier and Zeidman could not be compared either in terms of the content of their broadcasts or the tone and intent of their programs:

> The case of the Rev. Morris Zeidman, who was put off the air at the same time as Father Lanphier, does not excite us at all, for our limited acquaintance with his broadcasts has suggested that they were often calculated not only to arouse violent disagreement but to go much further-to offend the deeply held religious feelings of large numbers of those within reach of his airwaves. This quality of offending legitimate susceptibilities we have not found in Father Lanphier's broadcasts, and we do not think that he can be charged with it.[55]

The view of *Saturday Night's* editor seemed to reflect the attitudes of CBC executives, who conceded that the remarks of each radio personality were different, but peace on the air could only be preserved with the enforcement of Regulation 7c with regards to Zeidman, and the de-politicization of Lanphier's "News and Reviews in Religion."[56]

As the petitions and letters of protest poured into the CBC's head offices in Toronto in November and December 1937, Gladstone Murray and CBC Chairman Leonard Brocklington attempted to reach a compromise acceptable to all parties.[57] Both Zeidman and Lanphier had the opportunity to meet with the CBC Board Chair and General Manager in Toronto in late November to state their cases in defence of their actions and hear the CBC's counterproposals.[58] When these meetings failed to resolve the issue of controversial broadcasts, the CBC contacted the authorities to which each man would report in each church. With Lanphier this proved to be relatively easy, with Brocklington seeking to have Archbishop James C. McGuigan function as a safeguard against any more "on air" transgressions by his priest. For his part, McGuigan agreed to supervise the broadcasts carefully and vet the scripts of the "Catholic Hour" in advance of each broadcast, which included making certain that no political statements were made about communism or fascism with the context of a religious broadcast.[59] With Lanphier subject to the scrutiny and authority of his bishop, the Catholic part of the crisis appeared solved. Zeidman's pacification was much more difficult to obtain. His broadcasts were made independently of any official structures within the Presbyterian

Church. When Murray asked the Presbyterian Mission Board, of which Zeidman was a member, to supervise the minister's broadcasts, it refused on grounds that Zeidman's radio work did not fall under the jurisdiction of the Board.[60] Zeidman had suggested that he would submit to the authority of the Protestant Radio League, but the CBC was uncertain about the League's impartiality, and its effectiveness as a supervisor and monitor of potential controversy. In the end, Zeidman was permitted to return to the air under the following conditions: "[that] the content of the broadcast is to be restricted to items of purely ecclesiastical nature, there being no politics, national or international, or advocacy of controversial theories in economics . . . that the regulation prohibiting 'abusive comment on race, religion or creed' with be strictly observed."[61] Zeidman consented to the terms and was permitted to return to the air for an experimental period.[62] By February 1938, the air wars were officially over; Lanphier soon returned to his "Catholic Hour" on CBC Toronto and the Trans-Canada Network, while Zeidman moved his program to CKOC in Hamilton.[63]

The first air war had given rise to Regulation 7c, and the second also produced a significant milestone in the history of religious broadcasting in Canada. In August 1938, Gladstone Murray created the National Religious Advisory Council for the CBC. Focused on religious programming in the English language, the Council would meet monthly in Toronto, and be composed of two representatives each from the major denominations in Canada, based upon the size of each according to the Census.[64] The CBC would appoint the director of the Religious Programming Department as the liaison between the NRAC and the Corporation. The first meeting of the NRAC, in September 1938, consisted of two Anglican clergy, of whom Canon J.E. Ward was named chair of the Council, two United Church ministers, of whom J.R. Mutchmore became secretary of the Council, two Presbyterians, one Baptist, and two Catholic priests. Interestingly, one of the two priests named to the Council was none other than Charles Lanphier, who served as a popular member of the group until just before his death in 1960. Although the inaugural Council did not represent smaller denominations directly, the founding members promised that they would take into consideration the views of smaller groups and, in time, the Council was expanded to include Lutheran and Jewish representation.[65]

The Council was responsible for reviewing applications for religious programs to be aired on a "free-time" basis for the CBC, monitor the regulations regarding religious programs, and supervise the division of air

time on Sundays for broadcasts from all denominations in all regions.[66] In time, the NRAC was producing two major religious initiatives on Sunday afternoons: "The Catholic Hour" for twenty consecutive weeks, followed by the corresponding Protestant Hour or Devotional Hour, which shared the same timeslot for another twenty weeks, and the Protestant "Church of the Air," which ran later on Sunday afternoons from October to May.[67] Each series broadcasts from different parts of Canada each week, using the facilities of the local CBC station or an affiliate; programs like the Catholic Hour, for instance might run five consecutive weeks from one location – Halifax, Toronto, Winnipeg, or Vancouver – and then another for the next bundle of five week programs. "Church of the Air" and the "Devotional Hour" would alternate between the major denominations and the Salvation Army, Lutherans, Reform and Orthodox Jews, or Christian Science, and move from region to region. According to CBC Executive W.O. Finlay:

> The aim of the Council is to provide a source of worship of the highest possible character and value in which all can participate. Inasmuch as these broadcasts will originate in succession from six broadcasting stations of the C.B.C. reaching from Vancouver to Halifax, they will bring within reach of homes throughout the entire Dominion the voice and message of outstanding preachers of all denominations and music from our finest choirs. It is felt that by none will this opportunity be more keenly welcomed than by those in lonely rural sections of our Dominion.[68]

The NRAC was meticulous in its attempts to strike a denominational balance of the English-language airwaves, while ensuring that Regulation 7c was respected. Even when Lanphier himself got into hot water for his political adlibs and diversions into anti-Nazi and anti-Communist commentary, in 1939, his membership on the NRAC did not stop him from being barred from broadcasting in late 1938 and early 1939.[69] The NRAC was one safeguard in ensuring that the air wars would be a thing of the past.

The creation of the National Religious Advisory Council and the threat of Regulation 7c did not end, once and for all, intemperate and controversial religious broadcasts, but it contributed to a building of consensus regarding how to do religious radio programming at the CBC. While Fortner is quite correct that religious groups provided no distinctive moral philosophy for the use of the radio in Canada, one would be hard

pressed to find any original Canadian religious thinkers or Canadian philosophers of media at that time. Marshall McLuhan's moment was still thirty years into the future. What Canadian churches managed in the 1930s, however, was something typically Canadian – a practical solution that would enhance the peace, order and good governance of radio. Amidst the distinctive melange of public and private broadcasting under one roof, and amidst the great potential for a sectarian explosion at any time, broadcasters and churchmen reached a compromise that acknowledged the importance of religion to Canadians, while making assurances that the national airwaves would be characterized by toleration and peaceful coexistence between the Christian churches themselves, and between Christians and other faith groups, specifically Jews. Far from treating Canada's religious groups as just "one more interest group," the CBC maintained a religion department, offered religious groups supervision over their own programming, and perhaps most importantly, an imaginative outlet in which to create their own programs and broadcast them for free.[70] Although English Canada's religious programming would pale in comparison to the time allotted to entertainment, news and current affairs, sports, and music, the free-time religious broadcasts on CBC would become a mainstay of Sunday radio and television programming until the early 1970s. Private stations would still provide time to sponsored religious groups, both local programs and those packaged in the United States, but these too would be subject to Regulation 7c. The air wars of the 1930s had given birth to the orderly and ecumenical management of religion on the radio thereafter.

Endnotes

1. Robert S. Fortner, *Radio, Morality and Culture in Britain, Canada and the United States, 1919-1945* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2005), 159.
2. Fortner, *Radio, Morality, and Culture*, 178.
3. Fortner, *Radio, Morality, and Culture*, 163.
4. Fortner, *Radio, Morality, and Culture*, 159.
5. Mary Vipond, *The Mass Media in Canada* (Toronto: Lorimer, 2000), 39-40; Albert A Shea, *Broadcasting the Canadian Way* (Montreal: Harvest House, 1963), 104-106; and Margaret Prang, "The Origins of Public Broadcasting in Canada," *Canadian Historical Review* 46 (March 1965): 1-31.

6. Sandy Stewart, *From Coast to Coast: A Personal History of Radio in Canada* (Toronto: CBC Enterprises, 1985), 9.

7. T.J. Allard, *Straight Up: Private Broadcasting in Canada, 1918-1958* (Ottawa: The Communications Foundation, 1979), 22.

8. Program Report, CKUA, Edmonton, University of Alberta, 15 June 1928 (broadcasts from St. Stephen's United Church College and St. Joseph's Catholic College), file 6206-176, vol. 154, RG 97, Library and Archives Canada (LAC), Ottawa; and Broadcast Schedule, October 1, 1928 to June 30, 1929, "Affiliated Colleges Program," Mondays, 8:20pm., CKUA Papers, University of Alberta Archives, Edmonton.

9. C.P. Edwards to E.J. Haughton, Division Superintendent, BC, 23 August 1924 and Memo To Minister, 3 October 1930, file 6206-144, v.1, vol. 605, Ministry of Transport Fonds, RG 12, LAC.

10. R Ainslie, Radio Inspector, to Director, Radio Branch, 11 October 1929, file 6206-132, vol.152, RG 97, LAC.

11. *Encyclopaedia of Newfoundland and Labrador*, vol. 1 (St. John's: Newfoundland Book Publishers, 1981): 270.

12. C.P. Edwards, Director of Radio Branch to S.J. Ellis, Inspector, 27 September 1927, f.209-32-97, vol. 493, Marine Branch, RG 42, LAC.

13. Alexander Johnston to TT Shields, 6 December 1924, file 209-32-97, vol. 493, Marine Branch, RG 42, LAC.

14. *Globe*, 13 January 1936; and Donald Warren, *Radio Priest: Charles Coughlin the Father of Hate Radio* (New York: The Free Press, 1996), 23.

15. James Penton, *The Jehovah's Witnesses in Canada: Champions of Freedom and Worship* (Toronto, ON: Macmillan of Canada, 1976), 94-110. Almost every history of broadcasting in Canada makes mention of the case, although Penton's is the most thorough and helpful account, despite his underlying assumption of a Catholic conspiracy between Minister Arthur Cardin and Deputy Minister and Radio Director, Alexander Johnston (J. Macklem to Director of Radio [Johnston], 2 July 1926, Unpublished Sessional Paper, page 112, file 254, vol. 184, Parliamentary Papers, RG 14, LAC).

16. *Toronto Star,* 21 July 1927, Unpublished Sessional Paper, pages 74-6, file 254, vol. 184, Parliamentary Papers, RG 14, LAC.

17. Managing Editor of the *Toronto Star,* John R Bone to CP Edwards, 12 April 1924, file 209-32-97, vol. 493, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, RG 42, LAC.

18. SJ Ellis to Director, 29 June 1927, file 209-32-97, vol. 493, RG 42; PR Millner, Whitby, to Director, 1926, page 105, file 254, vol.184, RG 14; T.H. Whitelaw, Medical Health Office, Edmonton, to Director, 23 November 1926, pages 101-2, file 254, vol.184, RG 14 and page 35; and Greater Vancouver Radio Association to Minister of Marine and Fisheries, 2 February 1928, page 35, file 254, vol.184, RG 14; file 32-1012, vol.493, RG 42 contains petitions and letters of protest regarding the IBSA stations. Many Saskatoon letter writers wanted the alternative to "jazz" offered by CHUC (Prang, "Origins," 45).

19. J Macklem, Inspector for Saskatchewan, to CP Edwards, 17 April 1928, file 209-32-101, pt 1, vol. 493, RG 42; and *Hansard*, Debates of the House of Commons, 18 Geo V 1928, volume 3, 12 April 1928, 1951-2.

20. *Hansard*, 31 May 1928, 3619-20.

21. Mr Irvine, *Hansard*, 31 May 1928, 36345-6.

22. Roger Bird, ed., *Documents of Canadian Broadcasting*, "Aird Commission Report" (Ottawa: Carlton University Press, 1988), 42, 48, and 50.

23. Bird, *Documents of Canadian Broadcasting,* 50.

24. "CRBC Rules and Regulations, 15 April 1933," in *Documents of Canadian Broadcasting*, 130.

25. House of Commons Debates, 21 April 1933, *Hansard*, 23-4 Geo V, 1933, vol V, 1932-3.

26. William Malone, *Broadcast Regulation in Canada: A Legislative History* (n.p.; private, 1962), 3; and Mary Vipond, *Listening In: The First Decade of Canadian Broadcasting, 1922-1932* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992), 39.

27. *Globe*, 2 August 1935.

28. *Catholic Register*, 13 July and 2 November 1933.

29. Fortner, *Radio, Morality, and Culture,* 175.

30. Peter Meehan, "The East Hastings By-election of 1936 and the Ontario Separate School Tax Question," CCHA *Historical Studies* 68 (2002): 105-132.

31. Harry Sedgewick, CFRB, to Hector Charlesworth, CRBC, 30 October 1935, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 9, vol. 40, RG 41, LAC; and Charlesworth to Sedgewick, 1 November 1935, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 9, vol. 40, RG 41.

32. Cecil Armstrong, Junior Deputy Grand Master, Grand Orange Lodge of Ontario West to Hector Charlesworth, Chairman, CRBC, 14 November 1935, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 9, vol. 40, RG 41.

33. Zeidman to Charlesworth, 4 December 1935, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 9, vol. 40, RG 41.

34. Charlesworth to Zeidman, 9 December 1935, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 9, vol. 40, RG 41.

35. *Globe,* 4 and 11 March 1936.

36. Protestant Radio League Broadcast, Sunday, 29 November 1936, 1:30-1:45 pm., file 2-2-8-2, pt. 9, vol. 40, RG 41.

37. Miss K Hughes to Hector Charlesworth, 19 April 1936, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 9, vol. 40, RG 41, provides one interesting Catholic epistle amidst a sheaf of letters for and against Zeidman.

38. Sedgewick to Murray, 7 December 1936, file 2-2-8-2, vol. 41, RG 41.

39. *Globe and Mail*, 23 December 1936.

40. Acting Secretary M Landry to All Broadcasting Stations in Canada, 23 December 1936, file 9-10, vol. 146, RG 41.

41. Notes for the Guidance of Speakers in Religious Programs, 28 January 1941, file 11-23-2, pt. 2, vol. 223, RG 41; CBC Acts and By-Laws, 1 July 1948, file 1-1-1, vol. 32A, RG 41; and Maurice Goudreault, Supervisor, Station Relations, Quebec, Memorandum to Director of Station Relations and Chairman, 2 March 1951, file 9-10, vol. 146, RG 41.

42. H Sedgewick to Murray , 10 December 1936, written in the margins, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 9, vol. 40, RG 41.

43. Transcript of M Zeidman, 10 January 1937, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 4, vol. 40, RG 41.

44. Protestant Radio League Broadcast, Transcript, 1937, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 9, vol. 41, RG 41.

45. *Catholic Register*, 2 November 1933.

46. Zeidman was exaggerating the potency of the CKCL signal. CFRB transmitted at 10,000 watts whereas CKCL was a mere 500 watt station. When the CBC assumed control of CRCT, later CBL, its transmitting output was raised to 50,000 as was the most powerful station in Canada (http/www.broacasting-history.ca/index3.html).

47. *Globe and Mail*, 7 April 1937; and *Hansard*, 6 April 1937, 2657-9.

48. Newscast and Review in Religion (Transcript), 31 October 1937, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 1, vol. 40, RG 41.

49. Radio Broadcast Transcripts, CJ Foran Papers, Archives of the Archdiocese of Edmonton, Edmonton, Alberta; Thomas C. Reeves, *America's Bishop: The Life and Times of Fulton J. Sheen* (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2001), 103; and Donald Warren, *Radio Priest: Charles Coughlin, the Father of Hate Radio* (New York: The Free Press, 1996), 110-12.

50. Gladstone Murray to EA Pickering, Secretary to the Prime Minister, 29 December 1937, 205834-7, William Lyon MacKenzie King Papers, C-3728, MG 26j, LAC; and WO Finlay to Murray, 6 November 1937, file 2-2-8-2, pt.2, vol. 40, RG 41.

51. Telegram, Murray to George A. Taggart, Station Manager CRCT, 8 November 1937, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 10, vol. 41, RG 41; and Charles Jennings to Taggart, 9 November 1937,file 2-2-8-2, pt.2, vol. 40, RG 41.

52. *Telegram*, 8 and 9 November 1937; Collection of Letters of Protest, file 2-2-8-2, pt.10, vol. 41, RG 41.

53. *Telegram***,** 10 and 15 November 1937.

54. File filled with letters and a formatted petition from several dozen parishes in the Diocese of Hamilton, file 2-2-8-2, pt.2, vol 40, RG 41; and *Catholic Register*, 18 November 1937.

55. Archbishop James McGuigan to King, 20 December 1937, cited in King Papers, C-3727, MG 26j. A reprinting of the feature was found in *CR* 25 November 1937.

56. Leonard W Brocklington, Chairman of the CBC Board of Governors, to McGuigan, 3 January 1938, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 10, vol. 41, RG 41.

57. CBC Memo, SS Brown to Murray, 6 January 1938, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 10, vol. 41, RG 41. The memo indicated that the CBC had received two hundred sixty three pieces of correspondence of which one hundred ninety-five favoured Lanphier, twenty-four favoured Zeidman, and forty-four constituted petitions with "wording almost identical."

58. Testimony of Father Charles Lanphier, 23 November 1937, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 2, vol. 40, RG 41.

59. Leonard W. Brocklington, Chairman of the CBC Board of Governors, to McGuigan, 3 January 1938, file 2-2-8-2, vol. 41, RG 41; and McGuigan to Lanphier, 2 January 1939, McGuigan Papers, SU03.29, Archives of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Toronto (ARCAT), Toronto. Here McGuigan

reminds Lanphier of what he agreed a year before.

60. Murray to EA Pickering, 25 January 1938, King Papers; and JW MacNamara to Murray, 8 December 1937, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 10, vol. 41, RG 41.

61. Murray to Zeidman, 5 January 1938, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 10, vol. 41, RG 41.

62. Murray to RB Bennett, 25 January 1938, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 10, vol. 41, RG 41; and *Catholic Register*, 20 January 1938.

63. Memo, Murray to CBC Board of Governors, 25 January 1938, and Gordon Anderson, Station Director, CKOC to Murray, 27 January 1938, file 2-2-8-2, pt. 10, vol. 41, RG 41.

64. *Catholic Register*, 4 August 1938.

65. Memo from CR Delafield, Program Division, 15 February 1939, file 1-23, pt. 2, vol. 223, RG 41.

66. Reverend JE Ward to Msgr. Edward Michael Brennan, 24 November 1939, file 1-23, pt. 2, vol. 223, RG 41.

67. Meeting Minutes, 15 September 1938, file 1-23, pt. 2, vol. 223, RG 41.

68. Memo WO Finlay, CBC, 28 December1938, file 1-23, pt. 2, vol. 223, RG 41.

69. ARCAT, McGuigan Papers, SU03.28b, Murray to Lanphier, 4 November 1938, McGuigan Papers, SU03.28b, ARCAT and McGuigan to Lanphier, 2 January 1939, McGuigan Papers, SU03.29; McGuigan Press Release, McGuigan Papers, SU03.31; and *Catholic Register*, 12 January 1939.

70. MemoF 19 January 1939 indicated that religious programs were among the CBC's most popular, file 1-23, vol. 223, RG 41.

A Puppy-Dog Tale: The United Church of Canada and the Youth Counter-Culture, 1965-1973

BRUCE DOUVILLE
York University

In May 1967, in a speech to the Ontario Welfare Council, a prominent United Church official remarked that Prime Minister Pearson "appeared to be a puppy-dog on LBJ's leash."[1] That official was Rev. J.R. Hord, Secretary of the Church's Board of Evangelism and Social Service, and he was commenting on the Canadian government's silent complicity in the Vietnam War. Hord was widely regarded as a loose cannon in the United Church of Canada, and his tendency "to formulate policy in the headlines" did not endear him to more senior leaders in the denomination.[2] Nevertheless, this incident illustrates the dilemma that the United Church faced in the 1960s: how to fulfill its prophetic role by speaking out on relevant issues, to remain engaged as the Church in the world. It is my contention that being relevant and engaged in the 1960s meant that the Church had to address the issues and concerns of the youth counter-culture. The Vietnam War was only one such concern.

The relationship between Canada's Christian churches and the youth counter-culture in the late 1960s and early 1970s is important, because it raises the perennial question of whether the church is primarily a "priestly (legitimating)" institution or a "prophetic (critical)" one.[3] In other words, does the church function as the religious arm of the dominant social, political and cultural system, or does it oppose – even subvert – that dominant system? From the mid-nineteenth century onwards, one sees a decline in the priestly role of Canada's mainline churches and a concomitant rise in their prophetic role.[4] But that decline is most evident in the

1960s, for it is then that the church loses its place of privilege in the dominant culture. According to John Webster Grant and others, this was the decade that witnessed the death of Christian Canada.[5] Similarly, it is chiefly in the late 1960s that we see Canada's mainline churches, particularly the United Church of Canada, shift markedly towards the political left, towards a more critical activist Christianity. The church was losing its priestly authority, but was assuming its prophetic mantle.

The period of transformation for the church coincides with another remarkable development in Canadian society: the emergence of the youth counter-culture, including both the psychedelic counter-culture of the hippies, and the political counter-culture of the New Left student movement. While much has been written about the relationship between liberal Christianity and the Canadian left in the early twentieth century, historians of Canada's 1960s counter-culture such as Doug Owram, Cyril Levitt and Myrna Kostash give only a passing nod to the role of religion.[6] This is regrettable, because there is a clear link between the rise of the youth counter-culture and the transformations that occurred within the Canada's mainline churches, especially the United Church of Canada. There was significant interaction between the Christian churches and the various institutions of the youth counter-culture, and they had an impact on each other. This interaction helped shape the counter-culture at the time, and to a much greater extent, it shaped the churches themselves for decades to come.

In this paper, I am going explore three questions. First, how did the United Church of Canada relate to the counter-culture? Second, what influence did this engagement have on the United Church itself? Third, was it successful in relating to the youth of the 1960s and early 1970s – and why or why not? I will argue that in dealing with the youth counter-culture, the United Church built on its history of openness to progressive social change. I will show that there were strong links between the United Church and the New Left student radicals, as well as to the hippies. Some United Church youth were actively involved in the New Left, and many United Church officials offered both verbal and tangible support to the student leftists and hippies. The evidence will show that the Church was transformed by its attempt to remain relevant to youth – to their culture, to their issues. Finally, I will offer some explanation as to why the Church failed to retain young members, in spite of the fact that by the standards of the counter-culture, it was the most politically and socially progressive mainline Protestant denomination in Canada. Geographically and

temporally, the focus of this paper will be Toronto, between 1965 and 1973. Toronto was the site of the headquarters of the United Church of Canada and its chief publication, *The United Church Observer*, and it was also the location of some important counter-cultural institutions, such as the Yorkville hippie scene, the Toronto Anti-Draft Project, and the Toronto branch of the Student Union for Peace Action (SUPA).

Before I turn my attention to the specific interactions between Toronto's youth counter-culture and the United Church of Canada, let me clarify the meaning of the terms "counter-culture," "New Left," and "hippies." The sociologist Theodore Roszak coined the term "counter-culture" in his 1968 book, *The Making of the Counter-Culture*. Roszak argued that in the dominant culture, experts manage all aspects of life, and "the prime goal of the society is to keep the productive apparatus turning over efficiently."[7] This productive apparatus, however, included the war machine, institutionalized racism, and a dehumanizing business culture. The counter-culture, then, was the conscious rejection, predominantly by youth, of all institutions of social control, and of the values embedded in these institutions. For the hippies, this "great refusal," to use Herbert Marcuse's term,[8] meant "dropping out" of society. The hippies were wary of all power structures – even radical ones – and they sought liberation through alternative spirituality, drugs and sexual freedom. In contrast, for the student radicals of the New Left, the "great refusal" was political, and it involved collective action to confront the corrupt system, tear it down, and in its place, to create new, radically egalitarian structures.

Did the counter-cultural youth perceive religion to be part of this corrupt system? This is a question of critical importance. Last year, at a conference in Kingston on the Global Sixties, a keynote speaker confidently assured his audience that the New Left (or "The Movement," to use the sweeping, monolithic term that he preferred) rejected all religious faith then, and continues to reject all religious faith today.[9] Even a cursory review of the history of "The Movement" in Canada shows that this statement is false. It is true that many of these young people saw organized religion as supportive of the status quo, or, at best, irrelevant. But others within the counter-culture were willing to make common cause with progressive church members or organizations on issues of common concern. Moreover, some prominent members of the New Left were themselves actively involved in progressive churches.

The United Church of Canada is important here because historically, it was the most socially and politically progressive of Canada's major

Christian denominations. In the 1950s and 1960s, the Church leadership could best be characterized as "moderately progressive" or "small-l liberal" in its social positions.[10] Philosophically, the Church's position was that God worked in the world, and thus, it was the Church's duty to speak prophetically on secular issues, and to engage with the wider world. In the twentieth century, the church definitely shifted from an emphasis on theological Christianity to a greater emphasis on ethical religion.[11] As such, the Church was moving from a traditional conversion-oriented understanding of evangelism towards a "new evangelism," which, one could argue, was hard to distinguish from social service or social activism. Not surprisingly, the key proponents of the "new evangelism" were executives of the denomination's Board of Evangelism and Social Service in the late 1960s, especially Rev. J.R. Hord.[12]

This trend towards a greater involvement in secular affairs, and towards a post-dogmatic, activist faith, was reinforced in 1965 by the publication of two influential books. The first of these was Pierre Berton's *The Comfortable Pew*. The Anglican Church of Canada commissioned this work, because Anglicans wanted an outsider's view of their institution and its shortcomings. The result was an indictment, not merely of the Anglican Church, but of all mainline Protestant churches in Canada. Berton criticized the church for being out of touch with modern society, and argued that it needed to become more up to date in both its medium and its message, more secular in its focus, less restrictive in its teachings on sexuality, and less concerned about literal belief in the supernatural. Moreover, he demanded that the churches take clear, unequivocal stands on current social issues. These changes were necessary, he contended, if the church were to remain relevant in "the new age."[13] Berton's critique received serious attention in the United Church of Canada, particularly by the Board of Evangelism and Social Service.[14]

The other influential work was *The Secular City* by Harvard theologian Harvey Cox. Cox argued that urbanization and secularization were two closely related phenomena, and that churches have been wrong to criticize them. Rather, the church should embrace the secular city, for God was present and active within it, and embrace social change. "Theology . . . is concerned *first* of all with finding out where the action is," he wrote, "Only then can it begin the work of shaping a church which can get to the action. This is why the discussion of a theology of social change must precede a theology of the church."[15] The kind of church that Cox envisioned was radically different from the traditional model. His

alternative model had little regard for denominational distinctiveness or traditional dogma, but very high regard for social action in the secular sphere. Not surprisingly, the strong influence of *The Secular City* on the United Church was most evident in the work and publications of the Board of Evangelism and Social Service. When the Board published a book about churches that were carrying out exciting community outreach projects, its title (*Churches Where The Action Is*) was a clear reference to Cox's book.[16]

Thus, in the 1960s, many within the United Church of Canada were eager to engage with secular society, to speak about relevant issues, and to discern where the "action" was. They were eager to build on the church's progressive, social gospel heritage. Consequently, the denomination was uniquely positioned to reach out to the youth of the counter-culture, to dialogue with them, and in some cases, to make common cause on shared issues of concern.

The United Church's involvement with the youth of Yorkville began in the late 1950s, with the work of Stewart Crysdale, minister of St. Paul's Church, Avenue Road. Crysdale established a social club for inner-city teens, many of them involved with gangs. By 1963, concerned members of several area churches (especially Walmer Road Baptist Church) became involved in this outreach project, and the Yorkville Area Community Services Association was formed. The C.S.O. was inter-denominational, but its director was United Church minister Rev. James E. Smith, and it continued to operate out of St. Paul's United Church, Avenue Road, on the edge of Yorkville.[17]

Initially, its prime concern was young people in inner-city gangs. However, this changed as Yorkville became, in Smith's words, a "Mecca for hippies."[18] Yorkville's "hip scene" dates back to the 1950s, and by the early 1960s, the area boasted a core of bohemian residents, as well as several successful coffee houses featuring folk music and alternative art. Throughout the decade, middle-class teenagers and young adults from the suburbs were drawn to the area, attracted by the intense media coverage, by the ready availability of drugs, and, in general, by the excitement of "making the scene." Influenced by the counter-culture emanating from the Haight-Ashbury district in San Francisco, and Greenwich Village in New York City, these young people began to remake Yorkville into a site to perform hippie identity.[19]

As interest in church's Drop-In Centre dwindled, Smith focused his attention on the budding Yorkville scene. Initially, it proved impossible to

draw the hip youth into the church. "Then we remembered that alienated kids relate to natural leaders," Smith recalled. In the search for a natural leader, the centre recruited Mike Waage, a charismatic and articulate seventeen-year old hippie from New York's Greenwich Village, who had moved to Yorkville in 1965. Waage was able to draw the hip youth to the centre, and under his leadership (and with the assistance of a little coercion and intimidation) they displaced the working-class "Greaser" youth who had been the organization's main clientele.[20] Soon, the church basement underwent major expansion and renovation. The hippies carried out the work themselves, digging out forty loads of clay, and converting an unused coal-bin into the "Cross-Beat Coffee Cave." Writing in 1966, Stewart Crysdale described the resulting space:

> [It is] equipped with record player, microphone, amplifier and speaker. The Kingsway Kiwanis Club put up $1,000 to partition the large club-room and provide a pool table. A Disc Jockey's room was built into the main club-room like a miniature radio station. In another part of the dungeon, they created the "Lazy U," a cozy social centre, fitted out with booth-seats and tables, ranch-type lamps and décor, and television. Nearby is the "Wells-Fargo Supply Depot," a snack counter for pop and light refreshments."[21]

The Drop-In Centre became a site for recreation, free meals, showers, employment counseling, and other practical services. It also became the principle hang-out for Yorkville's hip youth, a place to dance and listen to music. In Stuart Henderson's portrait of "a typical Saturday night":

> The record player blasting the new Stones record. Multicoloured teens dancing, meeting, grooving, stunning and high. Longhaired politicos leaning intensely over chess or cards, guitar cases by their sides . . . Teenaged boys and girls clutched in nervous and bold free love. It was a scene, a happening and a gong show rolled into one. The Centre had lost its original mission, to be sure. But, in the process, it had gained a new, significant status within the ever growing hip Village scene, and with it, a new mission altogether. For the next three years the Church Drop-In Centre would be known to many as a central, and among the most significant, sites for hip activity. It became, in the words of David DePoe, "like our community centre."[22]

Inadvertently and inevitably, the Centre also became the location for many drug deals. Toronto's Chief of Police referred to it as a "dope-dealer's post," and a neighbouring minister derided it as "the Church that sold dope." As Smith recalls, "the whole mass media got into the action . . . C.S.O. staff took O.D.'s out of the centre on stretchers nightly while others 'talked down' their friends on acid. The Press grooved on getting pushers to sell them dope on the steps of the church. The staff spent much of its time policing the crowds."[23] While the staff members were vigilant in their efforts to prevent drug use on the site, it is undeniable that drug use was present and pervasive. For example, even though Mike Waage was a valued and effective counselor with the Centre, Smith fired him for doing LSD one evening, and refusing to promise never to do it again. (Incidentally, at the time, he was doing LSD with a number of other staff members of the Centre, who all promised not to do it again, "but probably did it again promptly afterwards," Waage recalls.[24])

Under these circumstances, it is remarkable that the congregation of St. Paul's, Avenue Road continued to permit the Centre to operate on its premises. While church records do not contain any complaints specifically about allegations of drug use, there is evidence that congregants were uncomfortable with the operation of the organization. At a meeting of the church's official board in November 1967, a committee was struck to examine the relationship between the C.S.O. and the church, "including an assessment of the work being done by the C.S.O. on the one hand and on the other hand difficulties which are encountered in connection with the maintenance of the normal affairs of the congregation."[25] At a subsequent meeting in January 1968, the board decided that while "the association of St. Paul's-Avenue Road United Church with the C.S.O. will continue," the church would discontinue its financial support of the organization. It also resolved that "our congregation suggest to Mr. Smith that further specific attempts be made to induce the youth to take greater care of the premises both inside and outside of the building."[26] There were also complaints about unauthorized use of church space, and about noise.[27]

Nevertheless, it is worth noting that up until 1968, the church did finance this controversial Centre, and even after 1968 – even after all of the negative press given to the Yorkville scene – it permitted the C.S.O. to continue operating in the basement of St. Paul's. For whatever its difficulties, the Centre was carrying out needed work. For example, its counselors (many of them, hippies themselves) served as mediators between anxious parents and runaway youth, and often they were able to

effect reconciliation.[28] From the point of view of church people, this sort of work was consonant with the "new evangelism," it was about going "where the action is," and acting in the name of Christ (even if several of the counselors and volunteers were not Christian). At the same time, from the point of view of the youth themselves, the church was a space that they could claim as their own. In Henderson's words, "hanging around at The Church was itself becoming understood as a countercultural activity."[29]

The role that the United Church of Canada played in the Yorkville scene is not only evident in the work of the Community Service Organization. It is also evident in the denomination's support of the Diggers. Formed in 1967 by the controversial Company of Young Canadians worker David DePoe, as well as several of Yorkville's prominent hippie leaders and law student Clayton Ruby, the Diggers aimed to meet the needs of incoming hippies, and to advocate on their behalf when they encountered mistreatment by police and civic officials.[30] Consequently, David DePoe and the Diggers sometimes found themselves at odds with police and the municipal government. Their role in the protests and City Hall sit-in during the summer of 1967 is a story told elsewhere.[31] But it is worth noting that some United Church leaders were sympathetic to these radical actions. In October 1967, after the summer protests, Arch McCurdy of the United Church's Board of Evangelism and Social Service sent a letter to the Company of Young Canadians, commending David DePoe. McCurdy wrote that "Depoe had been providing . . . effective leadership although, of course, he is often misunderstood by the public." McCurdy also noted that the United Church Board of Evangelism and Social Service, "in recognition of the needs of the young people in Yorkville, is providing financial support for a worker in the district whose function is to identify with the youth and provide help when and where it is sought."[32] The community worker hired by the United Church was Brian "Blues" Chapman, an artist who had moved to Toronto from San Francisco, and who was himself a Digger.[33] His primary function, we are told, was "to give counsel and assistance to drug-using youth in" Yorkville.[34] It speaks to the progressiveness of the United Church that it was willing to select a hippie – with no connection to the church – to carry out this work. It is also noteworthy that when the Diggers established Digger House as a hostel in Yorkville for "dispossessed young people," the United Church's Committee on Experimental Ministries granted them $5000.[35]

The United Church's work among the Yorkville's hippies was not conversion-oriented. Smith wrote that the hippies rejected the institutional

church, and that their desire "was to be an honorary member of every religion except Christianity." Nonetheless, he clearly saw much in them that was Christian, for he wrote that "the Hippies do live the life of a servant community."[36] Religious affiliation and dogma were not of primary importance in this ministry; such was the nature of the "new evangelism," which was more concerned with *doing* the work of Christ. And while Smith's assessment of the Yorkville hippie scene wasn't always a positive one, the program that he led wasn't merely one of condescending assistance to a needy population. Rather, the C.S.O. was an example of the church working *with* the hippies; its ministry straddles the boundaries between social assistance and social activism. And the hippies appreciated what the church did. According to Smith, "the hippies . . . said on behalf of all alienated youth that of all the agencies, the Church has responded the most."[37]

The United Church's engagement with the New Left students took place on at least two levels: that of young United Church people themselves, and on the level of Church leadership. Some United Church young people were very active in the students' campaigns for progressive social change. For example, Doug Ward was president of the University of Toronto's Students' Administrative Council while studying theology at Emmanuel College. Later, in 1966-1967, Ward also served "as president of the Canadian Union of Students in 1966-76 – a year when student governments on four campuses dropped out of the union, more or less on the grounds that it was taking stand on social issues that were none of its business." Another University of Toronto SAC president was Tom Faulkner, a devout, active United Church member, who would later enter the ministry. Though he described himself as "a long way from being a radical" and a "pseudo-liberal,"[38] many of Faulkner's actions as president were surprisingly radical. Under his leadership, the council supported attempts to grant funds to help draft-dodgers, and "to have war-material-producing industries banned from recruiting employees on campus," as well as other controversial measures. Faulkner also favored changes to the university's power structure.[39] And Emmanuel College student Richard Hyde served as the first fulltime student president of the Student Christian Movement,[40] an organization that had played a significant role in the Canadian New Left.[41]

Perhaps the best example of the new politicized attitude of United Church young people was the establishment of Kairos, which, in 1965, replaced the old Young Peoples' Union as the organization for young

adults in the United Church. Unlike the old YPU, Kairos was explicitly concerned with social and political issues. Some of its members also belonged to the Student Union for Peace Action, a radical New Left group active on Canadian campuses between 1965 and 1967. Indeed, SUPA saw Kairos as part of "left/liberal protest action on campus," along with the Student Christian Movement, New Democratic Youth, and others.[42] In 1965, leaders of both Kairos and of the Anglican Young People's Association met with officials from the Canadian Young Communist League. "When someone suggested this was flirtation with subversives, the Kairos officer replied, 'The Kairos movement is far too radical to be subverted by the sedate people of the Canadian Communist Party."[43]

In their desire to combine radical Christian theology (for example, Bonhoeffer, Tillich, Cox) with a radical critique of society, some Kairos members may have felt more affinity with SUPA than with the United Church. Writing in the *SUPA Newsletter*, Bron Wallace reviewed the 1966 Kairos Summer Event, and raised some intriguing questions about the Church and its relationship with Kairos: "Is there a place for a youth movement which is still connected with a rather irrelevant institution? What is that place? How do we relate to the Institution? Do we relate or do we get out?" Wallace didn't claim to have the answers, but her concluding remark was not encouraging: "leave the United Church to its mourning."[44] She was not alone among Kairos members in expressing a cool attitude towards the institutional church. The organization's leaders indicated that they had little interest in church structures, and that their continued involvement in the United Church would "depend upon whether they find a place of meaningful participation," and whether "people . . . become involved around issues – specific local issues and issues like Viet Nam, Rhodesia, Latin America, Czechoslovakia. People had to begin to participate in a real way . . . not be involved in a mechanistic, paternalistic way."[45] But was this shift taking place?

In the late 1960s, it was certainly taking place at the leadership level, especially within the Board of Evangelism and Social Service. As was noted earlier, throughout the 1950s and 1960s, in general, the Church's political position could best be characterized as "moderately progressive." In 1965, its statement on the Vietnam War was critical, but rather tepid, and it was contradicted by a pro-war feature in the *United Church Observer* by columnist Willson Woodside.[46] But in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the United Church moved distinctly to the left. Key individuals in the Board of Evangelism and Social Service played an important

role in this shift, particularly Rev. J.R. Hord, the Secretary of the Board, but also associate secretaries Arch McCurdy and Gordon Stewart. All three expressed their admiration for the New Left students. When Gordon Stewart was asked if "God may be working through some young people who are antagonistic outside the church," he replied, "He may very well be."[47] Arch McCurdy ended a favorable review of "Youth and the Protest Movement" with the assertion that protest "is positive. To protest evil is to proclaim good. For the church to engage in protest is to be consistent with its historic witness. In today's terminology, Jesus was a Radical and the disciples constituted the New Left."[48] And in an address on "Youth" published in the *United Church Observer*, Ray Hord observed that although he was "discouraged by the large numbers of conformists among the young," he was "a little more optimistic about the 'hippies'" and "much more optimistic about the future . . . when I see the student radicals on the New Left."[49]

The issue that served as the link between Hord and those optimism-inducing hippies and student radicals was the war in Vietnam. This issue also succeeded in generating ample media attention, and also helped to goad his denomination into taking a more critical, activist role on social and political issues. When Hord succeeded J.R. Mutchmor as Secretary of the Board in 1963, his superiors might have expected that he would continue his predecessor's legacy of denouncing vice, such as alcohol consumption and gambling. Instead, he "changed the whole approach of the board." Hord refused to distinguish "between moral issues and social problems. Poor housing, unjust working conditions, international aggression – they all were moral issues to him."[50] Such was the rationale that led him to speak out strongly on the Vietnam War, and Canada's complicit role in it.

By mid-1966, his pronouncements on Vietnam were generating some discomfort. However, he generated real controversy during his speech on 18 May 1967, when he described Prime Minister Pearson as "a puppy-dog on LBJ's leash." He argued "that Canadians should not support 'Americans who are bombing the hell out of those poor people,'" and added that since "God is on the side of the hurt, the maimed, and the defenseless," then "God must be on the side of the Vietnamese."[51] The day after Hord's "puppy-dog" remark, his words were in the morning papers. Hord's remarks upset senior church leaders, especially Wilfred Lockhart, then Moderator of the United Church, and Ernest Long, Secretary of the General Council. This was partly because Pearson was "a United Church

hero and son of the manse."[52] There was another reason, too:

> There was apparent agreement between the moderator and Long that the comment hurt the church in Ottawa especially since a delegation from the church's International Affairs Committee was to visit Paul Martin the next week. Though some persons, especially political journalists, take a somewhat cynical view of how productive are the visits of church delegations to astute politicians, this was to be an official call.[53]

Lockhart acted quickly, issuing a hasty apology on behalf of the United Church, dissociating the Church from Hord's "personal" remarks, which he called "unworthy and unjustified."[54] However, not everybody was in agreement with the Moderator, and many rushed to Hord's defence and wrote supportive letters. As one of his friends wrote, "I wonder who apologized for Amos and Elijah?"[55] The implication in the latter question is clear: Hord had taken up the mantle of a prophet, and was calling his denomination to do likewise.

Hord's "puppy-dog" remark was probably not as controversial as his next move. At some point in 1967, he asked his assistant to make contact with Mark Satin of SUPA's Toronto Anti-Draft Program, which offered aid to American draft resisters in Canada. His assistant replied, "talked to Mark Satin as you requested. He was quite interested in what we were doing and obviously quite willing to co-ordinate any efforts."[56] Ultimately, this led to a decision in late September 1967 by the Board of Evangelism and Social Service to grant $1,000 to the Toronto Anti-Draft Program.[57] The sum was not exceedingly large, but the symbolic value of the donation was greater than the monetary value. The Board was taking a stand, because it supported the right to conscientiously object to war. By making the grant, it was leading by example, and encouraging ordinary church members to support the cause.

Once again, Hord and his colleagues on the Board had created a media event without the approval of General Council or of the Moderator. Within days, Wilfred Lockhart had over-turned the Board's decision.[58] But Lockhart's quick action did little to quell the backlash from conservative church members. Hord received a flood of letters, many of them from irate laypeople, threatening to withdraw financial support for the Church. "The Church is meddling with the liquor laws," one writer complained, "and now this meddling with American draft dodgers is, as far as I am concerned, the last straw." "If even one penny of my miniscule contribu-

tion to the work of the Church is directed toward this project," wrote another, "I would be inclined to withdraw it entirely." Another letter-writer railed against the character and behaviour of the war resisters:

> Have you discussed the behavior of these young men with any responsible young people in Canada? (Not the coffee-house, demonstrator type, but the reliable young people the church expects to be its backbone in the future.) Many young Canadians frown on the entry of these men to Canada. I have heard the following comments, "They're cowards, these types." And "In Canada they just criticize Canadians. I wonder what kind of men they will grow up to be."[59]

However, Hord also received a flood of supportive letters, many of them from ministers, peace activists, and well-known public figures, including June Callwood, Senator Keith Davey, and Stanley Knowles. Significantly, he received a strong letter of support from N. Bruce McLeod, the future Moderator of the United Church: "If 'powers that be' think that actions such as your board has recently taken alienate support for the Church – they are mistaken – there are far more people daily alienated by the *up-tight fearfulness of a Church that is afraid to stick its neck out*."[60]

Hord's controversial actions were important for two reasons. First of all, they won Hord the respect of the counter-culture. When he died suddenly in March 1968, his funeral was attended by "Quakers, hippies, inner-city workers and opponents of the Viet Nam war." Incidentally, one of the speakers was Digger Brian "Blues" Chapman.[61] Secondly, one could argue that his actions galvanized the left in the Church. In 1969 and 1970, the Church moved much more boldly on the issue of the Vietnam War, working in conjunction with the Canadian Council of Churches and the Toronto Anti-Draft Program to aid American war resisters in Canada.[62] Some individual ministers also supported war resisters in their congregations. Moreover, the Church developed a heightened awareness of the developing world and the difficulties it faced,[63] and it became less hesitant to speak prophetically about such matters. It is clear that by engaging with the New Left, especially in the form of its assistance to draft dodgers, the Church was transformed.

But the Church was transformed in other ways too. By the late 1960s, the counter-culture had become mainstream. While this development had more to do with marketing of style than ideological substance, on some level, the attitudes, values and fashions of the counter-culture

were now those of the dominant youth culture.[64] And the Church was eager to engage with these youth for a very important reason: by the late 1960s, it was evident that the Church was losing members,[65] and particular attention was given to the fact that teenagers were not coming to church.[66] There were notable exceptions in some successful congregations,[67] but the statistics were undeniable.[68]

Ironically, the Church was failing to retain its youth in spite of the fact that it devoted a great deal of attention to youth issues throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s. They were covered extensively in the *United Church Observer* by Harvey L. Shepherd, who himself had been a very active participant in SUPA. Youth issues were clearly a priority for Moderator N. Bruce McLeod.[69] And stylistically, the church strived to be hip. The church's new "Live Love" logo for 1970 was a hot commodity in Yorkville.[70] The church publication for youth, *Collage*, wasn't merely hip, it was psychedelic.[71] And it would be hard to find a major city where a United Church wasn't running a coffee house (called something like "The Psychedelic Inn") or where a church wasn't engaged in new forms of "experimental worship," or trying out livelier music. Nevertheless, it seemed that the progressive United Church was losing its youth. Even more ironically, conservative churches such as the Pentecostals were growing, and had no problem retaining their youth.[72] And the evangelical Jesus People Movement grew phenomenally in 1971 and 1972.[73] So how do we explain this irony? Why didn't the United Church gain – or at least retain – the counter-cultural youth?

Part of the answer lies in the fact that the rank and file of United Church members were not as progressive as some of its clergy, and even many of its clergy were merely moderates. For example, a poll taken of United Church members in 1968 showed that a majority of lay members did not approve of extending financial aid to American draft dodgers.[74] And a 1972 poll showed that a majority of decided lay members planned to vote Conservative in the upcoming election, though ministers were more inclined to vote Liberal.[75] Furthermore, from the viewpoint of a hippie or student radical, even the most progressive, sympathetic characters within the church – men like James Smith or Ray Hord – were still very conservative; they still opposed recreational drug use, free love and anarchist politics. In spite of the highly visible left within the Church, the average United Church probably didn't seem like an appealing place for a counter-cultural young person.

The other part of the answer is the ironic consequences of seculariz-

ing the faith. In the 1960s, the Church embraced the theology of Harvey Cox and his notion that God was at work within the secular city. By de-emphasizing dogma and taking controversial stands on social issues, the church was taking up its prophetic mantle. And in doing so, it sent out the implicit message that ethics were more important than theology. The consequences were fairly predictable; after all, if young people are told that they can find God and righteousness in the secular world, why should they bother looking for them in the Church? In contrast, the Pentecostals and the Jesus People offered something that was distinctly *different* from the secular world – different values, and a different culture. God and righteousness could *not* be found in this world. As a consequence, fortunately or unfortunately, they thrived. The theology of the secular city was a recipe for speaking and acting prophetically, disseminating Christian values among the wider world, and being "salt of the earth" and "the light of the world." However, it was not a recipe for institutional growth.

To conclude, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the United Church of Canada built on its progressive heritage to reach out to the new youth counter-culture. In the process of engaging with hippies and student radicals, the denomination itself was transformed. The Church leadership moved decidedly to the left in these years, though this did not draw those counter-cultural youth into the institutional Church. Nor, it seems, did it prevent a decline in membership or attendance, most notably among young people. This does not mean that the Church was wrong to assume a prophetic role, to speak on relevant issues, and to go "where the action is." By doing so, it generated controversy and criticism within the denomination, but it affirmed its commitment to social justice and peace, and to a progressive interpretation of Christianity. One can argue that this pattern recurred several times in the decades that followed, but that would be the subject of another paper.

Endnotes

1. *Globe and Mail*, 19 May 1967.

2. Kenneth Bagnell, "The view from the firing line," *United Church Observer*, 1 September 1967, 13.

3. I have adapted these terms from Hans Mol. For him, the priestly and prophetic functions of religion are not dichotomous, but complementary. I have chosen to use the terms in a more dichotomous sense (Hans Mol, *Faith and Fragility: Religion and Identity in Canada* [Burlington, ON: Trinity Press, 1985], 247,

260-264).

4. Gary Miedema, *For Canada's Sake: Public Religion, Centennial Celebrations, and the Re-making of Canada in the 1960s* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005), 4.

5. John Webster Grant, *The Church in the Canadian Era* (Burlington, ON: Welch Publishing Company, Inc., 1988), 215-218. See also Catherine Gidney, *A Long Eclipse: The Liberal Protestant Establishment and the Canadian University, 1920-1970* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004); and Miedema, *For Canada's Sake*, 4.

6. Doug Owram, *Born At The Right Time: A History Of The Baby Boom Generation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 218-219, 225; Cyril Levitt, *Children of Privilege: Student Revolt in the Sixties* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 8; and Myrna Kostash, *Long Way From Home: The Story of the Sixties Generation in Canada* (Toronto: James Lorimer, 1980), 10.

7. Theodore Roszak, *The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1968), 7.

8. Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964), xiii-xiv, 63.

9. Dimitri Roussopoulos, in a panel presentation on "The Many Meanings of Liberation" at "New World Coming: The Sixties and the Shaping of Global Consciousness" Conference, Queen's University, Kingston, 13 June 2007.

10. Grant, *The Church in the Canadian Era*, 171-172.

11. Henry Gordon MacLeod, "The Transformation of the United Church of Canada, 1946-1977" (Ph.D diss., University of Toronto, 1980), 226.

12. Kenneth Bagnell, "What's All This So-Called New Evangelism?" *The United Church Observer*, 15 April 1966, 16-19, 40.

13. Pierre Berton, *The Comfortable Pew: A Critical Look at Christianity and the Religious Establishment in the New Age* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1965).

14. For the United Church's response to Berton's book, see Pierre Berton et al, *Why the Sea is Boiling Hot: A Symposium on the Church and the World* (The Board of Evangelism and Social Service, The United Church of Canada, 1965).

15. Harvey Cox, *The Secular City: Secularization and Urbanization in Theological Perspective* (New York: Macmillan, 1965), 109.

16. Stewart Crysdale, *Churches Where The Action Is: Churches and People in Canadian Situations* (Toronto: Board of Evangelism and Social Service, 1966).

17. Crysdale, *Churches Where The Action Is*¸ 9-11; James E. Smith, *I Wish I Was A Fish: A Search For Live Options in Yorkville* (Toronto: Yorkville Area Community Services Association, 1972), 2-9; and especially Stuart Hender son, "Making the Scene: Yorkville and Hip Toronto, 1960-1970" (Ph.D. diss., Queen's University, 2007), 167-180.

18. Smith, *I Wish I Was A Fish*, 9.

19. A more thorough account of the rise and eventual demise of Yorkville's hip scene is contained in Henderson's "Making The Scene."

20. Henderson, "Making the Scene," 266-268; and Smith, *I Wish I Was A Fish*, 9-15.

21. Crysdale, *Churches Where The Action Is*, 11-12.

22. Henderson, "Making the Scene," 272.

23. Smith, *I Wish I Was A Fish*, 10-11.

24. Henderson, "Making the Scene," 394.

25. Minutes recorded 1 November 1967, Minutes of the Official Board, 1951-1970, Records of St. Paul's, Avenue Road (Toronto), United Church of Canada Archives, Toronto.

26. Minutes recorded 10 January 1968, Minutes of the Official Board, 1951-1970, Records of St. Paul's, Avenue Road (Toronto), United Church of Canada Archives, Toronto.

27. Letter, Rev. Francis Stevens to Rev. James E. Smith, dated 1 November 1968, found in the Session Minutes, 1963-1970, Records of St. Paul's, Avenue Road (Toronto), United Church of Canada Archives, Toronto.

28. Smith, *I Wish I Was A Fish*, 15-16.

29. Henderson, "Making the Scene," 392.

30. Henderson, "Making the Scene," 297-301.

31. Standard accounts are: Owram, *Born At The Right Time*, 210-215; Pierre Berton, *1967: The Last Good Year* (Toronto: Doubleday Canada Limited, 1997), 169-172, 183-184; and *Flowers on a One-Way Street* (National Film Board of Canada, 1967). For the most recent treatment of this episode, see Henderson, "Making the Scene," 321-337.

32. Letter, Arch McCurdy to Gerry Gambill, dated 12 October 1967, Incoming Correspondence 1965-1967, Company of Young Canadians Fonds, McMaster University Archives, Hamilton, Ontario.

33. "Honor Hord," *United Church Observer*, 1 April 1968, 33-34.

34. *United Church of Canada Yearbook – Volume II* (1968), 128.

35. In comparison, the Anglicans only donated $200, while the Catholics and Presbyterians gave nothing ("Church Digs Diggers," *United Church Observer*, 1 March 1969, 33; and Henderson, "Making the Scene," 445).

36. Smith, *I Wish I Was A Fish*, 21-22.

37. Smith, *I Wish I Was A Fish*, 31.

38. *The Varsity*, 17 March 1967, 25.

39. On Ward and Faulkner, see Harvey L. Shepherd, "Then Why Does He Have To Upset Everybody?" *United Church Observer*, 1 May 1968, 10-12, 20.

40. Jocelyn Dingman, "Takeover at the SCM," *United Church Observer*, 15 June 1967, 10-12.

41. Gidney, *A Long Eclipse*, 107-111.

42. *SUPA Newsletter*, 12 August 1966, 12.

43. Kenneth Bagnell, "The end of the Beat Generation," *United Church Observer*, July 1965, 11.

44. *SUPA Newsletter*, 5 October 1966, 9-10.

45. Harvey L. Shepherd, "Is There Room For You In Kairos?" *United Church Observer*, 1 March 1969, 29.

46. Willson Woodside, "Should the Yanks go Home?" *United Church Observer*, 1 June 1965, 22-23, 28.

47. Bagnell, "What's All This So-Called New Evangelism?" *United Church Observer*, 15 April 1966, 40.

48. *Twenty-Third General Council: Record of Proceedings* (United Church of Canada, 1968), 388.

49. "Youth: Excerpts from the Final (Uncompleted) Address of the Rev. J.R. Hord," *United Church Observer*, 1 April 1968, 11.

50. Patricia Clarke, "Ray Hord: A Prophet Ahead Of His Time," *Mission Magazine* (1981), 13-14.

51. *Globe and Mail*, 19 May 1967, 27.

52. Clarke, "Ray Hord: A Prophet Ahead Of His Time," 14.

53. Kenneth Bagnell, "The view from the firing line," *United Church Observer*, 1 September 1967, 13.

54. "Moderator apologizes," *United Church Observer*, 15 June 1967, 21-22.

55. Letter, Rev. C.B. Hickman to Ray Hord, 21 June 1967, Box 62, File 316, Board of Evangelism and Social Service Fonds, United Church of Canada Archives, Toronto.

56. Memo, Tim Smith to Ray Hord, undated, Box 44, File 1, Board of Evangelism and Social Service Fonds, United Church of Canada Archives, Toronto.

57. *Toronto Star*, 26 September 1967, 1.

58. *Toronto Star*, 30 September 1967, 1, 15.

59. Letters from John Townson, R.C. Patterson, and Mrs. B.E. Conquergood, all addressed to Hord, all dated 27 September 1967, Box 43, File 1, Board of Evangelism and Social Service Fonds, United Church of Canada Archives, Toronto.

60. Letter, N. Bruce McLeod to Ray Hord, 4 October 1967, Box 43, File 3, Board of Evangelism and Social Service Fonds, United Church of Canada Archives, Toronto.

61. "Honor Hord," *United Church Observer*, 1 April 1968, 33-34.

62. "Consultation on U.S. Draft Age Immigrants to Canada," 8 May 1970, Box 43, File 9; and "News Release of the United Church of Canada," 2 April 1971, Box 43, File 8, Board of Evangelism and Social Service Fonds, United Church of Canada Archives, Toronto.

63. Clarke, "Ray Hord: A Prophet Ahead Of His Time," 15.

64. Henderson, "Making the Scene," 501-502; and Levitt, *Children of Privilege*, 98-99.

65. "Disappointment," *United Church Observer*, 1 June 1967, 11.

66. N. Bruce McLeod, "Why Won't They Go To Church?" *United Church Observer*, 1 November 1969, 20-22, 40.

67. "Sarnia, Ont.: Youth Power Succeeds," *United Church Observer*, 1 June 1969, 7.

68. In fact, "decline in church attendance and membership and the rise in leakage date from 1959" (MacLeod, "The Transformation of the United Church of Canada," 216).

69. N. Bruce McLeod, "Youth in the Church," *United Church Observer*, January 1973, 6-7.

70. "It's Love, Love, Love," *United Church Observer*, 15 February 1970, 7.

71. Patricia Clarke, "Would You Call This Magazine Religious?" *United Church Observer*, 1 December 1969, 12-15, 40.

72. K.B. Birch, "Why Have All the Students Come," *Pentecostal Testimony*, November 1972, 11.

73. David Di Sabatino, "The Spiritual Sixties and the Jesus People Movement," introduction to *The Jesus People Movement: An Annotated Bibliography and General Resource* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 3-18.

74. "How You Vote On Vietnam," *United Church Observer*, 15 March 1968, 16-18, 46.

75. "The United Church Votes Conservative," *United Church Observer*, July 1972, 20-21.

"Righteousness Exalteth a Nation": Providence, Empire, and the Forging of the Early Canadian Presbyterian Identity[1]

DENIS MCKIM
University of Toronto

In *Arcadian Adventures with the Idle Rich*, Stephen Leacock satirises the fictional Presbyterian Church of St. Osoph. Implicitly critiquing the denomination's reputation for fractiousness and austerity, he observes that the congregation of St. Osoph's is so thoroughly quarrelsome that it has severed its ties to virtually every other Presbyterian group. St. Osoph's, Leacock irreverently elaborates,

> seceded forty years ago from the original body to which it belonged, and later on, with three other churches, it seceded from the group of seceding congregations. Still later it fell into a difference with the three other churches on the question of eternal punishment, the word "eternal" not appearing to the elders of St. Osoph's to designate a sufficiently long period. The dispute ended in a secession which left the church of St. Osoph practically isolated in a world of sin whose approaching fate it neither denied nor deplored.[2]

Satirizing St. Osoph's – and, by extension, the larger Presbyterian community to which it belonged – was surely Leacock's chief objective. Yet it should not go unnoticed that his sketch also sheds considerable light on the Presbyterian ethos of the day.[3]

Perhaps the most revealing aspect of Leacock's account is his depiction of the divisive tendency that beset this ill-tempered congrega-

tion. The fragmented state of mid-nineteenth-century British North American Presbyterianism attests to the existence of such a predisposition. As a result of a litany of disputes – the most intractable of which pertained, predictably, to the immensely contentious church-state controversy – the denomination found itself divided into no fewer than eight autonomous sub-components, as well as several smaller groupings, which existed independent of the larger bodies.[4] The splintering of British North American Presbyterianism can thus be seen as evidence of the fractious tendency displayed to such a seemingly absurd degree in Leacock's St. Osoph's.[5]

It is hardly surprising, then, that accounts of the history of Presbyterianism in nineteenth-century Canada have tended to dwell on the deeply-ingrained pattern of intra-denominational conflict that preceded the establishment of the national Presbyterian Church in Canada in 1875. Investigations of the denomination's formative era have devoted substantial attention to the supposed "spirit of separation" that was thought to be responsible for the scattering of Presbyterianism into the various Synods and smaller groupings to which I have already alluded. Such discussions are typically followed by an explanation as to how this notoriously quarrelsome assortment of subgroups eventually became engaged in a progressive "movement towards union" in which, according to the conventional account, anxieties were allayed, gaps were bridged, and, at length, union was achieved.[6]

This pattern of reconciliation has traditionally been portrayed as the logical religious corollary to the political and economic maturation of the Canadian state. That is, discussions of the creation of a unified church that was coextensive with the confederated Canadian provinces are often intertwined with a misleading, teleological discourse on Canada's transition from subordinate colony to self-sufficient nation. In privileging the endemic divisiveness that preceded the establishment of a national union, such an emphasis obscures the unity of thought that pervaded the denominational community throughout the pre-1875 era (the period with which I am chiefly concerned). Counteracting early Canadian Presbyterianism's myriad schisms, this underlying conceptual cohesiveness bound together the denomination's various subgroups.

The conventional colony-to-nation approach to the history of early Canadian Presbyterianism hinges on the notion that residual "overseas influences" were responsible for denominational fragmentation in the years prior to 1875. Such influences, moreover, are thought to have waned

as Presbyterianism's constituent parts became more comfortably ensconced within the newly-minted dominion. Central to this process, according to the traditional account, was the inspiring example of Confederation. Mirroring the British North American provinces in their decision to enter into a national union, Presbyterianism's subgroups have been portrayed as casting off the divisiveness of the pre-Confederation era. Instead, the argument runs, they enthusiastically embraced a nation-wide institution as a more effective mechanism for bringing about the Christianisation of Canadian society. The narrative typically unfolds as follows: colonial subservience gave way to national assertiveness, "old world" division gave way to "new world" unity, and the Presbyterian Church in Canada was born.[7]

The preceding critique is not meant to suggest that the emphasis placed by such scholars as Edmund H. Oliver, S.D. Clark, and H.H. Walsh on the indigenisation of Canadian Presbyterianism is wholly inaccurate. To deny the importance of this pattern would be both ungenerous and misleading – after all, the eventual realisation of a nation-wide Presbyterian church inarguably involved the overcoming of significant, longstanding obstacles. It seems evident, though, that a tendency to concentrate disproportionately on Presbyterianism's institutional history – and in particular on the sloughing off of "old world" influences prior to the advent of a nation-wide union – has led to the emergence of a reductive conception of the denomination's formative era that at best is incomplete, and that at worst neglects important aspects of its intellectual substance.

In a 1993 address to members of the Canadian Historical Association, Phillip Buckner urged his audience to jettison the increasingly outmoded notion that the formulation of a coherent Canadian identity was a "natural development" that entailed the total eradication of "all other loyalties."[8] Rather than conceiving of Canadian nationalism as a "natural" phenomenon that permanently eclipsed British imperial fervour in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, he advocated an alternative epistemological tack. In keeping with the pioneering works of J.G.A. Pocock, he recommended the adoption of a spatially vast, conceptually fluid approach that concerns itself with the elaborate, inter-connected web of commercial, ideological, and emotional circuits that constituted the amorphous, trans-oceanic British imperial world.[9] The implementation of such an interpretive model, Buckner reasoned, would neutralise the potentially distorting excesses of nationalist triumphalism, and would reassert the centrality of the "imperial experience" within English-

Canadian history and culture.[10]

Consistent with Buckner's recommendation, it seems that situating Canadian Presbyterianism's foundational era within the context of a wider "British world" offers a refreshing alternative to the traditional depiction. In stressing the permeability of borders and the enduring, multi-sided significance of the British connection, such an approach represents a departure from the comparatively parochial institutional and national emphases that have hitherto dominated accounts of Canadian Presbyterianism's formative epoch.

By applying such a framework to the denomination's intellectual dimension it becomes apparent that, contrary to the indigenisation narrative, "old world" influences in fact played a seminal role in the formulation of a coherent, integrated Presbyterian self-conception. Indeed, I shall argue that for all of their apparent fractiousness the various subgroups that comprised the wider denominational community were, at bottom, tied together.

Conceiving of themselves as a "national" community analogous to the ancient Israelites, the Presbyterians succeeded in coalescing around a cluster of widely held beliefs. They saw themselves as endowed with a divinely sanctioned responsibility for the advancement of God's providential design, through which the wicked would be punished and the righteous would be rewarded. This conviction dovetailed with their fierce attachment to the principles, institutions, and mystique of the British Empire. The Presbyterians also felt that they were bound together by the denomination's distinctive form of church polity, which promoted a sense of communal inter-connectedness throughout the various subgroups. Flowing from this constellation of beliefs was a millennial sense of mission that reverberated throughout the denominational consciousness, and that extended well beyond the borders of British North America and the early Canadian dominion.

This paper takes as its central theme the synthesis of providentialism and British imperial enthusiasm that invigorated nineteenth-century Canadian Presbyterianism. It argues that this combination played an indispensable role in the shaping of a coherent denominational identity.

A consideration of providentialism as an overarching motif within the mental world of nineteenth-century Canadian Presbyterianism must begin with an exploration of its most salient traits. The Christian doctrine of providence maintains that the "sovereign God who creates is also the God who guides."[11] More precisely, providence – the notion of the

unfolding of a divinely authored, foreordained design—is thought to consist of three irreducible elements: first, that God is the fount of creation; second, that God sustains, accompanies, and exercises authority over all that is in existence, and is thus intimately involved in the rhythms and phenomena that actuate and characterise both physical and historical change; and finally, that the fruits of both creation and change are infused with an unwavering, albeit frequently inscrutable, purpose that for all of its mystery will nevertheless assuredly be realised, culminating gloriously in the Christian millennium. The cosmos, the totality of history, the natural world in all its verdant complexity, and the inner-workings of human society – *everything* is accounted for. In short, then, the doctrine of providence amounts to nothing less than the awe-inspiring assertion that no aspect of God's handiwork is exempt from divine guidance and oversight.[12]

Orthodox nineteenth-century Presbyterians placed a particularly heavy emphasis on God's providential sovereignty. This tendency was born out in an abiding belief in the creator's infinite authority. It was also evident in a corresponding conviction regarding humankind's abject inability to merit salvation. Unlike contemporaneous Arminian theology, which reputedly held that saving faith in God stems from human free will, doctrinaire Presbyterians, steeped as they were in the stern tenets of Calvinism (of which more will be said), were unshakably insistent on God's total omnipotence. They were equally convinced of the insufficiency of individual agency when it came to humanity's deep-seated yearning for sanctification. Redemption, the Presbyterians reckoned, is entirely contingent on God's graciousness, and not at all on the capricious whims of human beings who, left to their own devices, were thought to be both intrinsically and irredeemably corrupt in consequence of original sin's indelible stigma.[13]

"The one theory," observed the Reverend Michael Willis, principal of Knox College, Toronto, in a barbed reference to Arminianism, conceitedly and presumptuously conceives of God's graciousness as contingent on the will of "the sinner." By contrast, churches rooted in the Calvinistic tradition were thought to afford "all the glory" to God. In Willis' view, adherents of Calvinism attributed the extension of saving faith to "[the] wonderful love of Him" who "in His infinite wisdom and mercy chose us not because we were holy or foreseen to be holy, but that we should be [made] holy and without blame before Him in love."[14]

Thus, when it came to the question of sanctification, zealous Presby-

terians such as Willis placed tremendous stress upon the indispensable importance of the creator's benevolent graciousness and none whatsoever on human initiative. While they were by no means unique among Christian denominations in focusing on the providential theme, the early Canadian Presbyterian conception of God's absolute sovereignty nonetheless occupied a clearly-defined, unmistakably important position within the denominational imagination.

In surveying the principal features of the early Canadian Presbyterian identity, the centrality of the determinative, superintending, all-encompassing providential schema can scarcely be overstated. It furnished the denominational community with an invigorating sense of destiny that went a considerable distance in knitting together an otherwise unwieldy variety of Presbyterian subgroups. A belief in God's universal authority, too, was fundamental to the denominational world-view. As a result, articulations of the Presbyterians' sense of distinctiveness and duty were couched throughout the pre-1875 era in expressly providentialist terms.

The all-powerful hand of God was thought by the Presbyterians to be everywhere apparent and ceaselessly at work. It followed that the unfurling of the divine plan encompassed both painful, distressing phenomena as well as that which was positive and gratifying. Indeed, tumult and suffering were widely held to be punitive manifestations of divine displeasure.

Punishment for sinfulness was meted out, in the Presbyterians' view, not only on an individual basis in which wayward sinners would suffer as a result of their trespasses, but on a communal or "national" basis as well. A critical mass of wrongdoing, in other words, could bring about the chastisement of an entire community, and could be visited upon the virtuous as well as the depraved. God's vengeance could thus be applied both individually and corporately – as punishment for the indiscretions and offences of individual sinners as well as the communities in which they lived.[15]

The pronounced extent to which nineteenth-century Presbyterians viewed earthly misfortune as punishment meted out by God is evident in the reaction of the congregation of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church in York, Upper Canada to a cholera epidemic that afflicted that community in the summer of 1832. Reacting to the crisis the church's minister, the Reverend William Rintoul, convened weekly meetings of the congregational session and broader church community in an effort to assuage York's suffering.

The meetings were designed to encourage prayer as well as "supplication to God" as a result of the severity of the "pestilential Disease," which was thought by members of the congregation to have been brought on by widespread immorality. Church records indicate that they explicitly acknowledged the workings of God "in a judgement so marked as the present malady." Accordingly, members of St. Andrew's humbly appealed to God to bring the plague to an end, and pled for mercy for the community as well as the world at large for the entirety of its duration.[16]

The notion that intense and/or pervasive sinfulness could elicit the wrath of God was by no means unorthodox. On the contrary, the anxieties evinced by the congregation of St. Andrew's, York were entirely consonant with the Calvinistic ethos that underlay Presbyterian doctrine. For John Calvin, the uncompromising sixteenth-century theologian for whom the system is named, a preponderance of iniquity in a given community represented a pernicious moral miasma that, when left unchecked, led inevitably to the flouting of God's laws. For Calvin, an inability to curb pernicious behaviours could spark a degenerative downward spiral in which the proliferation of vice and disorder would bring about potentially cataclysmic expressions of divine displeasure.

Within the context of sixteenth-century Geneva, which witnessed the vigorous, systematic implementation of Calvin's various institutions and teachings, sin and crime were viewed as indistinguishable from one another. In a situation in which scriptural precepts and ordinances pervaded virtually every aspect of the socio-political order, any and all transgressions were invariably violations of the edicts of God. Secular and sacred laws in Calvin's conception were eminently complementary and, indeed, inextricably interwoven. Civil legislation and the authority of earthly magistrates were therefore doubly important since, in addition to promoting stability in the secular sphere, they also served as a bulwark against impiety by enforcing godliness.[17]

But where sinfulness could bring about expressions of God's disappointment, divine approval could, in contrast, manifest itself in a nurturing paternalism that sought to reward righteousness and encourage further obedience. While God could punish sinful individuals and communities he could also exalt those who were righteous. In keeping with this notion, nineteenth-century Canadian Presbyterians conceived of themselves as enjoying a "special" providential status that was indicative of divine favour.[18]

The Presbyterians' sense of uniqueness was predicated upon the belief that they were an exceptional denomination tasked with an equally exceptional mission: namely, to facilitate civilization's progress and to propagate as extensively as possible Christianity's glad tidings. They saw themselves as a divinely favoured community analogous to the Old Testament Israelites – as a people, in other words, united to God by way of an unbreakable covenantal bond and imbued with a divinely ordained destiny that linked them indissolubly to the unfolding of the providential design.[19] The Presbyterian "Zion," they maintained, was endowed by God with an unmatched combination of piety, prudence, and fidelity, and was responsible for the advancement of the grand providential design.[20]

Notwithstanding their numerous politico-religious differences, the early Canadian Presbyterians conceived of themselves as fitting neatly within a larger, trans-oceanic British "nation."[21] This national community transcended the arbitrary borders of political geography and united devout members of the denomination throughout the Empire in a spatially amorphous, conceptually coherent body. Under-girding the Presbyterian nation was an abiding sense of "loyalty to our Queen" and an equally ardent "attachment to our constitution."[22]

Indeed, a widespread sense of British imperial enthusiasm went a considerable distance in counteracting the ethnic differences, vast territorial distances, and institutional cleavages that separated early Canadian Presbyterianism's various constituent parts. A celebratory mythology that centred on the superiority of British institutions and on the magnificence of the British Empire fostered an atmosphere of concord that ultimately overshadowed intra-denominational differences. A pervasive imperial zeal, in short, served to bind together an ethnically heterogeneous, geographically scattered, institutionally fragmented denomination.[23]

Bolstering Presbyterian cohesiveness throughout this expansive community was the denomination's distinctive form of church polity. This consisted of individual church courts, local presbyteries, regional synods and, at the national level, general assemblies. The denomination's intricate governmental structure systematically promoted both social solidarity and liturgical uniformity throughout a multitude of Presbyterian subgroups. While rows concerning matters such as the church's relationship to the state were undeniably frequent, the importance of principles such as communal cohesion, order, and doctrinal integrity were nevertheless, as a result of the denomination's characteristic system of church polity, fervently upheld throughout the amorphous British Presbyterian commu-

nity.[24]

In addition to providing an otherwise disparate, geographically diffuse assortment of Presbyterian subgroups with a nucleus of ideas around which to coalesce, this invigorating combination of providential favour, British imperial enthusiasm, and pan-Presbyterian inter-connectedness also infused the denomination with a dynamic sense of mission. By equipping the wider Presbyterian nation with a compelling conceptual synthesis of pride, prestige, cohesiveness, and virtue, it strengthened their belief in a unique communal responsibility for the advancement of God's redemptive design.

It is important to recognise that convictions regarding the denomination's providentially sanctioned destiny were propagated and amplified by way of a Presbyterian public sphere. Emanating from podiums and circulating through a plethora of religious newspapers as well as published lectures and addresses, the ideas and anxieties proffered by devout Presbyterians throughout nineteenth-century Canada constituted, in the aggregate, a vibrant discursive community. By weighing in on pressing issues and controversies, articulate Presbyterians made public their views, engaged in often vigorous debates, and contributed to the shaping of a fundamentally coherent Presbyterian sentiment that, in the event, cross-cut the denomination's numerous institutional, regional, and politico-religious divisions.[25]

The views of the elites in the pulpit, then, were not simply foisted onto the congregants in the pew. To be sure, educated, well-connected individuals invariably exerted disproportionate influence. This was especially true if they were in the position of delivering a sermon to a congregation rendered docile by a sense of reverence, intimidation, or some combination of the two. Despite this fact, the prevailing attitudes that percolated within the denominational community can best be understood not as the result of an arbitrary, "top-down" imposition, but as the product of a sustained, organic process of discussion, thought, and analysis.

This integrative public sphere brought together members of a politically fragmented, geographically dispersed denomination in a variety of discussion-oriented communities in which words and ideas intermingled and jostled for supremacy. Cumulatively, such communities acted as a deliberative forum through which concerns and convictions regarding a wide range of issues could be debated, negotiated, and eventually conveyed to a broader Presbyterian public.

Although disagreements over the degree to which the state should

involve itself in the affairs of the church continued to rankle, such discursive communities nevertheless played an important part in identifying and articulating the priorities of substantial swathes of the denominational membership. The sustained emphasis placed by Presbyterians on the denomination's special providential status and on the glorious destiny of the British Empire was therefore not confined to the writings of an isolated, unrepresentative few. Rather, it was indicative of a broadly held belief – expressed by way of the denominational public sphere – that pervaded early Canadian Presbyterianism's mental world.

As a result of the Presbyterians' belief in the denomination's divinely favoured status, conflicts such as Great Britain's protracted struggle with revolutionary and Napoleonic France in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were viewed through a providential lens. In an 1814 sermon entitled "The Prosperity of the Church in Troublous Times," the Nova Scotia Presbyterian minister and educator Thomas McCulloch enunciated an epic, millennial conception of history in which events such as the chaotic French revolution and Britain's victory at the battle of Trafalgar were invested with cosmic significance. In McCulloch's conception they served to definitively demonstrate that the British Empire was indeed the beneficiary of divine favour.[26]

McCulloch asserted that the French Revolution, despite purporting to advocate such ennobling principles as liberty, equality, and fraternity, had in fact been predicated on "principles of infidelity." More pointedly, he noted that beneath a veneer of enlightenment lurked an insidious radicalism that strove to undermine social stability. Owing to a seemingly unquenchable atheism, the proponents of such corrosive tenets sought, in particular, to do irreparable harm to Christianity, the vital bedrock of any virtuous, well-regulated polity. Britain, he asserted, was in contrast the sturdy, virtuous "bulwark" of western civilisation. Specifically, it was a beacon of virtue and piety, a defender of order and constitutional governance, and a steadfast opponent of the godless radicalism espoused by the French revolutionaries and their equally iniquitous sympathizers elsewhere in the world.

Accompanying this exalted status, McCulloch thundered, was a responsibility for spreading the light of civilization and Christianity to the wretched and benighted the world over. "[Our] native country," he propounded, in reference to the widely dispersed British diaspora, is endowed with a special "duty" that transcends worldly considerations. For McCulloch, this sense of moral obligation found expression in a fervent

desire to see the gospels promulgated as widely and as energetically as possible. Convinced of the British Empire's divinely authored destiny, he went as far as to posit that it was the indispensable instrument through which the regeneration of the world would achieved. Elaborating on this sentiment, he argued that the efforts of Britain's Protestant evangelists – with the doctrinally unassailable Presbyterians inevitably in their vanguard – would precipitate the coming of the Christian millennium and, eventually, the establishment of a New Jerusalem.[27]

McCulloch expanded upon the Empire's grand destiny by portraying British Protestantism as the universal locus of Christian righteousness and zeal. He stated that the intensification of evangelical fervour within the ranks of this uniquely righteous community foreshadowed the worldwide proliferation of the gospels as well as the Christian millennium itself. It was foreordained, he explained, that the revival of religious enthusiasm within the "commonwealth of Israel" would presage the dramatic expansion of the boundaries of the Christian "Zion." Britain's Protestant evangelists, under the auspices of an awesome superintending providence, were responsible in McCulloch's view for nothing less than the redemption of the world, which in turn would precipitate the second coming of Christ.[28]

McCulloch's concluding remarks aptly encapsulate both the essence of his vision and, more broadly, the sense of ardent providentialism that galvanised early Canadian Presbyterianism. "Labours in the name of the gospel," he averred, elaborating on what for him was the symbiotic relationship between British imperialism and Protestant evangelism, will most assuredly "harmonize the affections of men," draw together the various "nations" in a single "family of love," and usher in the thousand-year reign of "universal goodness."[29]

Nor were Presbyterian conceptions of the Empire's special providential status limited solely to conflicts that bore immediately upon Britain and its array of imperial possessions. The revolutionary tumult that enveloped much of continental Europe in 1848, for example, was viewed as notably portentous despite the fact that it did not lead to formal, large-scale British involvement.

The surge in radicalism that issued in the toppling of monarchies in that year was seen as important for two principal reasons. First, the fact that the British Isles themselves were for the most part spared the upheaval that characterized the conflicts on the continent was construed as evidence of divine favour and protection (curiously, the "Young Ireland" rising and

mobilisation of the Chartists, both of which took place in 1848 were, either as a result of oversight or calculated omission, largely excluded from such discussions). Second, the turbulence of the era, consistent with the soaring declarations of McCulloch, was thought to signify the imminence of the Christian millennium.

Both themes were trumpeted in an essay published in the May 1848 edition of the *Ecclesiastical & Missionary Record*, a Canadian Presbyterian publication. An unnamed author employed the metaphor of an earthquake as an evocative means of emphasising the singular import of what was thought to be transpiring. No natural phenomenon is more "terrific" than the earthquake, the author stated. Those who are not devastated by it cannot help but acknowledge the comparative "impotency of man" and the "terribleness" of God's punishments.[30]

The tremors and rifts wrought by earthquakes were linked in the author's conception to God's absolute sovereignty over the universe. They were portrayed as indicative of his capacity for punishing sinful individuals as well as the communities in which they lived. Similarly, revolutions, as the earthquake's political equivalent, were cast as punitive manifestations of divine disapproval as a result of the pervasiveness of worldly tyranny and corruption.

After portraying the era's upheaval as an expression of divine judgement, the author moved on to a discussion of the significance of the era's tumult in relation to the unfolding of the providential design. Integral to this conception was God's benevolent preservation of Britain as a veritable oasis of peace and stability despite its close physical proximity to the revolutionary maelstrom. For the author, there could be no doubt as to whether an omnipotent superintending providence had prevented the transmission of the revolutionary contagion from continental Europe to Great Britain. "God has so ordered it," the author confidently declared, that the chaotic spasms that were responsible for the overthrow of haughty "imperial thrones" on the continent failed to wreak comparable havoc among his favoured peoples in Britain.[31]

Pivotally, in addition to hobbling the monarchical "despotism" of such figures as France's Louis-Philippe, the era's instability was thought by the author to be symptomatic of the imminence of the glorious millennium and second coming of Christ. The "time of the end" was plainly drawing nigh. This was evident in the harsh judgements meted out by God on a series of "usurping and tyrannical potentates and states," which in turn were seen as foreshadowing the glorious realisation of the

"Kingdom of the Prince of Peace" on earth.[32]

In bold, broad strokes, the author proceeded to sketch out the crucial sequence of events that would culminate in the triumphant thousand-year reign of the Son of God. The "despotisms and privileged castes" which had traditionally held sway over continental Europe must all be overturned so as to allow for the proliferation of gospel "truth," the author asserted. "[Yea] and though 'that worst of tyrants, an usurping crowd'" will for a time wield great power God's chosen peoples should neither lose focus nor shrink from their responsibilities. For, "when darkness is deepest the morning light is approaching." Thus, the article concluded, even "coming troubles" could be construed as anticipating the arrival of the "long wished-for millennial day."[33] Taken together, the author's sentiments capture the fusion of providentialism and British imperial enthusiasm that invigorated Canadian Presbyterianism in the pre-1875 period.

Early Canadian Presbyterianism was by no means a monolithic entity. For the better part of the nineteenth century a seemingly irrepressible penchant for intra-denominational squabbling militated against the establishment of a single body. For evidence of this quarrelsome tendency one need look no further than the dizzying profusion of largely autonomous subgroups that existed prior to the establishment, in 1875, of the nation-wide Presbyterian Church in Canada.

Yet an investigation of the prevailing anxieties and aspirations that circulated within the denominational consciousness reveals that, divided as they may have been over issues such as the endlessly vexatious church-state question, Presbyterianism's myriad constituent parts also shared considerable common ground. While the lack of institutional uniformity prior to 1875 is undeniable, when it came to the life of the mind the various subgroups succeeded in coalescing around a cluster of compelling, broadly held impulses and convictions.

Conceiving of themselves as part of an amorphous, trans-oceanic British nation, the early Canadian Presbyterians were, in the final analysis, tied together by a widespread belief in the incomparable greatness of the British Empire. Suffusing the denominational community, too, was a belief in Presbyterianism's providentially ordained destiny, which manifested itself in a millennial sense of mission that transcended the boundaries of British North America and the early Canadian state. For Presbyterians, it seems that righteousness, in tandem with divine providence, was indeed the mainspring of national exaltation. Resounding throughout the denomination, this conviction played a vital role in the

forging of a coherent Presbyterian identity in nineteenth-century Canada.[34]

Endnotes

1. The first part of this paper's title is drawn from Proverbs 14:34 (King James Version).

2. Stephen Leacock, *Arcadian Adventures with the Idle Rich* (New York: John Lane, 1914), 203.

3. A note on terminology: in making general references to the pre-Confederation era the term "British North America" will be used. An exception to this pattern will be phenomena that are strictly confined to Upper and Lower Canada, or to their successor colonies of Canada West and Canada East, respectively. In such instances the terms "Canada" and "Canadians" will be freely employed. When referring to the pre-1875 period on the whole, however, I will use the terms "early Canada" and "nineteenth-century Canada"; while, admittedly, somewhat imprecise (among other things, such terminology prematurely anticipates the absorption of the various British North American colonies into a national union prior to Confederation) these nevertheless seem preferable to "British North America" which, in addition to being comparatively uneconomical, fails to account for the national entity that would come into existence in July 1867.

4. A succinct overview of the church-state controversy as it relates to Presbyterianism appears in John S. Moir, "'Who Pays the Piper . . .': Canadian Presbyterianism and Church-State Relations," in *Presbyterianism in Canada: Essays by John S. Moir*, ed. Paul Laverdure(Gravelbourg, SK: Gravelbooks, 2003). See also John Webster Grant, *Divided Heritage: The Presbyterian Contribution to the United Church of Canada* (Gravelbourg, SK: Gravelbooks, 2007), especially 28-57; and John S. Moir, *Church and State in Canada West: Three Studies in the Relation of Denominationalism, 1841-1867* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959). For a complete listing of the various Presbyterian subgroups see John S. Moir, *Enduring Witness: A History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada* (Burlington, ON: Eagle Press Printers, n.d.), "Major Presbyterian Unions in Canada," chart opposite page 130; and Neil G. Smith, Allan L. Farris, and H. Keith Markell, *A Short History of the Presbyterian Church in Canada* (Toronto: Presbyterian Publications, n.d.), 50.

5. In addition to the issue of fractiousness, Leacock's sketch gestures in the direction of a second theme that figured prominently within the "real life" history of nineteenth-century Canadian Presbyterianism. As Joseph C. McLelland has noted, the dour, intransigent attitude evinced by the congrega-

tion of St. Osoph's regarding the duration of the reprobate's ultimate punishment was evident during the scandalous heresy trial of D.J. Macdonnell, which began in 1875. Essentially, Macdonnell, who served as Minister of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Toronto, expressed misgivings concerning the position of the Westminster Confession of Faith – the fundamental articulation of Presbyterian doctrine – on the question of eternal damnation. He admitted to being wracked by "moral confusion" as a result of the apparent tension between the unsettling notion of endless punishment and the idea of a benevolent, merciful God. For doctrinal conservatives, Macdonnell's comments appeared to call into question the conceptual bedrock of orthodox Presbyterianism, and were therefore tantamount to heretical theological laxity. As a result of Macdonnell's agreement in 1877 to adhere to a declaration of piety deemed acceptable by the prosecuting party, the controversy was defused. That the charges against him, which likely would have ended his career, were ultimately dismissed suggests that at least a modicum of "liberality of thought" was permissible within the wider Presbyterian community. Yet at the same time, the emotional intensity and protracted length of the episode also bespoke the degree to which influential elements within late-nineteenth-century Canadian Presbyterianism were guided by a doctrinaire rigidity that was very much in keeping with the strident ethos exhibited in Leacock's fictional Presbyterian congregation (see McLelland, "Ralph and Stephen and Hugh and Margaret: Canlit's View of Presbyterians," in *The Burning Bush and a Few Acres of Snow: The Presbyterian Contribution to Canadian Life and Culture*, ed. William Klempa [Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1994], 115; McLelland, "The Macdonnell Heresy Trial," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 4, no. 4 [October 1958]; David B. Marshall, *Secularizing the Faith: Canadian Protestant Clergy and the Crisis of Belief, 1850-1940* [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992], 42-5; and Moir, *Enduring Witness*, 172-4).

6. H.H. Walsh, *The Christian Church in Canada* (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1956), 212-214; see also S.D. Clark, *Church and Sect in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1948); Smith, Farris, and Markell, *Short History of the Presbyterian Church*; and Stuart C. Parker, *Yet Not Consumed; A Short Account of the History and Antecedents of the Presbyterian Church in Canada* (Toronto: Thorn Press, 1942); Edmund H. Oliver, *The Winning of the Frontier* (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1930); and John Thomas McNeil, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925* (Toronto: Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1925), especially 1-32.

7. Walsh, *The Christian Church in Canada*, 214; Clark, *Church and Sect in Canada*, 329-330; and Oliver, *The Winning of the Frontier*, 196-202.

8. Phillip Buckner, "Whatever Happened to the British Empire?" *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 4 (1993): 12.

9. The principle features of such a framework were initially propounded by Pocock who, in the 1970s, called for the fashioning of a "new British history" that would situate the global British diaspora in "a context of inherent diversity" in which the notion of "a monolithic 'parent society'" would be supplanted by what he termed "an expanding zone of cultural conflict and creation" (Pocock, "British History: A Plea for a New Subject," *Journal of Modern History*, 47, no. 4 [1975]: 602). For more recent assessments of this conceptual approach, see Carl Bridge and Kent Fedorowich, "Mapping the British World," *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 31, no. 2 (May 2003); and Nancy Christie, "Introduction: Theorizing a Colonial Past: Canada as a Society of British Settlement," in *Transatlantic Subjects: Ideas, Institutions, and Social Experience in Post-Revolutionary British North America*, ed. Nancy Christie (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008), 3-44. For examples of works relating to Canadian Christianity that have built upon Pocock's appeal, see Richard Vaudry, *Anglicans and the Atlantic World: High Churchmen, Evangelicals, and the Quebec Connection* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003); Michael Gauvreau, "The Dividends of Empire: Church Establishments and Contested British Identities in the Canadas and the Maritimes, 1780-1850," in *Transatlantic Subjects*, 199-250, as well as the following contributions by Todd Webb: "Making Neo-Britons: The Transatlantic Relationship between Wesleyan Methodists in Britain and the Canadas, 1815-1828," *British Journal of Canadian Studies*, 16, no. 1 (2005); and "How the Canadian Methodists Became British: Unity, Schism, and Transatlantic Identity, 1827-54," in *Transatlantic Subjects*, 159-198.

10. Buckner, "Whatever Happened to the British Empire?" 30.

11. Donald K. McKim, *Presbyterian Beliefs: An Introduction,* 27. McKim is no relation to the author of this paper. See also Paul Helm, *The Providence of God* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1994); and Horton Davies, *The Vigilant God: Providence in the Thought of Augustine, Aquinas, Calvin and Barth* (New York: Peter Lang, 1992).

12. Helm, *The Providence of God*, 22-3; and McKim, *Presbyterian Beliefs*, 27.

13. Davies, *The Vigilant God*.

14. Michael Willis, *The Gospel of Grace Vindicated; Being Sermons Preached on Several Sabbath Evenings in 1869* . . . (Toronto: A. Lovell, c. 1870), 12.

15. The impact of evangelicalism's emphasis on sin, suffering, and redemption on British intellectual culture from the late-eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth centuries is illuminated in Boyd Hilton, *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought, 1795-1865* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988).

16. 1 July 1832, Session Records, St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, Toronto, Presbyterian Church in Canada Archives (PCCA), Toronto.

17. H.M. Höpfl, *The Christian Polity of John Calvin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); and William James Bouwsma, *John Calvin: A Sixteenth-Century Portrait* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).

18. For an analysis of the providential motif in late eighteenth-century Nova Scotia, see Gordon Stewart and George Rawlyk, *A People Highly Favoured of God: The Nova Scotia Yankees and the American Revolution* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1972).

19. For Anthony D. Smith, the "moral life" of a people purportedly wedded to God by way of a permanent covenantal bond is characterised by neither naive optimism nor passive fatalism. Rather, it is typified by a pervasive apprehensiveness regarding the community's susceptibility to sinfulness and the corresponding spectre of divinely-administered punishment (Smith, *Chosen Peoples* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003], 64-65). See also Donald Harmon Akenson, *God's Peoples: Covenant and Land in South Africa, Israel, and Ulster* (Montreal and Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991).

20. *The Presbyterian, a Missionary and Religious Record of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in Connection with the Church of Scotland* (June 1848): 79.

21. Incisive discussions of the advent of the modern, geographically and politically self-contained "nation-state" can be found in E.J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780; Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); and Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism,* 2nd ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006 [1983]). Gellner defines nationalism as "primarily a political principle, which holds that the political and the national unit should be congruent" (Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, 1). Such an interpretation differs sharply from the amorphous "national" community envisaged by the Presbyterians of the British world. The fulsome expressions of pro-British loyalty put forth by many Canadian Presbyterians in the nineteenth century stand in contrast to the reputation for revolutionary fervour garnered by their American co-religionists in the late eighteenth. As a result of an array of factors – principal among them the Calvinistic tradition of resisting impious (and thus illegitimate)

authorities, Scots Presbyterian opposition to the reputedly despotic overtures of the Stuart monarchs in the mid- and late-seventeenth century, and the denomination's diffuse, democratic system of church polity – Scottish and Scots-Irish Presbyterians in America, especially in such "middle colonies" as Pennsylvania, have frequently been portrayed as among the keenest revolutionary participants; so much so that certain loyalists are alleged to have dismissed the insurgency as little more than "a Presbyterian war" (Martin Marty, "The American Revolution and Religion, 1765-1815," in *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vol. VII, *Enlightenment, Reawakening and Revolution, 1660-1815*, ed. Stewart J. Brown and Timothy Tackett [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006], 502-3). See also Patricia Bonomi, *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society, and Politics in Colonial America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Mark Noll, *Princeton and the Republic, 1768-1822: The Search for a Christian Enlightenment in the Era of Samuel Stanhope Smith* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989); and Joseph S. Tiedemann, "Presbyterianism and the American Revolution in the Middle Colonies," *Church History* 74, no. 2 (June 2005): 306-344.

22. Reverend William Gregg, Sermon at Cooke's Church (n.d.),Toronto. Gregg Papers, Reel 2, PCCA.

23. For a discussion on the degree to which eighteenth and nineteenth-century Scots Presbyterians (particularly those of Lowland extraction) viewed themselves as essentially British, see Colin Kidd, "Race, Empire, and the Limits of Nineteenth-Century Scottish Nationhood," *The Historical Journal*, 46, no. 4 (2003); and Kidd, *The Forging of Races: Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic World 1600-2000* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), especially 15-16. On the Highland contribution to the Empire see Andrew MacKillop, *More Fruitful than the Soil: Army, Empire and the Scottish Highlands, 1715-18* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2000); and Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005 [1992]), especially 119-120. The pervasiveness and political potency of loyalty as a rhetorical and symbolic construct in Upper Canadian society is skilfully elucidated in David Mills, *The Idea of Loyalty in Upper Canada, 1784-1850* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988); and Jane Errington, *The Lion, the Eagle, and Upper Canada: A Developing Colonial Ideology* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1987).

24. Kerby A. Miller, in assessing the experiences of Ulsterite Presbyterian emigrants, has made this point in a notably persuasive manner (Miller, *Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1985], especially 157-58). Additional aspects of the transatlantic Ulsterite Presbyterian world are explored in David A.

Wilson and Mark G. Spencer, eds., *Ulster Presbyterians in the Atlantic World: Religion, Politics and Identity* (Dublin: Four Courts, 2006).

25. For a more exhaustive discussion of this theme as it relates to early English-Canadian political culture see Jeffrey L. McNairn, *The Capacity to Judge: Public Opinion and Deliberative Democracy in Upper Canada, 1791-1854* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000). A useful overview appears in J.A.W. Gunn, "Public Opinion," in *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*, eds. Terrence Ball, James Farr, and Russell L. Hanson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

26. Thomas McCulloch, *The Prosperity of the Church in Troublous Times. A Sermon, Preached at Pictou, Friday, February 25th, 1814, (The Year Before Waterloo) By Thomas McCulloch with Introductory Remarks by Rev. Robert Grant, East River, Pictou Nova Scotia* (New Glasgow, NS: S.M. Mackenzie, 1882), 7-10. See also Stanley E. McMullin, "In Search of the Liberal Mind: Thomas McCulloch and the Impulse to Action," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 23, nos. 1-2 (1988).

27. According to John Wolffe, the notion that the British Empire was imbued with a divinely ordained responsibility for the diffusion of Christian piety and the advancement of western civilization continued to circulate widely amongst mid- and late-nineteenth-century Britons. The attitudes evinced by the early Canadian Presbyterians in this period are highly consonant with such an interpretation (Wolffe, *God and Greater Britain: Religion and National Life in Britain and Ireland 1843-1945* [New York: Routledge, 1994], 222). For an assessment of the part played by millenarianism in stoking the fires of political radicalism in late-eighteenth-century New England see Nathan O. Hatch, *The Sacred Cause of Liberty: Republican Thought and the Millennium in Revolutionary New England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977).

28. McCulloch, *The Prosperity of the Church in Troublous Times* . . ., 14-15.

29. McCulloch, *The Prosperity of the Church in Troublous Times* . . ., 17.

30. *Ecclesiastical & Missionary Record of the Free Church of Scotland* (May 1848): 106.

31. *Ecclesiastical & Missionary Record of the Free Church of Scotland* (May 1848): 106.

32. *Ecclesiastical & Missionary Record of the Free Church of Scotland* (May 1848): 106.

33. *Ecclesiastical & Missionary Record of the Free Church of Scotland* (May 1848): 106.

34. The author would like to thank Frances Beer, Samuel Beer, Mark McGowan, David McKim, Susana Miranda, Alison Norman, Arthur Silver, Nathan Smith, and Cara Spittal for their generous comments on various iterations of this paper.

From the Ukraine to the Caucasus to the Canadian Prairies: Life as Wandering in the Spiritual Autobiography of Feoktist Dunaenko

SERGEY PETROV
University of Calgary

When asked about European religious immigration to Canada, most Canadians would immediately refer to the Mennonites. People from western Canada or those with some interest in history or religion are likely to name Hutterites and Doukhobors. Indeed, those three groups are outstanding examples of religiously motivated mass immigration. All three survive up to this day and have been objects of scholarly and, at times, public interest.

However, there is another quite distinct group of religiously motivated settlers, which is rarely recognized because it followed fairly mainstream Protestant religious practices and has largely assimilated into larger Canadian society. Calling themselves "evangelical Christians," this group began immigrating to Canada in the first decade of the twentieth century from western parts of the Russian empire, and, after Poland had regained its independence (1918), from eastern Poland. Almost all of them were of Slavic origin – Ukrainians, Russians, Byelorussians and Poles. The Ukrainians were predominant in numbers.

In his *Hidden Worlds* Royden Loewen points to the multidimensionality of the immigrant perception of the world around them. In writing about Mennonite immigrants from Russia, Loewen notes: "This world, shared with other immigrants, was part farm, part German, part continental European, and part capitalist. Ironically, these shared worlds have sometimes been the most hidden, despite the concern of ethnic historio-

graphies to highlight the unique features of any given community."[1] The life experience of Feoktist Dunaenko, a Slavic evangelical immigrant pioneer in the Prairies, was a tangible example of a multidimensional world. In fact, unlike many Mennonite, Hutterite, and Doukhobor groups, which tended to create insular communities, Slavic evangelicals have always been at the forefront of interaction, diffusion, cross influence, and assimilation, creatively absorbing various influences and amalgamating them into new forms. This makes their "hidden worlds" among the most interesting examples of immigrant experiences in Canada.

The author of this paper is currently conducting field work in Manitoba and Saskatchewan with the purpose of collecting memories, life stories, and other historical evidence among descendants of early Slavic evangelical settlers. Of course, most of them are second generation at best, and what they are able to tell about the earlier period is what they had heard from their parents and grandparents. However, when we consider relevant surviving written sources, I am convinced that Dunaenko's life story is a compelling example of the hidden world of the Slavic evangelical community.

The autobiography of Feoktist Dunaenko, (ca.1860- after 1917), is a fairly rare example of an autobiographical text produced by an early Russian-Ukrainian evangelical believer, and one of the earliest Slavic evangelical settlers in western Canada. Dunaenko was born into a typical middle income Orthodox peasant family, converted to vigorous evangelicalism as many did at that time, suffered from discrimination and mistreatment along with thousands of his fellow-believers, was exiled, and, finally, joined thousands of other religious emmigrants who left Tsarist Russia. He never was a pastor, a famous preacher, or a recognized author. What is highly atypical, however, is that he bothered to write a fairly substantial autobiography. Of course, no one interested in the Russian evangelical movement will miss such classical works as *In the Cauldron of Russia* by Ivan Prokhanov,[2] *In the Flame of Russia's Revolution* by Nikolai Salov-Astakhov,[3] *Twice-Born Russian* by Peter Deyneka,[4] *Christians under the Hammer and Sickle* and *My Life in Soviet Russia* by Paul Voronaeff,[5] or *With Christ in Soviet Russia* by Vladimir Martzinkovski.[6] However, these autobiographical books are literary works produced by highly educated authors with very specific ideological agendas. They were published and re-published in the West to a large degree due to their political topicality during the Cold War era. Magazines of evangelical Christians and Baptists in Russia and the USSR from 1905

to late 1920s (such as *Khristianin*, *Baptist*, *Baptist Ukrainy*) abound with conversion narratives and short autobiographical stories, but the Dunaenko life story is a fairly rare example of a Russian evangelical spiritual autobiography (not just a conversion story) of the early twentieth century written by a rank-and-file believer that would include a narrative of an immigration experience. The very fact that Dunaenko was a simple peasant with no part in the complex politics of the church-building, church administration, and with no expressed political position, gives an attentive reader access to the "hidden worlds" of his life experience. Dunaenko's life story is marked by an obvious lack of literary sophistication, and an extraordinary level of intimacy and sincerity.

Exile and wandering for Christ's sake constituted an important part of Dunaenko's life. The spiritual reinterpretation of and reconciliation with his wandering is an ongoing theme of his autobiography. The main conclusion Dunaenko wanted to convey to his readers was that wandering is a spiritually meaningful and rewarding experience for the followers of Christ. Furthermore, the author of this paper believes that this consideration reflects the motivations and goals behind early Russian and Ukrainian evangelical immigration into Canada.

The autobiography was written by Feoktist Dunaenko when he was already in Canada, probably, towards the end of his life. Nikolai Vodnevsky, an American-based Russian Christian publisher and author, received the old manuscript of the autobiography in the mail, apparently sent to him by some of Dunaenko's relatives after his death. According to Vodnevsky's own account, at first he paid no attention to it and he stored the manuscript in his archives. Years later, cleaning up his archives, he discovered Dunaenko's text again, and was about to dispose of it, but his "inner voice" stopped him. Vodnevsky re-read the manuscript, and was deeply impressed by the author's sincerity, faithfulness in the face of trials, spirit of forgiveness and love for enemies. Vodnevsky published the autobiography in 1975 in the format of a brochure under the title "*He Endured till the End (Do kontsa preterpevshii*)."[7] The brochure did not contain any publication data, since most of the literature published by western Christian publishing houses in Russian was meant for sending (often smuggling) into the USSR.[8] Since the break up of the Soviet Union, the autobiography has been re-published by Christian publishers in Russia and the Ukraine. However, in spite of its important position as a source on life experience of early Slavic evangelical settlers in Canada, it has never been the focus of scholarly attention.

This analysis is divided into three parts. The first section examines the pre-history and circumstances of his conversion; the second section is a narrative of the ordeals Dunaenko had to endure for the sake of his faith; and finally I examine his life in Canada.

Dunaenko's Conversion

Dunaenko was born around 1860 into a peasant Orthodox family near the town of Uman in the south-western part of the Russian empire, now central Ukraine. He was a devout Orthodox believer from his childhood. He even sang regularly in church and had a good reputation with the local priest and congregation. His young adult years coincided with the birth and rapid spread of the Stundist[9] movement in southern Russia. This movement was born in 1860s under the direct influence of such factors as the pietist revival among numerous Mennonite and Lutheran colonies in southern Russia, local traditions of religious dissent such as the movement of the Molokans,[10] and the publication of the Bible in vernacular by 1872.[11] Similar movements appeared at the same time in the Caucasus and in Saint Petersburg. In early 1900s, all three branches were organised into two unions – the Union of Baptists, and the Union of Evangelical Christians – with very similar theology and practice, and in 1944 both unions merged to form the church of Evangelical Christians-Baptists, the largest Protestant denomination of the former USSR.[12]

One of the most prominent early Stundist leaders in the Ukraine was Ivan Grigoryevich Riaboshapka (1831-1900), a miller from the village of Liubomirka near Kherson, an area saturated with German colonies and Molokan sectarians. Riaboshapka converted under the influence of his friend, the German blacksmith Martin Hübner, a member of a local pietist Lutheran community. Later he was baptized by another prominent leader of the early Ukrainian *shtunda*, Efim Tsymbal, who in his turn received baptism from a *Brüdergemeinde* minister Abraham Unger.[13] By the time young Feoktist Dunaenko took an interest in spiritual matters, Riaboshapka was already a famous preacher. Riaboshapka planted groups of believers near where Dunaenko lived. Dunaenko's wife started secretly attending one of these house churches.

Conversion narratives of early Russian Evangelical Christians have been studied in detail by Heather Coleman of the University of Alberta. She calls these conversion narratives "a major literary art form of the Russian Baptists."[14] Coleman argues that one of the recurring themes of

the early Baptist conversion narratives was an emphasis on the genuine, internal, and domestic nature of their conversion. She notes that "the Baptist faith was widely perceived as 'foreign' but converts rejected this view, portraying evangelical conversion as a natural outgrowth of broader Russian popular aspirations and, indeed, as the solution to the ignorance, hatred, hierarchy, and spiritual emptiness."[15] According to Coleman, these conversion narratives explored themes such as the manner in which "an ordinary person [made] his way in a changing world . . . the search for salvation in Russian popular religion . . . the cultural conflict within oneself and in relation to others brought on by leaving the Orthodox Church, and the emergence of a Russian evangelical community."[16] As we will see, Dunaenko also perceived his conversion as a genuine and natural act. In fact, Dunaenko's conversion story includes many themes in common with other such narratives.

Dunaenko described his conversion as the process that started with his authentic interest in the Bible. In a sincere attempt to figure out the biblical message, he undertook an uneasy task of reading a copy of the Bible in Old Church Slavonic, the sacred liturgical language of the Orthodox church in Slavic countries. Although the liturgical language is in some ways similar to modern Russian or Ukrainian, it is difficult for an average untrained person to understand it. We do not know what formal training Dunaenko received, but considering his peasant and rural background, and limited material resources, there is no reason to believe that his education went far beyond basic literacy. To try to read and understand the Old Church Slavonic text is a sign of the exceptional importance that Dunaenko attributed to his personal spiritual development. Reading the Bible prompted Dunaenko to seek spiritual community with like-minded believers, and he joined a local evangelical group planted by Riaboshapka.

In an attempt to halt the spread of heresy, the Orthodox church sent trained missionaries to areas particularly affected by sectarian movements. Typically, these missionaries set up public discussions with sectarians. Typically, these missionaries had much more formal education than sectarian leaders. Their ultimate goal was to dissuade sectarians and bring them to repentance. However, the recurring motif of many Russian sectarian narratives is one of how the educated and arrogant missionary and his "worldly wisdom" were crushed by the clear arguments brought forth by simple sectarians.[17] Dunaenko's autobiography contributes to this tradition. During a public meeting with a missionary, Dunaenko asked a

church ministrant, an elderly man respected for his piety, to explain in the vernacular some of the Old Church Slavonic expressions frequently used at the liturgy. It turned out that the ministrant did not know their meaning, which provoked laughter of the gathered. More importantly, the missionary had to confront Dunaenko, asking him whether he knew the meaning of those expressions, which gave Dunaenko an ample opportunity to speak about his religious views.

Immediately after the dispute, the missionary in a private conversation with Dunaenko threatened him with exile: "Remember, you will be exiled! You'll die in exile. There you will see people who dance during their prayers. You'll have to leave your so called brothers, and, possibly, for good. Is it worth leaving your wife and children?"[18] To that Dunaenko replied: "Lord's will be done." He expressed his willingness to accept exile and interpret it as wandering for Christ's sake as so many in Russia had done before him.

Dunaenko's Ordeals

A life of a member of a dissenting religious community in Tsarist Russia in many cases meant wandering. Sectarians and religious dissenters were among the most mobile classes of the Russian society from as early as 1660s. At that time Old Believers, a large dissenting group of the Orthodox who rejected reforms introduced by Patriarch Nikon, started moving out of the immediate reach of authorities, to Caucasus, northern Russia, Urals, Siberia, and, in some cases, abroad. Later, in nineteenth century, dissenting groups such as Molokans, Doukhobors and Sabbatarians joined Old Believers in their internal migrations in search of peace and freedom and moved to the Caucasus in 1830s.[19] It should be noted that such migrations were not always exile; at times, sectarian migration was voluntary. The metaphor of exodus, a religiously motivated move to a new land, appears to be a recurring topic and a rhetorical tool underlying many religiously motivated migrations across the Christian world. This mode of thinking characterized Russian religious migrants as well.

Dunaenko was not exiled immediately after his debate with the missionary. He had to endure detention and brutal beatings until in May, 1894, he was ordered to settle in Transcaucasia. Dunaenko had to go there by himself, leaving his family at home. Russian Transcaucasia at that time was densely populated by religious dissenters, who comprised the vast majority of the Slavic population of the province. He did meet people who

danced while praying, that is, Molokans. His experience with them, as we will see, proved to be very positive.

Dunaenko soon realized that even forced exile proved to be a better choice compared to the mistreatment and discrimination he suffered in his native village. As he noted: "I wrote a long letter to my wife about how I live and how I settled. In response, my wife described her life in detail. I saw that my current situation is easier than hers. She wrote that the police every day disturb her, forcing her to baptize children in the Orthodox church."[20] Finally Dunaenko's wife decided to leave her home village and go to Transcaucasia to join her husband. Normally, at that time one needed a notice of safe conduct from the old residence in order to move. Dunaenko's wife, suspecting that her petition for safe conduct would likely be refused, fled from her village, and finally joined her husband in exile. Later she managed to get a notice of safe conduct from her previous residence by mail.

The family endured many hardships before they were firmly established. More than once Molokans helped them in need. Dunaenko noted that "Three days later a few people from the Molokan brotherhood came to see us. They saw our misery and lack of clothing. We couldn't even clothe our children, though it was February. One Molokan took off his sheepskin coat and gave it to my wife, crying from sympathy for us. Another took three rubles out of his pocket and gave them to me with tears in his eyes."[21] People despised by missionaries and the establishment, those who "danced as they prayed," proved to be Dunaenko's partakers in wanderings for Christ's sake. Like him, they left their homeland in the interior of the country, and wandered to the Caucasus. Later, just as Dunaenko, they sailed to the so-called New World in search of freedom and refuge. Most Molokans went to the Caucasus voluntarily to take part in the glorious millennial kingdom of Christ, while Dunaenko arrived against his will, leaving his family and fellow believers. However, his exile proved to be a spiritually meaningful and rewarding experience. The example of Molokans, wanderers for Christ's sake like himself, invigorated and encouraged him throughout his exile.

Materially, Dunaenko's life was extremely difficult, as is evident from the story of the kind-hearted Molokans. There was not enough work, and earnings were inadequate for a family. In addition, Dunaenko had to spend money on rent. Nevertheless, "in a word, it was difficult, but we glorified God that neither the police nor Orthodox priests oppress us here."[22]

After seven years in exile, by 1901 the Dunaenkos were expecting to be able to return to their native village; however, their exile was extended for two more years. When they were finally given freedom, they returned to the Ukraine to discover that their house, land and mill had been taken over by Feoktist's brother. However, after some time Dunaenko regained some of his reputation among his neighbours, and was elected a representative of his rural community before higher administration, "possibly because I was a bit more literate than others and have seen a lot."[23] It should be noted that in 1905 the Manifesto of Religious Toleration came into effect. The Manifesto permitted many groups of religious dissenters to legalize their existence. Among other rights, sectarians received the right to conduct the registry of civil statistics of their members independently from the Orthodox church.

Nevertheless, mistreatment of religious dissidents, especially those that were deemed "foreign" did not stop. Coleman states that even after the 1905 Manifesto, sectarians were still perceived as dangerous, not just by the authorities. Indeed, there existed "popular violence against evangelicals in the villages. For in the village, too, the converts were perceived as dangerous – to traditional, social, family, and religious relationships."[24]

Emigration to Canada

After a series of threats from the local police officer Dunaenko decided to apply for a passport to travel abroad. The police officer replied: "Good riddance. You have nothing to do here. You just make people's heads spin [with your preaching]." Dunaenko and his family were happy the authorities did not interfere with their decision to leave the country. They got their passports without hindrance, and packed up to sail to Canada. Of course, his previous experience as a Caucasian exile allowed Dunaenko to see a new stage of wandering from a positive perspective. He knew that it was God that made his life meaningful and happy, no matter where he went.

Dunaenko and his family of six children came to Canada in 1910. He never mentioned specifically any geographical names in the new country, but it is evident that they lived somewhere on the prairies and made their home near a larger Ukrainian rural settlement. Most other people in the neighbourhood were Galicians. At that time Galicia was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and Dunaenko calls his neighbours "Austrians." Apparently, he was given a standard homestead of virgin land

where he had to "cut the trees, root out stumps, break large stones."[25] As many other immigrants in the Prairies at that time, Dunaenko was not able to live off his farm right away, and had to seek temporary employment that would give him an immediate source of income. He worked for a railway, apparently, a CPR line, that was located 85 miles from his homestead. After having earned a bit of money, he returned to the homestead and built a sod house together with his wife. "We carried building materials on our own shoulders, fell down of tiredness, yet we built a hut, and covered it with sod. When it was raining, water was dripping into the house. We both thought: "When will our misfortunes and poverty end?"[26] Compared to the level of material well-being before the exile (Dunaenko had a house, a mill, and some land), his life in Canada seems to have been exceedingly hard. However, Dunaenko and his family felt happy, because, as he plainly stated, "there are no . . . zealous priests, but freedom of word and conscience."[27] So, wandering that was so hard from the fleshly point of view proved to be a fruitful spiritual experience, and, indeed, realization of God's will. Dunaenko referred to a popular proverb, trying to make his point clear: "Without God do not step over your threshold, but with God you may go even overseas."[28]

Dunaenko defined his own identity in terms of ethnicity, language, and religion. First, it is notable that Dunaenko very rarely spoke of himself in clear ethnic terms. He was born in the heartland of the present-day Ukrainian state. Apparently, his mother tongue was an eastern dialect of the Ukrainian language. However, he must have been highly proficient in standard literary Russian, for he constantly read the Bible in the Russian vernacular. In the trans-Caucasian exile, where people of Slavic origin comprised only a small minority, Dunaenko and his family associated mostly with Russians, and were perceived as such as an autochthonous population. In Canada, where Galicians, immigrants from what is now western Ukraine, prevailed, he identified himself as Ukrainian, although showing an awareness of a linguistic, cultural, and religious differences between Galicians and "Russian" Ukrainians. As he noted: "It's difficult for me to speak to them. Both I and they are Ukrainians. But I'm a Russian Ukrainian, and they are Austrian."[29] At the same time, he reports reading the gospel in the Ukrainian language in Canada.[30] Catholic Poles engaged in religious conversations that Dunaenko conducted with his Galician fellow workers.[31] Apparently, they were able to elaborate a common Slavic lingua franca to comprehend each other. What his example shows is that Dunaenko did not perceive himself as "not quite Ukrainian," or "insuffi-

ciently Russian," or as a victim of russification, polonization, canadization or any other "malicious influences." As we know him from his autobiography, Dunaenko was wholesome and happy, in spite of all hardships. First, he did not see Ukrainian or Russian identity as necessarily separate or opposing each other in terms of culture, language, and mentality; it simply did not appear to create any internal conflict. Second, for Dunaenko and for Slavic evangelical immigrants in general, ethnicity was not the primary means of self-identification. Rather, it was their religious convictions, common background, shared aspirations and partaking in the same process of a spiritually meaningful wandering, that shaped their identity.

In spite of the fact that Dunaenko never was a famous or prominent person, research has turned up external evidence of his life, although rudimentary and brief. Ludwig Szenderowski, engineer, pastor, and a son of a leader of evangelical Christians in Poland, mentioned Dunaenko in his historical essay on evangelical Christians. In the section on evangelical Christians in Canada, he wrote: "First Evangelical settlers in Canada from around year 1900 were the following families: Saveliev, Pavlov, Fedorov, Gavrilov, Muzyko, Lemberg, Mazurenko, Dunaenko, Egorov, Shcherbinin, and many others. All of them without exception settled in free Canada on homesteads granted by the government in western Canada – in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta."[32] Some of the aforementioned family names (though not Dunaenko) can also be found in the published reflections by the leader of Ukrainian Baptists in Canada, Petro Kindrat, who was among the first Baptist immigrants from Kiev and Caucasus that formed the nucleus of the Ukrainian Evangelical Baptist church in Winnipeg.[33] Dunaenko, as related in his autobiography, preached in his local church which apparently took place in a rural setting.

It is not clear when Dunaenko passed away. The last time reference he mentioned specifically in his life story was Easter of 1917, when his friend's wife converted. However, according to Dunaenko, "I have missed much in my notes. If I wrote in detail, it would have been a thick book."[34] The main conclusion Feoktist Dunaenko wanted to share with his readers was that he "had seen many people, had been to many cities until finally arrived in a foreign land. But with Christ one is at home everywhere."[35] Thus, physical wandering was perceived by Dunaenko as an integral and a tangible expression of walking with Christ, which emphasized and confirmed that an earthly homeland is temporary, and that he unconditionally belongs only to God.

Conclusion

The life story of Feoktist Dunaenko is a perfect exposition of the motivations, moving forces, and the background that stood behind the immigration of Slavic evangelical believers to Canada in the beginning of twentieth century. It shows that religious considerations were the unique reason for Feoktist Dunaenko's immigration to Canada. Both genetically and typologically his motives for immigration belong to the old and recurring biblical pattern of exodus, the search for a land of freedom, and the spiritual significance of wandering. This particular rhetoric topos is hard to overestimate when considering the self-identity of Slavic evangelical immigration into Canada. Dunaenko's case shows that Slavic evangelical Christians were a distinctive group of religious settlers in Canada, different from the majority of the Ukrainian or Russian immigrants to this country.

We can compare Slavic evangelicals in western Canada to more famous religious groups such as Mennonites, Hutterites and Doukhobors. The three mentioned religious bodies are widely recognized in the scholarship and in public opinion as important streams of religiously motivated early settlers who helped to shape the cultural and religious mosaic of western Canada. The case of Feoktist Dunaenko illustrates that Slavic evangelicals are another group of essentially the same sort.

Endnotes

1. Royden Loewen, *Hidden Worlds: Revisiting the Mennonite Migrants of the 1870s* (Winnipeg: The University of Manitoba Press, 2001), 7.
2. Ivan Prokhanov, *In the Cauldron of Russia* (New York: All-Russian Evangelical Christian Union, 1933).
3. Nikolai Salov-Astakhov, *In the Flame of Russia's Revolution with God and the Bible* (Ephrata, PA: Grace Press, 1999).
4. Peter Deyneka, *Twice-born Russian: An Autobiography* (Grand Rapids MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1944).
5. Paul Voronaeff, *My Life in Soviet Russia* (Tulsa OK: Christian Crusade, 1969); and *Christians under the Hammer and Sickle* (Wichita, KS: Defender Publishers, 1935).
6. V.Ph. Martzinkovski, *With Christ in Soviet Russia* (Prague: Edited and published by the author, 1933).

7. Feoktist Dunaenko, *Do kontsa preterpevshiy*, foreword by N. Vodnevsky (n.p.: n.d.), 6-7.

8. On the smuggling of religious literature into the USSR during the Cold War please, see Brother Andrew (Andrew van der Bijl), with John and Elizabeth Sherrill, *God's Smuggler* (Old Tappan, NJ: Spire Books, 1967); and Brother Andrew, *The Ethics of Smuggling* (Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 1974).

9. This name derives from the German word *Stunde* – "the [prayer] hour." The first Ukrainian evangelicals either attended German prayer meetings in nearby colonies or modeled their own meetings after the German example.

10. Molokans were an egalitarian Bible-based movement of the Russian religious dissent that evolved in the second half of the eighteenth century. Molokans rejected Orthodox ritualism, icons, and sacraments.

11. Andrew Blane also mentions such social and economic factors as "the extraordinary social ferment that accompanied the Crimean War and the Emancipation of 1861" (see his "Protestant Sects in Late Imperial Russia," in *The Religious World of Russian Culture*, ed. Andrew Blane [The Hague: Mouton, 1975], 269).

12. Walter Sawatsky, *Soviet Evangelicals since World War II* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1981), 56-61.

13. See, for example, J.H. Rushbrooke, *Some Chapters of European Baptist History* (London: The Kingsgate Press, 1929), 91; and Steve Durasoff, *The Russian Protestants* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1969), 40.

14. Heather Coleman, *Russian Baptists and Spiritual Revolution, 1905-1929* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005), 47.

15. Coleman, *Russian Baptists*, 48.

16. Coleman, *Russian Baptists*, 49.

17. See A.L. L'vov, *Chtenie Biblii i ritorika nachetchikov*, http://www.ruthenia.ru/folklore/lvov1.htm (accessed 5 April 2008).

18. Dunaenko, *Do kontsa preterpevshiy*, 21. "People who dance while praying" as mentioned by the missionary was not a wild metaphor used to scare Dunaenko. It is a direct reference to so-called Jumper Molokans, a religious community that emerged in 1830s. It is rooted in the enthusiasm caused by predictions of the beginning of the millennium in 1836 by the famous German pietist Johann Albrecht Bengel (1687-1752), and the subsequent mass

immigration of Württemberg pietist enthusiasts into southern Russia in search of refuge from the coming tribulation.

19. On the Molokan and Doukhobor migration, see Nicholas Breyfogle, *Heretics and Colonizers. Forging Russia's Empire in the South Caucasus* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005), 49-83.
20. Dunaenko, *Do kontsa preterpevshiy*, 39.
21. Dunaenko, *Do kontsa preterpevshiy*, 45.
22. Dunaenko, *Do kontsa preterpevshiy*, 40.
23. Dunaenko, *Do kontsa preterpevshiy*, 46.
24. Coleman, *Russian Baptists*, 68.
25. Dunaenko, *Do kontsa preterpevshiy*, 47.
26. Dunaenko, *Do kontsa preterpevshiy*, 47.
27. Dunaenko, *Do kontsa preterpevshiy*, 49.
28. Dunaenko, *Do kontsa preterpevshiy*, 50.
29. Dunaenko, *Do kontsa preterpevshiy*, 47.
30. Dunaenko, *Do kontsa preterpevshiy*, 48.
31. Dunaenko, *Do kontsa preterpevshiy*, 48.
32. Ludwig Szenderowski, *Evangel'skie Khristiane* (n.p.: Canadian Union of Evangelical Christians, 1980), 318.
33. Petro Kindrat, *Ukrain'skyi Baptysts'kyi Rukh u Kanadi* (Winnipeg: Doroha Prawdy, 1972), 40.
34. Dunaenko, *Do kontsa preterpevshiy*, 51.
35. Dunaenko, *Do kontsa preterpevshiy*, 51.

Zelma and Beulah Argue: Sisters in the Canadian Pentecostal Movement, 1920-1990

LINDA M. AMBROSE
Laurentian University

In April 1925, *The Pentecostal Testimony* reported on the Argue sisters' American Midwest tour, citing a "wonderful meeting," and "prais[ing] God for this great meeting."[1] This paper traces the lives of Zelma Argue and Beulah Argue Smith, who traveled widely in evangelistic crusades in Canada and the United States. Zelma, better known in Pentecostal circles today,[2] remained single; Beulah married a well-known Canadian Pentecostal minister and had four children. Based on the sisters' work as portrayed in *The Pentecostal Testimony* (the national denominational magazine of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada) 1920-1990, my paper considers the gendered aspects of the Argue sisters' ministries, how their lives reflected themes in the larger story of North American Pentecostal women during the first half of the 1900s.

Zelma Argue, born in 1900 in North Dakota, was the eldest daughter of Andrew Harvey (A.H.) and Eva Phillips Argue. Beulah was born six years later, after the family's move to Winnipeg, where they played a major role in the Canadian Pentecostal movement. In 1939, on the death of their mother, the *PT* made it clear that the entire Argue family was heavily involved in ministry; they were:

> her husband, A.H. Argue, widely known evangelist and Bible expositor, Zelma; who has traveled with her father in recent years as an evangelist; Wilbur, who is engaged in business; Beulah, wife of Bannerman Smith, Pastor of the Ottawa Assembly of the Pentecostal

> Assemblies of Canada; Eva, wife of Fulton Robinson, Regina; Watson, Pastor of Calvary Temple, Winnipeg, Man., and Elwin, well-known young Canadian evangelist.[3]

Making these two women particularly interesting is their working context. Since the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada (PAOC) decided to ordain women only in 1984, what caused these sisters to be so advanced? How were their very public ministry roles legitimized? How were their lives and ministries shaped by gendered roles and considerations? This paper argues that family ties and the gendered nature of their roles as daughter, sister, wife, and mother afforded them these opportunities.

Historiography of Canadian Pentecostal Women

The literature on Canadian women in the church has grown significantly in recent years. In 1992 Ruth Compton Brouwer lamented the lack of attention paid to religion in English-Canadian women's history;[4] recently the gap in the literature has lessened, since scholars have published a variety of works on women in the holiness movement, overseas missionary work, and the Salvation Army.[5] While Brouwer argued over fifteen years ago that religion was the unacknowledged quarantine in English-Canadian women's history, I suggest that the growing literature of women in the Christian church indicates neglect of charismatic and Pentecostal movements. Although American scholarship has begun to emerge, there is very little Canadian scholarship on Pentecostals generally, and less on Canadian Pentecostal women.[6]

While reference to Canadian Pentecostalism is found in broader studies of evangelicalism,[7] very little exists on the gendered aspects of Pentecostal experience. This lack of attention was recently highlighted by American researcher David Roebuck's call for historians to explore that neglected past.[8] Roebuck suggested that "scholarly biographical work" on Pentecostal women was especially needed; I suggest that the biographies of the Argue sisters are a good beginning place.

Zelma and Beulah Argue are just two of many Canadian women working in ministry throughout North America early in the Pentecostal movement. My search in the PAOC archives in Mississauga, Ontario, revealed the names of approximately thirty such women.[9] Among those identified, it seems that marital status did not deter women from ministry, but did affect the roles that women played at various stages of their lives:

single women tended to be evangelists and missionaries; young married women traveled with their husbands, but after children arrived, couples usually settled into pastorates with the wives serving alongside their husbands; married couples sometimes went to the foreign mission field as well, to work alongside the numerous single women. Exceptions to this pattern existed, however, while some aspects of the Argue sisters' experiences seem typical, others defy the usual pattern.

The one role seemingly closed to women was the administration of church affairs. Scholars have explained this lack of involvement as a sexist, exclusionary measure by men seeking to maintain power over church governance. Indeed, as the Pentecostal movement became more institutionalized, this tendency seemed to strengthen. Sociologists have noted its similarity to Max Weber's model; he argued that the religion of the underprivileged tends to give women more equality, continuing until a religious movement becomes more of an established church.[10] American scholars Charles H. Barfoot and Gerald T. Sheppard tested the model's viability for American Pentecostalism, finding that it assists in explaining ways in which women have been excluded.[11] One feminist theological scholar, Pamela Holmes, applied a similar analysis to the Canadian Pentecostal churches, arguing that the PAOC denomination follows the same pattern. Holmes cites numerous women denied recognition of their effective ministries, despite the Pentecostal principle of gender equality in spiritual matters. Using the historical record of PAOC Convention business meetings, Holmes traces how discriminatory decisions were institutionalized.[12]

Gender History as a Paradigm for Early Pentecostal Women's Work

Studies on institutional powers being concentrated in the hands of the male sex as the Pentecostal movement evolved into an institutionalized church help to explain the contemporary experiences of discrimination against women, but fail to clarify the early experiences of women like the Argue sisters who performed many ministry activities, achieving a remarkable degree of authority. Theological studies of Pentecostal belief systems have offered explanations for women's centrality in the early movement, pointing to two key teachings – the imminent return of Christ and the outpouring of the Spirit on both sexes – to explain why Pentecostals welcomed women in ministry more than other denominations in the early 1900s. This paper focuses on the Argue sisters' work as Pentecostal

evangelists and their acceptance in roles that gave them a remarkable degree of influence.

Gender history is a useful approach in understanding the experiences of early Pentecostal women in Canada since it considers male/female relationships: how the sexes cooperate and compete to reinforce/challenge existing roles and how power relations operate between the sexes and within each sex. As Joy Parr and Mark Rosenfeld explained in their 1996 book *Gender and History in Canada,* "Gender is a term feminist theorists developed to explain how being male or female is not simply the result of biology but is socially constructed and reconstituted . . . Gender identities – masculinity and femininity – acquire meaning in relation to one another."[13] Women's roles within Canadian Pentecostalism have obviously been negotiated continuously, as the controversies over their rightful place in the church attest. A gendered approach to the early women of Canadian Pentecost such as the Argue sisters is more than a recovery mission with the goal of including women in the story – it explores women's cooperation with men to fulfill their sense of God's calling.

More than thirty years ago Natalie Davis, a women's history pioneer, pointed out the futility of attempting to understand women's experiences in isolation from those of men: ". . . we should not be working only on the subjected sex any more than a historian of class can focus entirely on peasants."[14] Concurring, this paper studies the Argue sisters by placing them in the web of relationships they occupied in their familial and Pentecostal circles. Understanding their work and how they functioned in relation to the men in their lives (both their family members and other men with whom they worked), necessitates exploration. Relationships among women are also important to gender historians; some attention is therefore given Mrs. Argue, their mother, and to other female evangelists, their role models.

As Joy Parr has argued, gender history "entails an inherent instability in identities – that being simultaneously a worker, a Baptist, and a father, one is never solely or systematically any of these."[15] In the case of the Argue daughters, they were not simply evangelists, but also musicians and writers, sisters and daughters, and, in Beulah's case, wife and mother. The sisters adopted many roles, never occupying only one at any given time. Placing these women into their complex web of family and ministry relationships both clarifies and complicates explanations for the freedom they enjoyed in their ministry lives.

A.H. Argue: Promoting His Daughters' Ministry

As the daughters of A.H. Argue, Zelma and Beulah were well connected to influential people in Canadian Pentecostal circles. Thomas Miller explains that Argue was widely respected in the early Canadian movement, not only by his own children, but by Pentecostals across North America.[16] Moreover, the admiration between father and daughters was mutual, as A.H. commended all his children to the Pentecostal assemblies across the continent. Some evidence of the father's encouraging his children in their ministries is seen in his assisting Zelma's pursuit of the credentials leading to her ordination. Long before ordination was available to Canadian Pentecostal women through the PAOC, Argue encouraged his daughter to seek it in the United States through the Assemblies of God. Zelma must have found A.H.'s endorsement personally affirming, but such support meant that he also recommended her to the larger church body. More than the case of a proud father promoting his child, this was a case of a highly respected Canadian church father promoting her to the wider body of believers.

This proud father's insistence that his daughter should attempt ordination was also, however, a smart business move. A.H. knew that after ordination, Zelma was entitled to half-price railway fares in the United States and Canada.[17] Zelma's American birthplace may have worked in her favour to expedite her ordination and cross-border travel – the road was less smooth for her younger sister. Preaching in Chicago in the summer of 1927, Beulah referred to the difficulties she initially encountered crossing the US border. Her difficulties might have resulted from her youth or insufficient paperwork to explain her trip, but she noted that after obtaining some form of photo identification for $20, her border crossing was eased.[18] These glimpses into the practical considerations the Argue sisters faced affirm James Opp's conclusion that by 1920 the Argue family was "in the process of transforming themselves into professional evangelists."[19]

When A.H. endorsed his daughters' ministry work it meant more than a father proudly promoting his children, or cleverly economizing on travel costs. Having worked with some prominent female evangelists, he believed fully that God sometimes calls women into full-time ministry. Argue's first encounter with such a woman occurred when he worked with American healing evangelist Maria Woodworth-Etter between 1913 and 1916, after the family's move to California. Both Zelma Argue and her

brother Watson were deeply affected by Woodworth-Etter's children's meetings, referring to them as life-changing.[20] Back in Canada, the Argue family hosted Aimee Semple McPherson during her Winnipeg crusade in March 1920.[21] Later that year the Argues assisted in McPherson's meetings in Montreal, leading the afternoon sessions:[22] This was obviously a close association. One source suggests Zelma Argue's ability in the Montreal crusade led McPherson to try persuading the young woman to leave her father's ministry and join with her.[23] However, A.H. also recognized in Zelma what McPherson saw: a capable young woman with good stage presence, a potential asset to his ministry. Because he was no stranger to the idea of women evangelists, having worked with at least two famous ones by the time he launched his ministry with Zelma, A.H. encouraged his daughter to stay with him.

Eva Argue: Ailing Mother and Absent Partner

Indeed, in his own work A.H. had need of his daughter's help. Although he freely endorsed female evangelists, for health reasons his wife Eva did not join him in traveling on his crusades. In a tribute to Eva after her death, Zelma revealed that her mother had suffered from several health problems: "In 1925, at the conclusion of Dr. Price's great campaign [in Winnipeg], in which she had been a faithful altar worker, she suffered a collapse in health."[24] This problem, added to the fact that she was raising six children during her husband's busiest traveling years, meant that Eva did not play the role of travel companion and co-worker. Being unable to travel with her husband must have been a disappointment: she had grown up Methodist, later working with the Salvation Army in Winnipeg. Both of those church traditions gave prominent place to women in ministry, and Eva would have been very familiar with the ideas of women on the platform and assisting their husbands.[25]

As Zelma noted about her mother, "unable herself to go to the front of the battle, she helped others to go. Unable to be with her husband on the field, she sent her children. 'Go! Hold up his hands,' she would say."[26] In obedience to her mother's wishes, Zelma and her brother Watson worked at their father's side. Here again gender history provides a useful tool to analyze how the Argue family's ministry operated: this is an example of power exercised within the family. Joan Wallach Scott points out that "gender is a primary way of signifying relationships of power,"[27] but it is important to remember that these power relationships are not only about

power between the sexes, but also power relationships among same-sex persons. Gender historians explore how hierarchies of power operate; and in this case, even from her home and sick bed Eva Argue exercised power over her children, urging them to do the work of the ministry in her absence. A.H. Argue's traveling with his son and his daughter seemed to be a fulfillment of the Joel prophecy about sons and daughters prophesying in the last days. From the first issues of the *PT* published in 1920, references to the Argue evangelistic trio abound.

Although Eva Argue was not physically present on those preaching tours, she nevertheless had an influence. Jean Miller Schmidt, writing about Methodist preachers' wives, cites Leonard I. Sweet, who

> identified four distinct models of that role from the Protestant Reformation to the twentieth century: the Companion, who 'held up her husband's hands in his sacred calling'; the Sacrifier, who 'clasped her hands in pious resignation' and 'hindered him not in his work' by staying out of his way and raising her family on her own'; the Assistant, who 'became her husband's right-arm, sharing many pastoral responsibilities and functioning as an extension of his ministry'; and the Partner, who 'ministered with both her own hands' developing a 'ministry alongside her husband.[28]

Sweet suggested that "every minister's wife probably developed her own unique strategy," and that for many women, these models "often coexisted and intermingled with older roles."[29] From our knowledge of the Argues' experiences, it seems that Eva mainly occupied the role of "sacrificer," remaining at home to raise the other children and tend to her health. At the same time, she actively prayed for her husband and children, suggesting something of the "companion" model even in her absence.[30]

Eva's children, particularly Zelma, adopted the roles of "assistant" and "partner" to their father in the work of the ministry. Zelma was the one who "ministered with both her own hands" and eventually developed "a ministry alongside," though in this case, it was beside her father, not a husband. For a gender historian, it is interesting to see how the roles of wife and daughter blended in Zelma. In Eva's absence, Zelma became very much her father's assistant and partner, bringing a feminine presence to the evangelistic meetings.

The Argue Sisters' Evangelistic Team

In 1925, a series of crises led to a major change in the Argue family's evangelistic crusades. The Calvary Temple in Winnipeg – home church and base for their traveling ministry – had recently experienced a change of leadership and Zelma's brother, Watson, was named as the senior pastor, with A.H. Argue serving as his associate.[31] In addition, after a successful series of meetings with Charles S. Price as their guest at the Winnipeg church, Eva Argue's health collapsed; travel for the famous evangelistic trio was seriously curtailed. The situation's solution led to a new configuration: while Watson stayed in Winnipeg pastoring the church, A.H. assisted him, staying close to his wife during her recuperation. Zelma was free to travel but needed a companion, and the family decided to launch Beulah, only 19 years of age. The 1925 report of the sisters' meetings in Indiana, cited at this paper's beginning, is the first published account of the two sisters as a team; it is significant to note that those meetings were held in the spring after Beulah's school term at the Bible College ended.[32]

The period of Zelma and Beulah's shared ministry as traveling evangelists was relatively short, lasting only from 1925 to 1928; it was concentrated in the spring and summer. The partnership was further limited by the fact that Beulah was a full-time student unable to travel during the school year; it finally ended when she accepted a marriage proposal. Yet the sisters held highly successful campaigns in several major centers in the US, including Chicago and Los Angeles. Their work produced rave reviews from the pastors they worked with, particularly in western Canada. From Alberta, for instance came this report:

> The Argue sisters have just come to open a campaign there [Leth bridge] and we are expecting to hear of a great time of refreshing in Lethbridge . . . When we arrived home again the great campaign with the Argue sisters was in full swing. It turned out to be a great meeting. The interest grew, and the crowds came until our large hall was packed clear out on the street and many turned away.[33]

The tour continued throughout the summer of 1926, with positive reports multiplying. In August, this appeared in the *PT*: "We ran into the swells of the revival waves left by the Argue Sisters [in Lethbridge], who had just concluded a campaign and had returned to Edmonton for a second short campaign, and I am sure there was a welcome awaiting them there.

God Bless them. 'I commend unto thee Zelma and Beulah.'"[34] This travel pattern, beginning after Beulah's school year ended each spring, was repeated up to 1928. In May of that year, the sisters planned a campaign in Saskatchewan that was much anticipated.[35] Beulah remained on in that province afterward, conducting a series of meetings independently in Herschel, and in Saskatoon during the month of June 1928 before her marriage.[36]

The Argue sisters were highly esteemed not because of age or experience, but because of their youth. They offer a prime example of Pentecostal women occupying two roles at once: being young and being female. Pentecostal theology offers room for gender equality in the scripture from Joel: in the last days, sons and daughters will prophecy. Zelma referred to this passage: "Yet there is more. Away back in the days of Joel . . . it was foreseen and foreordained that upon young men and young women, even upon children, the Lord would pour out of his spirit in those last days."[37]

The legitimacy of allowing women, even young women, to adopt a leadership role was shored up by the eschatological sense of urgency that early Pentecostals took from their conviction that they were indeed living in "the last days," that Christ's return was imminent; this helped legitimatize the young Argue evangelists.[38] Pentecostal leaders appealed to the scripture about the "fields being white unto harvest" and that one should "pray the Lord of the harvest send out workers." If women were willing to work, responding to God's calling, then logically they should be welcomed into the evangelistic field to help with the harvest of souls.

Zelma Argue: Evangelist and Writer

As the Argue brothers and sisters began choosing their life partners, the family's evangelistic team dynamic changed again. After Beulah's marriage to C.B. Smith, Zelma did some solo campaigns in Moose Jaw in the winter of 1929; Watson traveled as a guest evangelist to the Smiths' church in Saskatoon.[39] Watson, working more and more with the Canadian Bible College based in Winnipeg, was conducting campaigns throughout the West. When he married in June 1930, it was clear that his days of traveling with Zelma were over.[40] There are reports of Zelma traveling alone for a campaign in Carberry, Manitoba, in 1931;[41] she also filled in at a convention in Saskatoon when the scheduled speaker was ill. Reporting on the meeting afterward, the pastor (her brother-in-law) praised

Zelma's performance: "Sister Argue did not spare herself in helping those who were seeking as she remained in the prayer room until the small hours of the morning praying and encouraging hungry hearts."[42]

With two of her siblings and previous traveling companions now married and settled into new partnerships, Zelma resumed her partnership with her father over the next few years on campaigns that that took them to San Diego during the winter of 1931, on tour through southern Ontario in the spring of 1932, and then through western Canada the following year. For the next few years, frequent reports of their campaigns and camp meetings filled the *PT*'s pages. Their travels took them across Canada and often into the United States as well, with reports from Kansas City, Missouri, and Ebenezer, New York, in the spring of 1934.[43]

The frenetic pace at which the father-daughter team traveled is well documented in the *PT*. In February 1936, news was published about various evangelists; the entry about A.H. Argue revealed that "The Argues are wintering in Florida and doing evangelistic work in that state."[44] While this was obviously a much more comfortable climate than Winnipeg's in the winter, the Florida location was chosen only partly for rest. Eva Argue's health had improved to the point where she could winter in the south; from there, A.H. and Zelma continued their evangelistic work. After that winter in Florida, the Argues spent time in various locations across the United States, including a series of meetings in California where the family had maintained contacts from their days with Maria Woodworth-Etter and Aimee Semple McPherson. This helps explain Zelma's ties to that state and her eventually taking up a pastorate there.

Zelma was also concentrating on another kind of work during the winter of 1936: writing. Since the launch of the *PT* in 1920, she had been a regular contributor, but now she was also publishing her work in book form. In February 1936, her book *Garments of Strength*, was released; eighteen months later, the *PT* was advertising three additional titles: *Strenuous Days, Prevailing Prayer,* and *The Beauty of the Cross.* In October 1937, the *PT* described her writings as "a devotional series with readings for everyday in the month. In this way, their value never wears out."[45] Her writing was called so popular that "Miss Argue's books sell themselves."[46] The *PT* even launched a subscription campaign using her books as an incentive: "it is a good time to subscribe now and thus take advantage of receiving one of Miss Argue's books ABSOLUTELY FREE."[47]

Even with her busy schedule, Zelma Argue was indeed a prolific

writer. Shearer claims that, with almost 200 articles published in American Pentecostal periodicals and most of those simultaneously published in the Canadian *PT*, "[Zelma Argue] wrote more articles for the *Pentecostal Evangel* than anyone except C.M. Ward."[48] Her publications regularly appeared not only in the Canadian *PT*, but in sister American publications as well, especially *The Latter Rain Evangel,* and *The Pentecostal Evangel.*

Focused on her life as an evangelist, Zelma did not marry. Her mother died in 1939 at the relatively young age of sixty four, while her father lived until 1959, reaching the age of ninety.[49] Zelma partnered with another woman, Jeanette Jones, to pastor the Trinity Gospel Tabernacle in Los Angeles, California, from 1948 to 1957. After her resignation, she travelled on crusades for another seven years, then taking her retirement in 1964 supported by a pension from the Assemblies of God.[50] While technically she did not play the role of evangelist's or pastor's wife, while travelling with her father and her brother, Zelma Argue filled the role of helpmeet while simultaneously establishing her own individual ministry.

Beulah Argue Smith: Wife and Mother, Minister and Musician

In contrast to Zelma, Beulah did marry; that marriage explains in part why her traveling ministry with Zelma was so short-lived. Beulah's husband, Rev. C.B. Smith, was an evangelist, pastor, and administrator for the PAOC denomination; they met while studying in Winnipeg. Together the Smiths took up pastorates in Saskatchewan, Ontario, and British Columbia before settling in Peterborough, Ontario, where C.B. assumed the presidency of the PAOC Bible College, a post he still held at his death. Given those biographical details, one might predict that Beulah's life, particularly after her marriage, would have been very conventional, typical of a woman in the second half of the twentieth century, where women married to church leaders enacted the roles of supporting and promoting their husbands' careers. Beulah Argue Smith's married life and ministry career, however, defy such stereotypical predictions.

C.B. Smith was ordained just a few weeks after the wedding in 1928. The newlyweds had a busy summer: the *PT* reported that "On August 19th Evangelist C.B. and Beulah M. Smith came to [Woodstock, ON to] give us a three weeks' campaign. At this writing, two weeks of the campaign have passed and God has been richly blessing their ministry."[51] In the same issue: "Brother and Sister Smith are going to Convention in Montreal, and then to Saskatoon, Sask., to take the pastorate there."[52] The

following year, the February 1929 *PT* reported, "The Assembly in Saskatoon is making splendid progress under the leadership of Brother and Sister C.B. Smith. They are looking forward to an evangelistic meeting with Brother A. Watson Argue, next February."[53] Here again, family ties were evident. The Smiths seemed destined for a conventional life in the ministry, having landed a pastoral job early in their marriage.

It is therefore somewhat surprising to read that two years later Beulah was traveling once again conducting evangelistic meetings – and doing so independently. From Carman, Manitoba, Pastor H. Wesley O'Brien comments: "We praise God for a good report of the work here. In a recent campaign of three weeks, beginning January 18th, with Mrs. C.B. Smith of Saskatoon as Evangelist, many were saved, some healed and the saints built up."[54] That same spring, another report from Saskatoon reminded readers that although Beulah sometimes traveled alone, the Smiths' marriage was solid and they were true partners in ministry. The April 1941 *PT* included a "Report from Saskatchewan": "Brother and Sister C.B. Smith of Saskatoon are believing for greater things in their Assembly than ever before. The young people's [sic] work is very encouraging."[55]

As encouraging as pastoral work was for the couple, they felt called to evangelism; at the end of summer 1931, they resigned from the church in Saskatoon "to take up work in other fields."[56] That other field was evangelism, something very familiar to Beulah Argue Smith. For the next two years, the Smiths followed an itinerant path to various locations, holding evangelistic campaigns. In December 1931, Pastor Atter from Westmeath, Ontario, reported that "We thank God for another visitation of Pentecostal power at Westmeath. Evangelists C.B and Beulah Smith . . . gave forth the old time Pentecostal message in the power and demonstration of the Spirit, bringing great conviction and stirring the whole community."[57] In January, reports from Windsor and Wallaceburg echoed similar successes; one recounted that during the Smith meetings, "several professed salvation, much prejudice was broken down with outsiders, and the saints were much encouraged."[58]

The Smiths attended the graduation ceremonies of the Pentecostal Bible College in Toronto in May 1932, and in June it was reported that they had just concluded a series of meetings in Woodstock, Ontario, where they had ministered four years earlier shortly after their wedding: "The work has gradually been going forward in Woodstock, and the results of these meetings will prove a blessing."[59] The Smiths also spent time in the

fall of 1932 in Galt, Ontario, attending the opening of a new Pentecostal Temple building and then remaining for three weeks of meetings. One outcome of these meetings was reported to be a greater acceptance of Pentecostalism by other denominations – the Smiths were credited with creating that acceptance. The *PT* noted that "Like many other places, Galt had suffered on account of the prejudice in the hearts of the city people toward the Pentecostal Movement but, praise God, through Brother and Sister Smith's ministry, the ice was broken through and several souls were saved."[60]

After two years of traveling to various locations to hold crusades of differing lengths, the Smiths abandoned their itinerant lifestyle for the permanency of a pastoral charge once again. The May 1933 *PT* announced that "Rev. C.B. Smith has accepted the Pastorate of the Ottawa Assembly and is taking charge of the work there immediately."[61] Not surprisingly this news of permanency was soon followed by news of a pending baby. On 10 July 1934, Beulah gave birth to a son, George Campbell Smith, who would eventually follow in his father's footsteps.[62] With the young family settled into the leadership of a congregation in a large urban centre, it seemed inevitable that Beulah's days as a traveling evangelist were over. That, however, was not the case.

Before her baby had his first birthday, Beulah was back on the road. As surprising as it is to find her doing this as a married woman and new mother, it is even more so to realize that she was doing so independently, not as her husband's "helper." The May 1935 *PT* reported that "Bethel Tabernacle, Toronto, expects to have sister Beulah Smith, of Ottawa, with them for a campaign shortly."[63] These solo travels are reminiscent of Aimee Semple McPherson's pattern, with one important difference: McPherson did not maintain a long-term marriage commitment.

Beulah's ministry life was complex. In these travels, she neither lived in her father's shadow nor teamed up with him as Zelma did. Yet neither was her traveling ministry always done in partnership with her husband at this stage. She was frequently listed as the featured evangelist for campaigns in churches and at summer camps; whether her husband participated or not is unclear. It seems that usually he did not, his absence due to the heavy demands made on the pastor of a large church, and his commitments to the administrative work of the denomination.

Looking a little deeper, though, one detects the gendered aspects of Beulah's ministry work. She was not advocating an abdication of traditional female roles; instead, she embraced those roles, but included

more non-traditional forays into the world of preaching and evangelism. Beginning the editorship of a children's page at the *PT* in August 1937, for example, she was still described primarily as a wife:

> This month we welcome to our staff of editorial writers Mrs. C.B. Smith of Ottawa, Ont. Mrs. Smith is well known throughout Canada. As a member of the Argue family Mrs. Smith traveled many years in evangelistic work across the continent. Now the wife of one of our busiest pastors Mrs. Smith has kindly consented to edit each month the column OUR BOYS AND GIRLS."[64]

Doubtless, in addition to Beulah's family ties, her gendered status as a mother made her seem particularly suited for this work.[65]

Beulah continued this editorial work on the children's page for the next three years, nurturing young believers in their faith and entertaining them with stories, puzzles, and various features. On the announcement in the 1 May 1940 *PT* that she was leaving the children's page, the journal reinforced the fact that Smith was occupying multiple roles: "I am sure that you will all be sorry to learn that Mrs. Beulah Argue Smith, on account of her busy life as secretary, evangelist, preacher and mother finds it impossible to continue as editor of this page."[66] Further reinforcing the nurturing aspect of the editorial role, the editor wrote, "Another kind understanding mother will be looking after your interests through this page"; children were asked to send their letters to a Toronto address on Danforth Avenue.

In fact the Smiths were moving to that same Toronto address to manage the pastorate of the Danforth Gospel Temple, but Beulah could no longer continue as editor. It is not surprising that this busy woman might drop one of her many commitments; indeed, with competing demands of family and ministry responsibilities in a new city, this was almost predictable. Here again, however, Beulah Smith was not stopping her ministry work to concentrate more single-mindedly on her family commitments; with the move to Toronto came a whole new set of opportunities. Toronto was the site of the new Ontario Bible School, the Pentecostal training facility for the Eastern District of the PAOC; in addition to his new church, C.B. Smith took on the responsibility of President of the fledging school from 1940 to 1944. Beulah also joined the teaching staff and on 15April 1941, the *PT* announced her new position; the caption under her photograph read: "Mrs. C.B. Smith under appointment to staff of Ontario Bible School for next term." The same caption

announced that "pastors, workers and friends will gather from city and country at Evangel Temple, Toronto on April 24th for a great final closing rally for the [school] year." One assumes that Beulah would have attended that occasion, although four weeks after that event, she gave birth to her second son, David;[67] at that time, many women even gave up their jobs as their due dates neared.[68] Smith's new appointment as the school's music teacher would have to be balanced with the demands of her infant son, who was not yet six months when the fall 1941 term began Two years later, David's brother Robert, who would continue in the family tradition of ministry, was born.[69] Beulah Argue Smith's life was clearly an example of what gender historians have noted about concurrent and overlapping roles: not only was she the daughter of a well known evangelist, the wife of a well known pastor and college administrator, and the mother of a growing young family – Beulah Argue Smith was simultaneously a Pentecostal evangelist and a college instructor.

In 1944 C.B. Smith was promoted to the highest office in the PAOC when he became General Superintendent for Canada, occupying this post for eight years while also editing the *PT*. In 1952 the Smith family moved to Victoria, BC, to pastor the Glad Tidings Tabernacle. Five years later they returned to Ontario when C.B. was asked to become president of the PAOC Bible College, which had relocated from Toronto to Peterborough under the name of Eastern Pentecostal Bible College.[70] By this time, the four Smith children were mostly grown: Robert, the youngest at fifteen, was still at home; David was seventeen, and would soon begin his studies at Carleton University in Ottawa.[71] Again Beulah accepted a post to instruct at the College, teaching music to a variety of church workers and assuming the title Director of Music.

Only three years after their move, C.B. Smith was killed in a tragic car accident. Tributes to the much loved pastor, administrator, and family man poured in.[72] A building dedicated to his memory was constructed on the campus of the Eastern Pentecostal Bible College; in the spring of 1965, Beulah Argue Smith cut the ribbon officially opening the facility. The C.B. Smith Memorial Building bears a plaque that simply states: "Dedicated to the Glory of God and in Loving Memory of Rev. C.B. Smith President of Our College 1940-1944 [and] 1958-1961."[73]

As a widow Beulah Argue Smith, popular and influential, remained on the College staff, busy with her music students, who testify to her popularity and impact.[74] As Director of Music, Smith led the school choirs and "many of her former students who are in the ministry today vividly

recall her leading the student body in rousing versions of 'The Word of God' and 'The Hallelujah Chorus' at countless graduation exercises."[75] She also hosted annual "Schools of Missions" on the campus in summer, when missionaries returning from the field met with pastors and missions promoters for instruction and fellowship.[76] Smith continued her work at the College until the 1970s when she moved to a new retirement facility for Pentecostal workers in Toronto, Shepherd's Lodge. After her death early in 1990, her obituary in the *PT* reported that in addition to her ministry accomplishments, she "was a devoted wife, mother, sister, grandmother and great-grandmother."[77]

Conclusion

Zelma and Beulah Argue were highly regarded as powerful and influential women during their lifetimes; their legacy is commemorated and celebrated among Canadian Pentecostals. Between 1984 and 1994, articles appeared in the *PT* calling attention to these "pioneers of the faith." That veneration reminded readers that "since the inception of the PAOC we have had some great women who were pioneers, missionaries, evangelists, pastors, teachers, and active pastors' wives."[78]

Reflecting on the lives of such women, it is clear that gender history can help to explain how and why these early women made their contributions. Placing the Argue sisters into the complex web of their family ties and ministry connections is an important first step toward understanding. One might argue that the Argue sisters were exceptional because their male relatives gave them legitimacy. However, while their father's or husband's endorsements were important, they serve only as a partial explanation for such successful ministries. These sisters were much influenced by women as well: Eva Argue played a central role in the lives of her daughters, as did Maria Woodworth-Etter and Aimee Semple McPherson.

Daughter, sister, wife, mother, preacher, evangelist, musician, teacher and writer – each Argue sister occupied many or all of these roles throughout her life. Zelma accompanied her father on his ministry, filling the role usually occupied by a wife and bringing a feminine presence to his crusades, while Beulah chose the more traditional roles of marriage and motherhood, but continued her involvement in evangelistic crusades, writing, and teaching; both women defied the stereotypical pattern. Gender history, with its attention to the context of their relationships and the

complexity of simultaneously playing several different roles, helps to explain not only how these women's ministries were legitimized, but also why their legacies are still celebrated today.

Endnotes

1. *The Pentecostal Testimony*, April 1925, 6 (hereafter cited as *PT*).
2. See Sheryl Shearer, "Zelma Argue: Handmaiden of the Lord," *A/G Heritage* (Spring 2002): 18-23.
3. *PT*, 15 May 1939, 12.
4. Ruth Compton Brouwer, "Transcending the Unacknowledged Quarantine: Putting Religion into English-Canadian Women's History," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 27, no. 3 (1992): 47-61.
5. Marilyn Whiteley, *Canadian Methodist Women, 1766-1925: Marys, Marthas* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Press, 2005); Jean Schmidt, *Grace Sufficient: A History of Women in American Methodism, 1760-1939* (Abingdon Press, 1996); Ruth Compton Brouwer, *New Women for God: Canadian Presbyterian Women and India Missions, 1876-1914* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990); Rosemary R. Gagan, *A Sensitive Independence: Canadian Methodist Women Missionaries in Canada and the Orient 1881-1925* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's Press, 1992); and Lynne Marks, *Revivals and Roller Rinks: Religion, Leisure and Identity in Late-Nineteenth-Century Small-Town Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996).
6. Edith L. Blumhofer, "Canada's Gift to the Sawdust Trail: The Canadian Face of Aimee Semple McPherson," in *Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience*, ed. G.A. Rawlyk (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's Press, 1997), 387-402; *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism and American Culture* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1993); and "Women in American Pentecostalism," *Pneuma* 17, no. 1 (Spring 1995): 19-20.
7. John Stackhouse, *Canadian Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century* (Toronto: University Press, 1993); Mark Noll et al., eds., *Evangelicalism: Comparative Perspectives on Popular Protestantism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994); Michael Wilkinson, *The Spirit Said Go: Pentecostal Immigrants in Canada* (New York: Peter Lang, 2006); and Michael Wilkinson, ed., *Canadian Pentecostalism: Transition and Transformation* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's Press, 2009).

8. David Roebuck, "Pentecostal Women in Ministry: A Review of Selected Documents," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 16, no. 1 (2006): 29-44.

9. My preliminary research at the PAOC Archives in Mississauga in September 2007 uncovered thirty Canadian women. Of these women, fourteen served as overseas missionaries, twelve were pastors and/or pastors' wives, and ten were evangelists.

10. Max Weber, *The Sociology of Religion* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963).

11. Charles H. Barfoot and Gerald T. Sheppard, "Prophetic vs. Priestly Religion: the Changing Role of Women Clergy in Classical Pentecostal Churches," *Review of Religious Research* 22, no. 1 (1980): 2-17.

12. Pamela M.S. Holmes, "Ministering Women in the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada: A Canadian Pentecostal Feminist Exploration," in *Canadian Pentecostalism,* 179-194.

13. Joy Parr and Mark Rosenfeld, *Gender and History in Canada* (Toronto: Copp Clark, 1996), 1.

14. Natalie Davis cited in Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1988), 29.

15. Joy Parr, "Gender History and Historical Practice," *Canadian Historical Review* 76, no. 3 (1995): 354-76.

16. Thomas William Miller, "The Significance of A.H. Argue for Pentecostal Historiography," *Pneuma* 8 (1986): 145. See also Douglas Rudd, *When the Spirit Came Upon Them: Highlights from the Early Years of the Pentecostal Movement in Canada* (Mississauga, ON: Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, 2002), 34-41.

17. Shearer, "Zelma Argue," 19 and 23, note 11.

18. Beulah Argue, *The Latter Rain Evangel*, August 1927, 9.

19. James Opp, *The Lord for the Body: Religion, Medicine, & Protestant Faith Healing in Canada, 1880-1930* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's Press, 2005), 150.

20. Rudd, *When the Spirit Came Upon Them*, 34-41. See also Shearer, "Zelma Argue," 18; and Wayne Warner, *Maria Woodworth-Etter: For Such a Time as This Her Healing and Evangelistic Ministry* (Gainsville, FL: Bridge-Logos, 2004), 183, 188, 196 note 5, 278, and 351.

21. "Gifts to Evangelist," *Manitoba Free Press, Winnipeg,* 6 March 1920, 3; "Mrs. McPherson Concludes Revival Campaign in City," *Manitoba Free Press, Winnipeg,* 8 March 1920, 3; and "Recent Evangelistic Campaign," *Manitoba Free Press, Winnipeg,*15 March 1920, 6.

22. Edith L. Blumhofer, *Aimee Semple McPherson: Everybody's Sister* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993); and Janice Dicken, "Take Up Thy Bed and Walk: Aimee Semple McPherson and Faith-Healing," *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History* 17, no. 1-2 (2000):137-53.

23. Edith Blumhofer, "Zelma E. Argue," in *Pentecost in my Soul: Explorations in the Meaning of Pentecostal Experience in the Assemblies of God* (Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House, 1989), 156; cited by Shearer, "Zelma Argue,"19.

24. *PT*, 15 May 1939, 12.

25. Jean Miller Schmidt, *Grace Sufficient: A History of American Methodism, 1760-1939* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999); and Leonard I. Sweet, *The Minister's Wife: Her Role in Nineteenth-Century American Evangelicalism* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983).

26. *PT* (15 May 1939, 12.

27. Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History*, 42.

28. Leonard I. Sweet, *The Minister's Wife*, 113-14; cited in Jean Miller Schmidt, *Grace Sufficient* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999), 3.

29. Schmidt, *Grace Sufficient*, 3.

30. *PT*, 1 April 1941, 19.

31. *PT*, January 1925, 7.

32. *PT*, March 1926, 12.

33. *PT*, July 1926, 9.

34. *PT*, August 1926, 4.

35. *PT*, April 1928, 3.

36. *PT*, June 1928, 1, 19.

37. *PT*, December 1920, 3.

38. Barfoot and Sheppard, "Prophetic vs. Priestly Religion," 9; and Roebuck, "Pentecostal Women in Ministry," 35-37.

39. *PT*, January 1929, 19; *PT*, February 1929, 16, 17; and *PT*, March 1929, 19.
40. *PT*, July 1930, 20.
41. *PT*, February 1931, 2.
42. *PT*, September 1931, 2.
43. *PT*, May 1934, 12; and *PT*, June 1934, 9.
44. *PT*, February 1936, 2.
45. *PT*, October 1937, 26.
46. *PT*, October 1937, 26.
47. *PT*, October 1937, 26.
48. Frederick A. Muster and Mel Gram, "Obituary of Zelma Argue," *Christian Life Center* (29 January 1980); cited in Shearer, "Zelma Argue," 21. A search for "Zelma Argue" in the online digitized periodicals at www.ifphc.org reveals 202 items.
49. *PT*, May 15, 1939, 12; and *PT*, March 1959, 7, 15, 26-27.
50. Argue, "Memories of Fifty Years Ago," *Pentecostal Evangel*, 22 April 1956, 6; cited in Shearer, "Zelma Argue," 20.
51. *PT*, September 1928, 11.
52. *PT*, September 1928, 11.
53. *PT*, February 1929, 17.
54. *PT*, March 1931, 16.
55. *PT*, April 1931, 7.
56. *PT*, August 1931, 2.
57. *PT*, December 1931, 2
58. *PT*, January 1932, 17.
59. *PT*, June 1932, 2.
60. *PT*, December 1932, 13.
61. *PT*, May 1933, 2.
62. *PT*, September 1934, 12.

63. *PT*, May 1935, 14.

64. *PT*, August 1937, 17.

65. *PT*, August 1937, 17.

66. *PT*, 1 May 1940, 15.

67. Beulah's son, born 16 May 1941, the Honorable David P. Smith, went on to have an illustrious career as an active member of the Liberal Party of Canada, serving as a member of the Canadian Senate, after being appointed by Jean Chretien in 2002.

68. Wendy Mitchinson, *Giving Birth in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002).

69. Rev. Robert Smith is Senior Pastor of the London Gospel Temple, a PAOC church in London, Ontario. See his biography at www.lgt.org.

70. *PT*, March 1961, 10, 33.

71. *PT*, September 1963, 28-29.

72. *PT*, March 1962, 11, 33, and 34.

73. *PT*, May 1965, 1.

74. *PT*, October 1991, 21.

75. *PT*, Mar 1990, 38.

76. *PT*, November 1963, 19.

77. *PT*, March 1990, 38-39.

78. See for example, *PT*, July 1984); and *PT*, December 1984, 29.

Canadian Pentecostalism: A Multicultural Perspective

MICHAEL WILKINSON
Trinity Western University

In the 1960s the Canadian government set out to study the bicultural and bilingual quality of Canadian society. The study was published in seven volumes as the *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*.[1] It was not without controversy, however.[2] While the government intended to enshrine French and English cultures as equal partners and founding peoples, reaction from a significant number of Canadians who were neither French nor English was swift. In volume four, *The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups*, it became clear that many other Europeans – and, in particular northern, eastern, and southern Europeans – wanted to be recognized equally as builders of Canada. Pierre Trudeau's vision of a bilingual and bicultural country soon became a vision of a plural and multicultural country. Canada was to be recognized as a multicultural commonwealth of many nationalities within the framework of two founding peoples.

One would think that the multicultural nature of Canadian society would be reflected in the study of religion. Yet, the dominant religious stories have been shaped by their dependence on French or English-Canadian culture. Religion in Canada was often interpreted through the framework of the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec or the United Church and Anglican Church in English-speaking Canada. Relatively little research has examined the ethnic and cultural diversity of Christianity in Canada.[3] This is especially true of Canadian Pentecostalism. Furthermore, the Canadian Pentecostal story was, and continues to be, largely shaped by the American story. In this paper I intend to re-contextualize the Canadian

story.[4] My point is not to discredit the contributions of American holiness religion. Rather, I seek to point to ways in which the voices of the other ethnic groups have largely gone unheard, especially the voices of German, Scandinavian, Italian, aboriginal, and, more recently, new immigrants from Asia, Africa, and Latin America. An important and neglected source for the development of Pentecostalism in Canada is the migration of Pentecostals to Canada from outside North America. In conclusion, I will suggest some reasons why the study of Canadian Pentecostalism has not incorporated the voices of these groups into its history and provide a research agenda for Canadian Pentecostal studies.

Multicultural Social Theory

During the 1990s, debates about multiculturality and polyethnicity intensified dramatically, so much so that scholars began to question the nature of multiculturalism both conceptually and empirically.[5] For example, Peter Kivisto argues that scholars needed to revisit the early idea of assimilation because it was erroneously understood.[6] More specifically, he argued that assimilation was not antithetical to multiculturalism and had much in common with the latter precisely because both concepts refer to the interaction of social groups. Kivisto conceptualized assimilation in such a way that it incorporates multiculturalism and transnationalism; assimilation, as historically defined, refers to the ways in which people groups interact leading to integration or pluralism.

Stephen Cornell and Douglas Hartmann describe multiculturalism quite differently arguing that it represents the efforts among social groups to maintain some sense of difference.[7] Furthermore, the effort to maintain some sense of cultural identity represented a shift among early sociologists as they attempted to explain conflict between groups and celebration of identity within groups. Multiculturalism also describes the *insistence* among social groups to recognize differences, which according to the authors, is especially controversial in the late twentieth century, not only in the United States, but also throughout the world. Multiculturalism explains the ways in which social groups are wrestling with questions of identity in different ways including the mixing of identities and attempts to consolidate and create boundaries that serve to protect identities.

In both cases, these authors argue that careful theoretical work needs to be applied to the understanding of cultural interaction as scholars refine a theory of multiculturalism. Steve Fenton, in contrast, states emphatically,

that no theory of ethnicity or multiculturalism is possible.[8] Instead, only a theory of modernity can be explicated that includes how modern societies are structured. A theory of "social context" best explains the relationship between social groups. The implication of Fenton's work focuses our attention on the way in which modern societies construct multiculturalism in several ways including colonial relations, majority-minority relations, and state policy that politicize and mobilize minority groups for action. The value of Fenton's work is his emphasis on understanding social context for the various ways in which people construct identities in relation to modern state development.

Multiculturalism in Canada has a number of meanings.[9] Descriptively, multiculturalism recognizes the existence of ethnically diverse groups. It also has a prescriptive meaning pointing to a set of ideals for promoting diversity. Politically it refers to government initiatives including policies about multiculturalism. Finally, multiculturalism has a practical component when it is used by cultural groups to advance their own interests. Thus, one has to pay attention to the way in which multiculturalism is referenced in the multivalent discourse surrounding the concept of multiculturalism. Theories of multiculturalism, increasingly diverse, now focus on a range of variables including ethnicity, class, gender, and sexuality. Surprisingly, very little attention is given to religion in the literature.

An exception to this trend is the recent work by Paul Bramadat and David Seljak where ethnicity, multiculturalism, and religion have become a major focus.[10] Bramadat and Seljak argue that a new story needs to be told about religion and ethnicity in Canada.[11] The authors highlight six themes that are important for understanding religious diversity, including the elasticity and persistence of religious identity, the particular and universal quality of diversity, the re-emergence of religion in the public sphere, issues surrounding diaspora and transnationalism, diversity and community building, and the interaction between minority values and majority values. Each of these themes highlights important aspects that demands further examination within a multicultural perspective that incorporates religion as an important variable.

In *Christianity and Ethnicity in Canada*, Bramadat and Seljak explore these themes in the context of Christianity stating: "Surprisingly little has been written on the role of ethnicity in shaping Canada's Christian churches, although our own experience tells us that it is significant."[12] Likewise, Bruce Guenther explores ethnicity and the multi-

cultural nature of evangelical Protestant denominations in Canada arguing that "what is missing from both positive and negative public perceptions of evangelical Protestants in Canada is any serious consideration of their cultural and ethnic diversity."[13] Following an examination of Asian, Black, Francophone, and aboriginal evangelicals, Guenther discusses the contribution each group is making to public life in Canada.

My own view is shaped by Charles Lemert.[14] Lemert points out that multiculturalism is a highly controversial, confusing, and misused word in social theory that requires some specificity. Lemert traces the twentieth-century emergence of the notion of "multicultural" that came to rest on two important principles: the universality of rights and the principle of justice. As a result, Lemert highlights an aspect of multicultural theorizing that must pay attention to issues beyond an increasingly diverse population demographic and to the values and policies of a society whereby power and authority is distributed. Tied up with his view is an understanding that identity, especially the politics of identity, is linked with notions of belonging in a multicultural society. Further, a multicultural perspective highlights issues of authenticity and raises questions about who are the "real" members of any society. Lemert's conceptualizing of "multicultural" points to an important aspect worthy of attention: the need to recognize the voices of those who have made a contribution without recognition. As he states: "Proponents of the politics of recognition assert that identity politics entail a real political struggle to overcome the effects of injuries inflicted by well structured social (as opposed to interpersonal) insults."[15]

One consequence of defining multiculturalism in such a way is to include aspects of identity and recognition in a retelling of religious history that incorporates the voices of those at the margins. Scholars need to rethink religious history and ask which voices are missing, ignored, or misplaced. The purpose of this article is to incorporate the stories of those Pentecostals often ignored in their own history. The main characters in this case include the so-called "other" European Pentecostals, aboriginals, and new immigrant Pentecostals.

Revisiting the Canadian Story

Canadian sources on Pentecostalism rely substantially on the works of Gloria Kulbeck, Gordon Atter, Thomas Miller, and Ronald Kydd.[16] Each of these authors reflect different aspects in the development of

Canadian Pentecostalism for which there are several debates over the issue of leadership, American religious influences, the relationship of American Pentecostalism to other renewal events around the world, and the worldwide spread of Pentecostalism. Early accounts in popular histories spoke about spontaneous outpourings of the Holy Spirit throughout the world. For example, the Canadian Gordon Atter notes that "the present-day Pentecostal movement had its beginning in a series of religious revivals that broke out in many parts of the world, almost simultaneously in the beginning of the twentieth century."[17] Gloria Kulbeck speaks of the Canadian revival as one source of evidence that a spontaneous move of God had occurred throughout the world. Thomas Miller, a noted historian of Canadian Pentecostalism, nuances his view without reference to the spontaneity of revival, but he did highlight how these series of revivals belonged to a larger tradition of evangelical Protestant renewal. By the late twentieth century, the American scholar Grant Wacker had critically evaluated the "suddenly from Heaven" perspective.[18] The focus subsequently shifted to detailed accounts, primarily American ones, on whether Parham or Seymour should be credited as the founder of Pentecostalism, the influence and significance of the Azusa revival, and the role of American missionaries in the global expansion of Pentecostalism.

Ronald Kydd's account of Canadian Pentecostalism reflects the historiographical issues of this period. But, I would add, they also create more questions than they answer. For example, Kydd writes extensively on the influence of Azusa on Canadian Pentecostalism. He states that "Pentecostalism as a religious tradition arose in the United States in the first decade of the twentieth century. Its primary emphases were the baptism in the Holy Spirit, speaking in tongues, evangelism, and eschatology. The movement *reached* Canada in 1906, becoming established first in Toronto at a mission operated by James and Ellen Hebden. In 1907 it took root in Winnipeg and in the same year made its way to the West Coast. Alice Wood carried the news of Pentecost to Swift Current, Saskatchewan, in 1908, and it broke on the east coast in 1911 through the efforts of Alice Garrigus" (italics mine).[19] Scholars are now critically evaluating this sequence of events and more specifically the role of the Hebden Mission as a separate and distinct Pentecostal ministry from Azusa.[20]

While Kydd focuses his attention on American contributions, he also suggests that American Pentecostal immigrants were central to the development of Pentecostalism especially in the Canadian prairies. He

argues that "When comparisons are made to respective populations, in the early decades of the century the prairie provinces had the largest proportion of Pentecostals. Not coincidentally these provinces also had the largest proportions of American immigrants."[21] I believe these claims need to be challenged.[22] My intent is not to negate the influence of American sources, but to show that Pentecostalism did emerge among some Canadians without American influences. This is not to suggest that the "spontaneity thesis" is correct. There is evidence that by the late nineteenth century there was a global network among missionaries – especially among Methodists – who prayed, preached, and encouraged revival in anticipation of the new millennium. One of the most influential revivals was in India among the Methodist Mukti Mission where an account of Spirit baptism including tongues was written by Minnie Abrams and published in 1905. Prior to this revival, the director of the mission, Pandita Ramabai, had sent her daughter to Australia and New Zealand in 1903 to observe renewal meetings. These events were widely published in the Bombay *Guardian* and the *Christian Patriot*, two major papers in India, in 1906. Seymour's newsletter also reported on the event in 1906 as did the Chicago *Daily News* in 1907. There is also evidence to suggest that Canadian Pentecostalism, especially at the Hebden Mission in Toronto developed without American influence.[23] Pentecostal scholars such as Gary McGee and Allan Anderson are now questioning the "central place thesis" including the diffusion of ideas accounting for the spread of Pentecostalism.[24] As I have argued elsewhere, it is probably more accurate to see the various stories of Pentecostalism converging and in interesting ways becoming "Azusa-*ized*" during this time.[25]

While providing very good work on the American Holiness contribution to Canadian Pentecostalism, American origin stories neglect an important chapter in the evolution of Pentecostalism. No one has dealt with the influences of Pentecostalism from outside of the United States that tends to obfuscate the multicultural development of Canadian Pentecostalism. Likewise, very little attention is paid to the contributions of other Europeans, aboriginals, or new immigrants.

The Contribution of the "Other" Groups

1. Other European Pentecostals

An examination of the ethnic origin of Pentecostals in Canada shows

that between 1931 and 1971 most Pentecostals were British in ethnic background followed by other European, French, and various ethnic groups.[26] For example, in 1931 sixty-nine per cent of Pentecostals claimed to have a British ethnic background, 2 per cent French, and 28 per cent "Other European" (see Table 1). The latter category mostly consisted of those claiming a German, Scandinavian, Dutch, and Italian ethnicity (see Table 2). The Scandinavian category included people who were Norwegian, Swedish, Danish and Icelandic. Finnish figures were not accounted for until later. For example, in 1971 there were 1,300 Pentecostals with a Finnish ethnic origin that represented approximately 0.6 per cent of the Pentecostal population.

Table 1: Percentage Distribution for Ethnic Origin of Pentecostals

	1931	1941	1961	1971
British	69	67	65	67
French	2	3	4	3
Other European	28	28	26	24
Other	1	2	5	6
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

Source: Derived from Census Canada, 1931, 1941, 1961, 1971.

The largest Pentecostal denomination in Canada, the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada (PAOC), responded to ethnic diversity in a pragmatic fashion, allowing for accommodation so long as there was no conflict doctrinally or organizationally. In the early twentieth century, the PAOC responded to the migration of Pentecostals from other European countries by allowing them to organize as "Branch Conferences." Branch Conferences were defined as "A unit in the General Conference organization equivalent to a District Conference in General Executive membership and relationship . . . A Branch is distinguished from a District Conference in that its territory of operation is not geographical, but is confined to ministry among certain races or language groups. Its geographical area of operation may therefore overlap or coincide with that of one or more District Conferences."[27] Branch Conferences operated independently, like District Conferences, within the general framework of the PAOC. Some ethnic groups, like the Dutch, however, assimilated into the English-speaking congregations even though their numbers were quite substantial compared to some groups like the Finnish Pentecostals who formed a Branch Conference.

Table 2: Percentage Distribution of Pentecostals as "Other European" Ethnic Groups

	1931	1941	1961	1971
German	11	9	10	10
Scandinavian	7	6	5	4
Finnish	0.1	0.4	nd	0.6
Dutch	3	4	4	2.4
Italian	3	2	1.4	1.6
Ukrainian	0.4	2.1	2.3	2.5

Source: Derived from Census Canada, 1931, 1941, 1961, 1971.

By 1941 three of the four Branch Conferences in the PAOC had been formed. This included the Slavic Conference (1931), the Finnish Conference (1939), the German Conference (1940) and later the French Conference (1949). Miller claims the Branch Conferences formed because of language differences.[28] While this appears to be an obvious reason, it is not entirely accurate. While a common language may draw German-speaking Pentecostals together, there are also constitutional issues, including a level of autonomy for the Branch Conference. Branch Conferences maintained autonomy both financially and organizationally. Likewise, Branch Conferences established their own congregational plans, camps, mission programs, and in some cases leadership training programs. In addition, not all ethnic groups desired to form a Branch Conference. Some, like the Italian Pentecostals, established a separate denomination entitled the Italian Pentecostal Church of Canada (recently renamed The Canadian Assemblies of God), which held close ties to the PAOC.[29] More recently, the PAOC has changed its policy of Branch Conferences in favour of "Language Fellowships" in response to the post-1970s migration

Table 3: Percentage Distribution of Ethnic Groups as Pentecostals

	1931	1941	1961	1971
British	0.3	0.7	1.2	1.5
French	0.01	0.04	0.1	0.1
German	0.6	1.0	1.4	1.6
Scandinavian	0.8	1.5	1.7	2.0
Netherlands	0.4	1.0	1.2	1.2
Italian	0.7	1.1	0.4	0.4

Source: Derived from Census Canada, 1931, 1941, 1961, 1971.

from Asia, Africa, and Latin America. I will return to this point later.

German-speaking Pentecostals represent a very good case study for understanding the multicultural quality of Canadian Pentecostalism. The origin of German Pentecostalism in Canada has two important sources. One is the migration of German-speaking Pentecostals such as Julius Schatkowski, August Kowlaski, and Oskar Jeske who played important roles in establishing Pentecostalism in Canada.[30] Many German-speaking Pentecostals migrated to Canada and brought with them a form of Pentecostalism shaped by European events. Some also maintained important networks for prayer, renewal, and education. For example, in the area of education, some important German-speaking pastors such as Wilhelm Kowalkski, Aflons Mittelstaedt, Reinhold Hildebrandt, Matthian Baumgartner, and Christian Green were trained in Europe at the International Bible Institute in Danzig, Poland.[31] Each of these leaders established prominent Pentecostal ministries in Canada. Pentecostal origins in Canada must also take into consideration the impact of revival prayed for by German farmers on the Canadian prairies. For example, in 1919 Rev. George Schneider, a German-speaking pastor from Edmonton, Alberta, began tent meetings where many German Christians were filled with the Spirit. As a result of these meetings, many were persecuted for their new experiences and left their churches to establish their own congregations which later joined the PAOC.[32]

Much of the Pentecostal ministry in Canada among German-speaking peoples developed independently. By 1934 there were ten congregations in Alberta. Feeling the need for closer ties with other Pentecostals, the Germans established their own organization, later joining the PAOC as an official Branch Conference in July 1940. Following both world wars, the Pentecostal movement in Canada grew with the migration of German-speaking Pentecostals from Austria, West Germany, and Poland, experiencing phenomenal growth in the cities of Edmonton and Winnipeg. During the 1950s and 1960s the German Branch Conference expanded by planting new congregations in Ontario and British Columbia. Growth also allowed for organizational changes in the 1970s as the German Pentecostals hired full-time administrators for their new office in Kitchener, Ontario. By the 1980s, however, migration changes from European to non-European sources would also impact the German Pentecostals in Canada. Issues over youth, language, and music, however, were secondary to the changes in migration patterns which had a direct impact on the rate of growth in their congregations.

The point I am making here is that a significant number of Pentecostals in Canada came from European origins for which we know very little about the particular ways in which their practice of Pentecostalism became rooted in Canada. We do know that European Pentecostalism is shaped by a number of events and theological developments globally but we don't know very much about the cross-Atlantic connections. One resource that we do have is from the German Pentecostals. Detailed critical studies of the influence of European Pentecostalism in Canada are sorely needed to fill in the details of the story of Pentecostalism in Canada.

2. Aboriginal Pentecostals

In July 2000, Matthew Coon Come was elected as chief of the Assembly of First Nations. What made Coon Come's election surprising to many people was not his ardent defense of Native rights or his political views, but his faith as a Pentecostal. Coon Come's faith was never in doubt.[33] And yet, very little is known about Native rights and religion in Canada, especially regarding the role of Pentecostalism. In fact, in Canada, Pentecostalism among aboriginal peoples did not become significant until the 1950s. By 2001 it was reported that 19,000 or 3.4 per cent of "Registered/Treaty Indians" identified themselves as Pentecostal (see Table 4). Another 35,000 Canadians with some aboriginal ancestry also claimed to be Pentecostal. While the number may not seem large, the rate of Pentecostalism among "Registered/Treaty Indians" is nearly three times that of the rest of the population (1.2 per cent).

Table 4: Percentage Distribution of Aboriginals as Pentecostals, 1931-1991

	1931	1941	1961	1971	1981	1991	2001
Aboriginal	0.08	0.1	1.1	2.1	3.3	4.0	3.4

Source: Derived from Census Canada, 1931, 1941, 1961, 1971, 1981, 1991, 2001.

Pentecostalism gained strength in native communities all across Canada including the northern regions. In the Far North, Inuit have adopted a charismatic Anglicanism, others have joined the Four Square church, and still others have formed independent Pentecostal congregations. The PAOC claimed over 100 aboriginal congregations by the end of

the 1980s. Despite these significant numbers very little is known about Pentecostalism among aboriginal peoples in Canada.

In an important study on aboriginal Pentecostalism in British Columbia, Robert Burkinshaw argues that Native Pentecostals played a prominent role in the development of Pentecostalism.[34] Even more interesting is the evidence for the prominent role of aboriginal peoples themselves in the establishing of Pentecostalism in British Columbia, despite the organizational efforts of the PAOC. Notwithstanding Burkinshaw's thorough account, there is still very little known about the unique theological expressions in the development of aboriginal Pentecostalism. There is very little known about the social consequences of aboriginal Pentecostalism including its public influence.

In another important study, Clint Westman conducted 14 months of field work among Cree Pentecostals in northern Alberta.[35] His research highlights the origins and development of Cree Pentecostalism from a minority group to its current status as a majority entity. Westman discusses the relationship between the Cree Pentecostals, the community, other evangelical Protestants, the broader network of Pentecostals, and the significance of Cree Pentecostalism both socially and politically. He also points to the lack of scholarly work on aboriginal Pentecostals arguing for ongoing research that examines the unique way in which Pentecostalism is contextualized among aboriginal peoples. Clearly, aboriginal Pentecostalism in Canada is a story yet to be told.

3. New Immigrant Pentecostals

Canadian Pentecostalism continues to change and is influenced by recent developments in migration.[36] Since the 1970s, when immigration policy began to allow for more immigrants from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, Pentecostalism in Canada has become increasingly culturally diverse. Research shows that the majority of new immigrants arriving in Canada are coming as Christians, and many of them are Pentecostals.[37] As a consequence, not only is Canadian Pentecostalism increasingly culturally diverse, but there are further changes to Canadian Pentecostalism, theologically, organizationally, and culturally. Yet, most denominational leaders seem to be unaware of the consequences of this new diversity. Furthermore, the contemporary and multicultural story of Pentecostalism is barely heard because of the ongoing debate over origins, especially, American holiness ones.

Table 5: Visible Minority Population for Pentecostals, 2001

Minority Group	Total
Chinese	2,595
South Asian	4,310
Black	47,595
Filipino	3,545
Latin American	5,730
Southeast Asian	535
Arab	150
West Asian	125
Korean	685
Japanese	330
Other Visible Minority	3,040
Multiple Responses	1,270
Total	69,910

Source: Derived from Census Canada, 2001.

Recent immigrant Pentecostals in the PAOC have struggled to be recognized as full partners. This struggle is illustrated through many misunderstandings that they are now working toward resolving. For example, in the 1990s denominational leaders did not understand to what extent these new immigrants were already Pentecostal with established viewpoints, theologies, mission practices, organizational polities, theological training, ministry experience, and global networks. Further, denominational leaders were unsure how to incorporate new immigrant Pentecostal leaders into their existing structures. However, in the past several years, some districts such as western Ontario have developed positions in cultural ministry where excellent leadership is given by those in the Korean Pentecostal community.[38]

Conclusion

The development of Pentecostalism in Canada is far more multicultural and global than recognized. Many immigrant Pentecostals who are not of British, French, and American origin have played a significant role in shaping the movement. Yet, researchers have not paid attention to their contributions. Even less so, researchers have not considered the unique cultural ways in which Pentecostalism was adopted by aboriginal peoples.

Today, with increased immigration from Africa, Asia, and Latin America, Pentecostalism in Canada is becoming even more culturally diverse. Yet, very little attention is paid to the role that immigration plays in Pentecostal origins or the contemporary context. This problem exists for a number of reasons. First, there are very few Canadian researchers examining Pentecostalism. Second, few researchers come from "Other European," aboriginal, Asian, Latin American, or African backgrounds. It is clear that Pentecostal studies in Canada are in need of research and support by academics, universities, and Pentecostal denominations in order to establish funding, collaboration, and a research agenda.

Endnotes

1. See Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, especially *The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups*, vol. 4 (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970).

2. See Leo Driedger, *Multi-Ethnic Canada: Identities & Inequalities* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1996), 106-08; Augie Fleras and Jean Leonard Elliot, *Unequal Relations: An Introduction to Race and Ethnic Dynamics in Canada* (Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall, 2003), 291.

3. This point is made most recently by Paul Bramadat and David Seljak, eds., *Christianity and Ethnicity in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008).

4. My perspective is shaped by the following: Allan Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Peter Beyer, "Defining Religion in Cross-National Perspective: Identity and Difference in Official Conceptions," in *Defining Religion: Investigating the Boundaries Between the Sacred and Secular*, eds. Arthur Greil and David G. Bromley (New York: Elsevier, 2003), 163-88; and David Daniels, "'Everybody Bids You Welcome': A Multicultural Approach to North American Pentecostalism," in *The Globalization of Pentecostalism: A Religion Made to Travel*, eds. Murray W. Dempster, Byron D. Klaus, and Douglas Petersen (Oxford: Regnum, 1999), 222-52. Also see Michael Wilkinson, "What is 'Global' about Global Pentecostalism?" *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 17 (2008): 1-13.

5. Roland Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* (London, UK: Sage, 1992), 59; and Stephen Castles and Mark J. Miller, *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*, 3rd ed. (New York: Guildford Press, 2003).

6. Peter Kivisto, *Incorporating Diversity: Rethinking Assimilation in a Multicultural Age* (Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2005).

7. Stephen Cornell and Douglas Hartmann, *Ethnicity and Race: Making Identities in a Changing World*, 2nd ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 2007).

8. Steve Fenton, *Ethnicity* (London, UK: Polity Press, 2003).

9. Augie Fleras and Jean Leonard Elliott, *Engaging Diversity: Multiculturalism in Canada*, 2d ed. (Toronto: Nelson Thomson, 2002).

10. Paul Bramadat and David Seljak, eds., *Religion and Ethnicity in Canada* (Toronto: Pearson Longman, 2005).

11. Paul Bramadat and David Seljak, "Toward a New Story about Religion and Ethnicity in Canada," in *Religion and Ethnicity in Canada*, 222-34.

12. Paul Bramadat and David Seljak, "Charting the New Terrain: Christianity and Ethnicity in Canada," in *Christianity and Ethnicity in Canada*, 3.

13. Bruce Guenther, "Ethnicity and Evangelical Protestants in Canada," in *Christianity and Ethnicity in Canada*, 378.

14. Charles Lemert, "Multiculturalism" in *Handbook of Social Theory*, ed. George Ritzer and Barry Smart (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2001), 297-307.

15. Lemert, "Multiculturalism," 306.

16. Gloria Kulbeck, *What God Hath Wrought: A History of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada* (Toronto: The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, 1958); Gordon Atter, *Rivers of Blessing* (Toronto: Full Gospel Publishing House, 1960); Gordon Atter, *The Third Force*, 3rd ed. (Caledonia, ON: ACTS Books, 1970); Thomas W. Miller, *Ripe for Revival: The Churches at the Crossroads of Renewal of Decline* (Burlington, ON: Welch, 1984); Thomas W. Miller, *Canadian Pentecostals: A History of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada* (Mississauga, ON: Full Gospel Publishing House, 1994); Ronald A.N. Kydd, "Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada" in *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, eds. Stanley M. Burgess and Gary B. McGee (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1988), 695-99; Ronald A.N. Kydd, "Canadian Pentecostalism and the Evangelical Impulse," in *Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Impulse*, ed. G.A. Rawlyk (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997), 289-300, 491-95; Ronald A.N. Kydd, "Canada," in *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, eds. Stanley M. Burgess and Eduard van der Maas (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2002), 48-51; and Kydd, "Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada," in *New International Dictionary*, 961-64.

17. Atter, *Rivers of Blessing*, 5.

18. Grant Wacker, *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).

19. Kydd, "Canadian Pentecostalism and the Evangelical Impulse," 289.

20. Michael Di Giacomo, "Pentecostal and Charismatic Christianity in Canada: Its Origins, Development, and Distinct Culture," in *Canadian Pentecostalism: Transition and Transformation*, ed. Michael Wilkinson (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2009), 15-38.

21. Kydd, "Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada," 695.

22. American immigrants shaped Canadian Pentecostalism, but so did the Germans, Ukrainians, Russians, Italians, and Scandinavians. William E. Mann's account of religious culture in Alberta tells us that many groups from the United States were established in Alberta including the Pentecostals; many others were Hutterites, Doukhobors, Jehovah's Witnesses, Baptists, Nazarenes, Free Methodists, and Evangelical Free. There were also many groups with connections to revivals in Europe. Many German, Slavic, Russian, and Scandinavian Pentecostals entered Canada. Canada experienced massive immigration in the early twentieth century. What is not told in the story is that most of the immigrants were from Eastern Europe. Mann states that "in the early depression years it [the PAOC] opened up German-speaking churches in the south of Edmonton and also attracted numbers of Scandinavians and Ukrainians" (see *Sect, Cult and Church in Alberta* [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1955], 19-20).

23. Thomas Miller, "The Canadian Azusa: The Hebden Mission in Toronto," *Pneuma* 8, no. 1 (1986): 5-29.

24. Gary B. McGee, "'Latter Rain' Falling in the East: Early-Twentieth-Century Pentecostalism in India and the Debate over Speaking in Tongues" *Church History* 68, no. 3 (1999) 648-65; Allan Anderson, *Spreading Fires: The Missionary Nature of Early Pentecostalism* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2007); and Edith L. Blumhofer, "Consuming Fire: Pandita Ramabai and the Global Pentecostal Impulse" in *Interpreting Contemporary Christianity: Global Processes and Local Identities*, eds. Ogbu U. Kalu and Alaine Low (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008).

25. Michael Wilkinson, "Canadian Pentecostalism: An Introduction," in *Canadian Pentecostalism*, 3-12.

26. Ethnic origin refers to the ethnic or cultural group(s) to which the respondents' ancestors belong. Immigrant population refers to persons who are, or have been, landed immigrants in Canada. A landed immigrant is a person who is not a Canadian citizen by birth, but who has been granted the right to live in Canada permanently by Canadian immigration authorities.

27. Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, General Constitution, 1968: Article XI.

28. Miller, *Canadian Pentecostals*, 201.

29. See D. Ippolito, *Origin and History of the Italian Pentecostal Church of Canada* (Toronto: IPCC, 1986).

30. See Arthur Drewitz, *History of the German Branch of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada* (Kitchener, ON: German Branch, 1986); Horst Doberstein, ed., *Grace and Glory: The story of the German Branch of the Pentecostals Assemblies of Canada* (Kitchener, ON: German Branch, 1990); Horst Doberstein, *Alberta District: Our Heritage* (Alberta District, German Branch, 1992); and Julius Schatkowski, *Rev. Julius Schatkowski: Autobiography, 1889-1974* (Alberta District, German Branch, nd).

31. Drewitz, *History of the German Branch*, 8.

32. Drewitz, *History of the German Branch*, 2; and Doberstein, *Grace and Glory*.

33. While living in Ottawa in the 1990s, I attended the same congregation as Matthew Coon Come and came to know his deep commitment to his faith.

34. Robert K. Burkinshaw, "Native Pentecostalism in British Columbia," in *Canadian Pentecostalism*, 142-70.

35. Clint Westman, "Understanding Cree Religious Discourse" (Ph.D diss., University of Alberta, 2008).

36. I have written extensively on the implications of new immigrants for Canadian Pentecostalism elsewhere: see Michael Wilkinson, "The Globalization of Pentecostalism: The Role of Asian Immigrant Pentecostals in Canada," *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 3 (2000) 219-26; and Michael Wilkinson, *The Spirit Said Go: Pentecostal Immigrants in Canada* (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2006).

37. See Reginald Bibby, "Canada's Mythical Religious Mosaic: Some Census Findings," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 39 (2000): 235-39; and Census Canada, 2001 "Religions in Canada."

38. Interview with Jacob Joo by Michael Wilkinson, 2007.

Thomas Merton, Prophet of the New Monasticism

PAUL R. DEKAR
Memphis Theological Seminary

In the 1960s, Thomas Merton (1915-1968), monk of the Cistercian (Trappist) Abbey of Our Lady of Gethsemani in Kentucky, described the contours of a "new monasticism" that would be simple, natural and nourished by the Bible and contemplation. Merton anticipated emerging lay contemplatives pointing to the moral decay of affluent society, manifesting Christ in society and helping create a "better world."[1]

This presentation explores Merton's call for Christian monastic renewal adapted to new contexts. The word monastery refers to communities of men or women or of men, women and couples with children living in the monastery. The word "monk" refers to male and female monastics. Among the vows a monk commits herself or himself to is chastity, a commitment that is understood as sexual purity and, possibly, but not necessarily, celibacy. Historically, Catholic and Protestant houses have provided for dispersed members called lay associates, companions or Benedictine *oblates*. As in earlier times, *oblates* respond to awareness that God has called them to a life-profession and share in the practices a specific house: prayer, study, work and service of God and neighbour

Contours of a "New Monasticism" in Merton's Writings

With publication of *The Seven Story Mountain* (1948), a narrative of his life from his birth (1915) to the year he made his solemn vows (1947), Thomas Merton fuelled a spirituality revolution. Readers of many nationalities, races, or religions found a mirror by which they could see

their story in Merton's. Although he later repudiated the book as it portrayed monks as persons who fled from the world, he continued to write about what he found attractive about the monastic life: liturgy, study, the practice of *lectio* (time spent in personal interaction with God's Word), silence, formation, conversion of life, a rhythm of prayer and work, contemplation and action; as well, he continued to examine areas that needed to be rethought to meet the problem of identity and authenticity of contemporary contemplatives.[2] Acknowledging that not everyone drawn to a life of prayer would become a monk, Merton saw the contemplative life as of great importance for everyone.

In *What Is Contemplation?* (1948) Merton wrote, "The seeds of this perfect life [contemplation] are planted in every Christian soul at Baptism. But seeds must grow and develop before you reap the harvest."[3] In this early pamphlet, Merton expressed concern about quietists who are "empty . . . of all love and all knowledge and remain inert in a kind of spiritual vacuum." In contrast with such selfishness true contemplatives let go of all care and, trusting God, allow the brightness of Jesus to shine in their lives.[4]

In *Seeds of Contemplation* (1949) Merton counselled anyone wanting to lead a contemplative life to pursue the love of God, which includes all other ends, by finding time and space to unfetter oneself from the world.[5]

In *Monastic Peace* (1958), Merton highlighted major signs of aptitude for the monastic life: openness to *metanoia*, a complete change of heart and conversion of life; seeking and finding God in inchoate and mysterious ways; self renunciation; willingness to be guided and governed by the common will ordinarily determined by the Rule and the Abbot; public and private meditative prayer; spiritual poverty; normal physical and mental health. Merton sounded a cautionary, and later a loud refrain: often the monastic life is too busy, making it difficult to maintain a healthy balance between contemplation and action.[6]

In 1958, in notes on contemplation recently published as *The Inner Experience*, Merton reflected two areas of growth in his own experience, a preoccupation with the dark side of modern life and an appreciation of eastern writings and contemplative practices. Merton expressed surprise ". . . that contemplative monasteries are content simply to receive individuals as retreatants, encourage them to receive frequent Communion and make the Way of the Cross, but do not do more to form groups . . . who could help and support one another . . . a kind of contemplative Third

Order . . . the most significant development of the contemplative life 'in the world' is the growth of small groups of men and women who live in every way like the laypeople around them, except for the fact that they are dedicated to God and focus all their life of work and poverty upon a contemplative center."[7]

In the early 1960s, in his journals and with a number of correspondents, Merton wrote of a need for monastic renewal. In a letter dated July 28, 1961 to Pierre Van der Meer, a Benedictine scholar of Beuron Abbey and part of a circle who frequented the home of Merton's friends Jacques and Raissa Maritain, Merton observed,

> The world has changed much since my entry into the monastery. It is no longer the society which I lately know, the world of my youth, of my parents. I think of myself as an exile two times, three times over. The way toward the Homeland becomes more and more obscure. As I look back over the stages which were once more clear, I see that we are all on the right road, and though it be night, it is a saving one.[8]

Merton identified at least three directions that such revitalization should take. First, he was concerned about emphasis on the institution as such, expressed in such ways as a preoccupation with the practices of specific orders. To Father Ronald Roloff of St. John's, a Benedictine abbey in Collegeville, Minnesota, Merton wrote that as Novice Master, "I feel myself obligated to instruct the novices not in a fanciful 'Cistercian spirituality' but to try as best I can . . . to give them a *monastic* formation in elements which are *common* to us all. I have never found it relevant to stress the fact that we don't have parishes and that you do . . . You are monks, we are monks. The big thing is, do we really seek God?"[9]

Second, Merton encouraged those orientated to a contemplative life to withdraw to places apart. To Sister Elaine M. Bane and a small band of Franciscan Sisters of Allegany, New York, he wrote,

> Remember that in the enclosed and solitary life, your solitude itself will do an immense amount for you. The sisters need not strain and struggle and worry too much about "degrees" of prayer. The great thing is to be emptied out, to taste and see that the Lord is sweet, and to learn the way of abandonment and peace. Littleness is the chief characteristic of the solitary . . . the gift to be silent and simple with the Lord is a treasure . . .[10]

A third feature of Merton's understanding of monastic renewal was the need on the part of small contemplative communities for opportunities to dialogue with members of surrounding society while preserving their life of prayer.[11] For Merton, openness to the world entailed a willingness to speak out on issues as such war and the threat of nuclear annihilation, and also to relate to adherents of other religions. In a letter to Aelred Graham, whose book *Zen Catholicism* had been reviewed favourably in *America*, Merton characterized Zen as "a life-saver for many people, here at the exhausted end of an era in which thinking has been dominated by Cartesiansism . . . We have to *be* real, not just mean to be."[12]

In a letter dated 21 October 1962 to Father Roloff, Merton worried about the business of his own house, and of many other monasteries: "There is overwork here as well as anywhere else. We lose people who go into work too deeply." Noting that at Gethsemani, a "very top-heaving schedule full of extra offices and community exercises has been considerably alleviated . . . [yet] a lot of people have taken advantage of this leeway to waste time diddling around." Merton concluded, "There *is* a monastic revival going on. One may well be dubious about its ambiguities and its numerous false pretenses, but the reality is nevertheless there."[13]

For Merton, monastic renewal was needed to enable those exploring monastic spirituality to go to the heart of the monastic life, *metanoia*, inner transformation and newness of life. Merton was encouraged by the convening of Vatican II (1962-1965) and took an active interest in its proceedings. Of the issues discussed at the Council, those that most concerned Merton were war and the relationship of Christians with the non-Christian religions. On 12 November 1963, Merton observed in his journal that some curia officials were "asses . . . parading and gesticulating, proclaiming ten thousand programs."[14] Generally, however, Merton was pleased with the Council. Merton welcomed what he understood as a remarkable shift of emphasis in *Lumen Gentium*, the Constitution on the Church, which shifted focus from the hierarchical nature of institution to the church as a community of the faithful.[15] He felt *Pefectae Caritatis*, the decree on the renewal of the religious life, emboldened monks to question the basic institutional structures of the religious life along lines he advocated.[16]

During the early 1960s, desiring greater silence, stillness and solitude, Merton began spending more time at a hermitage near the monastery. On 20 August 1965, Merton was relieved of responsibilities at the monastery and became a full-time hermit. Apart from attending Mass,

having a meal or getting his mail, Merton spent more and more time at the hermitage and expected eventually to end his days there.[17] Barred from writing about social issues, Merton gave increased attention to monastic renewal. In articles collected in a book prepared for publication on the eve of his departure for Asia in October 1968, *Contemplation in a World of Action*, Merton reiterated the main areas needing renewal: de-institutionalization; more time and place for silence; a balanced life; and insistence that contemplatives understand the crucial problems of the day including "race, war, genocide, starvation, injustice, revolution."[18] Merton acknowledged, "Fortunately there are creative forces at work. There are communities and superiors who are fully aware of the real nature of the monastic vocation not simply as a summons to become a cog in an institutional machine, but as a charismatic breakthrough to liberation and love."[19] In the title essay, Merton summarizes his own experience of contemplation in a way that has proved visionary for the new generation of monastics:

> Real Christian living is stunted and frustrated if it remains content with the bare externals of worship, with "saying prayers" and "going to church," with fulfilling one's external duties and merely being respectable. The real purpose of prayer . . . is the deepening of personal realization in love, the awareness of God . . . the exploration and discovery of new dimensions in freedom, illumination and love, in deepening our awareness of our life in Christ.
>
> What is the relation of this to action? Simply this. He who attempts to act and do things for others or for the world without deepening his own self-understanding, freedom, integrity and capacity to love, will not have anything to give others . . .
>
> [P]rayer and meditation have an important part to play in opening up new ways and new horizons. If our prayer is the expression of a deep and grace-inspired desire for newness of life – and not the mere blind attachment to what has always been familiar and "safe" – God will act in us and through us to renew the Church by preparing, in prayer, what we cannot yet imagine or understand. In this way our prayer and faith today will be oriented toward the future which we ourselves may never see fully realized on earth.[20]

Rise of a New Monasticism

Today, few are inclined to follow Merton to a cloistered life. Yet

"hidden contemplatives," laity "of the sort most remote from cloistered life, like Thoreau or Emily Dickinson" still read Merton whose appeal for a new generation of monastics is manifest in three contemporary currents.[21] For Catholics, the reforms of Vatican II have given impetus to many changes. Monasteries that had once existed almost independent of other recognized institutions have embraced more porous boundaries. Lay vocations outnumber traditional vocations. Over the past ten years, for example, the number of Benedictine oblates has grown by 75 per cent. Single or married, these lay monastics seek to live the teachings of Christ as interpreted by St. Benedict and in association with specific Benedictine houses. Integrating the rhythm of prayer, study and work within their chosen way of life, oblates generally live near the monasteries and participate in their liturgies, an annual retreat or monthly meetings, each activity designed to strengthen religious commitment.[22]

As for other orders, there are over 700,000 third-order Franciscans worldwide and growing numbers of Cistercian lay associates that claim the Cistercian charism as a gift of the Holy Spirit bestowed not solely on those who live within monastic enclosures. "We feel it is the gift of a 'way of life' that can be as appropriate for a layperson living in the world as it is for a monk or a nun living in a monastery."[23] Some are active with local chapters of the International Thomas Merton Society.

New forms of Catholic community have developed. Examples are Catholic Worker Houses that continue ministries initiated by Dorothy Day (1897-1980) and Peter Maurin (1877-1949) or the Little Portion Community located at Berryville in northwest Arkansas, rooted in the Franciscan tradition. Two movements have Canadian origins. In 1946 Catherine de Hueck Doherty (1896-1985) and Eddie Doherty (1890-1975) co-founded Madonna House at Combermere three hundred fifty kilometres northeast of Toronto. Fusing Orthodox and Catholic spirituality, Madonna House inspires community members worldwide with a commitment to social ministry out of a life of prayer in the spirit of Christ. In 1964 Jean Vanier (b. 1928) created the first L'Arche community at Trosly Breuil in France. Members care for the disabled in houses around the world.

A second sign of monastic renewal is the vitality of Protestant monasteries. Prominent among them are the sisters of Grandchamp in French-speaking Switzerland, the brothers of Taizé in France and the brothers of Bose in Italy. In Orleans, Massachusetts, the Community of Jesus draws from Baptist, Presbyterian and Episcopalian roots, is richly observant of the traditional praxis of the church, evangelizes through the

arts and succours those who come to it, even as it reaches out to those who need but cannot come.[24] This is noteworthy as Luther, Calvin and other early Protestants rejected the institution.

A third sign of monastic renewal is the emergence of intentional communities that draw on older traditions of monasticism yet embody features of what Merton characterized as a new monasticism. Those called to communal life find strength and liberation in a rhythm of contemplation and action. Some offer alternative seminary formation similar to the Confessing Church's "House of the Brethren" described by Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906-1945) in *Life Together,* a book that remains a powerful tract for our time.[25] Examples include the Caritas Community in Memphis, Tennessee, modeled on the Church of the Saviour in Washington DC; the Open Door Community, a Presbyterian residential community in Atlanta, formed in the Catholic Worker tradition; the Simple Way and New Jerusalem in Philadelphia and the Common Life Community based at Five Oaks, a retreat centre of the United Church of Canada located in Paris, Ontario. No inventory exists from which to estimate numbers, but new monastic communities have attracted attention.[26]

Over ten years ago, Jonathan R. Wilson, who holds the Pioneer McDonald Chair in Theology at Carey Theological College in Vancouver, British Columbia, discussed the call of prophets like Merton to construct local forms of community within which life can be sustained through the new "Dark Ages," which some believe are already upon us. Wilson wrote that we should pray, hope, and work for a form of life that would be continuous with the old monasticism in some respects, and discontinuous in other respects.

Wilson urged that Christians reverse the capitulation of the church to the Enlightenment project and return to the living tradition of the gospel. He outlined four marks that would be needed by a new movement to sustain faithful witness: a desire to heal the fragmentation of our lives in North American culture; a way for the whole people of God; discipline; and practices and virtues by which an undisciplined, unfaithful church might recover the discipline and faithfulness necessary to realize its mission in the world.

Wilson acknowledged that theological commitment and reflection must undergird a new monasticism. Right theology will not of itself produce a faithful church, which he characterized as the faithful living out the mission given to them by God in Jesus Christ, but that mission can be identified only by faithful theology. "So, in the new monasticism we must

strive simultaneously for a recovery of right belief and right practice."[27]

Wilson was describing an insight that theological reflection informs practice; conversely, practices shape theological reflection. As in the Second Testament, following Jesus today entails doing what he taught. "Just as I have loved you, you also should love one another. By this everyone will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another (John 13:34-35)." For Paul, faith was lifeless without love (1 Cor 13-14). For James, faith without works was dead (James 2:26). In the fourth century, Evagrius of Pontas wrote, "If you are a theologian, you will pray truly. And if you pray truly, you are a theologian."[28] Medieval Christians summarized in Latin, *lex orandi, lex credendi*, the law of prayer and belief.

Soon, Wilson's daughter and son-in-law, Leah and Jonathan Wilson-Hartgrove, helped found a new monastic community in Durham, North Carolina. Rutba House is one of a number of communities of Christians who think the church in western society has accommodated itself too easily to the consumerist and imperialist values of the culture. Responding to a call to enter more deeply into the pain of the world, many persons in the United States and elsewhere are on journey similar to that of my own Community of the Transfiguration, joining in prayer, simplicity of life and service to the poor.

In June 2004, Rutba House hosted a gathering of friends from around the country to discern the shape of a radical movement called the new monasticism. Out of the gathering came a book. Introduced by Jonathan R. Wilson, it offers strategic guidance for the movement. The new monasticism is diverse in form and characterized by these twelve marks:

> Relocation to the abandoned places of Empire;
> Sharing economic resources with fellow community members and the needy among us;
> Hospitality to the stranger;
> Lament for racial divisions within the church and our communities combined with the active pursuit of a just reconciliation;
> Humble submission to Christ's body, the church;
> Intentional formation in the way of Christ and the rule of the community along the lines of the old novitiate;
> Nurturing common life among members of intentional community;
> Support for celibate singles alongside monogamous married couples and their children;

Geographical proximity to community members who share a common rule of life;
Care for the plot of God's earth given to us along with support of our local economies;
Peacemaking amidst of violence and conflict resolution within communities along the lines of Matthew 18;
Commitment to a disciplined contemplative life.[29]

The new monastics are unified not by a shared theological tradition or denomination, but rather by the wisdom of a shared legacy, an overcoming of any division between the Marthas and Marys of the cloister and a spirituality that can shape the Christian life in post-modern society. Drawing on older traditions, they are living signs of God's presence in prophetic action, the re-shaping of Christian community and interfaith dialogue. One suspects the spirit of Merton is smiling upon them.

Concluding Reflections

Monasteries and intentional communities have played several positive roles in eastern and western Christianity. Sometimes monasteries have provided a place of safety or even survival. Emerging at a time when the wider culture collapsed, Benedictine monasticism provides an example. However, monasteries cannot be regarded primarily as places of flight or withdrawal. The monastic life is not an option for someone trying to escape her or his problems.

Monasticism is highly counter-cultural. Monasteries, or monastic-like communities, have at times been prophetic, witnessing to a culture in which discipleship has been difficult if not impossible. The confessing church movement in Germany with its clandestine seminary at Finkenwalde offers an example.

Monasteries have also served the role of generating renewal. During recent decades, the reform of traditional monasticism within the Catholic and Orthodox traditions, the emergence of ecumenical monasteries rooted in the Protestant reform tradition and the stirring of a new monasticism is providing sensitive and thoughtful people new ways to live as Christians.

The idea of redeeming time is a way to understand what is happening to monasticism in the west early in the twenty-first century. Every four hundred years or so Christian churches of the west have experienced an upsurge in monasticism. Today, if warnings about the effects of global warming and other environmental issues are realized, thoughtful critics

envision a transformation or collapse of civilization as we know it. The new monastics are preserving in post-modern, secular society not only a living tradition that has prospered in western society for nearly two millennia, but also a fresh vision of life's final meaning and a new spiritual direction by which an emerging generation of religious seekers may come into relationship with that meaning. Largely an urban phenomenon, the new monastics are multiplying around the world.

What is happening has led observers of the contemporary religious scene in North America to characterize the new monasticism or congregational monasticism as a framework by which the "practicing church" can give Christians in general and those involved in intentional community a revolutionary way to live more faithfully and to resist such aspects of western culture antithetical to Christianity such as individualism, materialism and anti-intellectualism.

Fifty years ago, living out of his Trappist vocation, Thomas Merton began to delineate the contours of a new monasticism through the growth of lay associations, the interest of Protestants in monasticism and the emergence of new forms of monastic community. Having abetted a veritable tsunami of interest in dialogue, contemplation and community, Merton called for ". . . the cultivation of a certain *quality* of life, a level of awareness, a depth of consciousness, an area of transcendence and of adoration which are not usually possible in an active secular existence" on the part of a generation seeking to be free from what William Faulkner called "'the same frantic steeplechase toward nothing' which is the essence of 'worldliness' everywhere."[30] While neither contemplation, nor action by itself, can guarantee the nurture of a the life envisioned by Merton, the mindful uniting of these two on the part of the new monastic communities offers a promising way by which Christians rooted in the messianic lifestyle of Jesus and the early disciples may address the challenges of post-modern living.

Endnotes

1. Thomas Merton, *Contemplation in a World of Action*, intro. Jean Leclercq (New York: Doubleday, 1971; pb. 1973), 31/166 and 13/148. In 1998, the University of Notre Dame Press reissued the book with a foreword by Robert Coles and without three sections: Jean Leclercq's introduction, two appendices to the original part I, and the original part 2. Hereafter, *CWA*, paging for the 1973 and 1998 editions.

2. Merton, CWA, 70, 53; and Lawrence S. Cunningham, *Thomas Merton and the Monastic Vision* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 191.

3. Thomas Merton, *What Is Contemplation?* (Notre Dame: St. Mary's College, 1948), 17.

4. Merton, *What Is Contemplation?* 71-7.

5. Thomas Merton, *Seeds of Contemplation* (Norfolk: New Directions, 1949), 60-61; and Merton, "Learn To Be Alone," *New Seeds of Contemplation* (New York: New Directions, 1962), 80-83.

6. Thomas Merton, *The Monastic Journey*, ed. Patrick Hart (Garden City: Image, 1978), 109, 114-17, 145ff.

7. Thomas Merton, *The Inner Experience. Notes on Contemplation*, ed. William H. Shannon (San Francisco: Harper, 2003), 136-7, 142.

8. Thomas Merton, *The School of Charity: Letters on Religious Renewal and Spiritual Direction*, ed. Patrick Hart (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1990), 139.

9. Letter dated 26 September 1962 (emphasis Merton's), in Merton, *The School of Charity*, 147.

10. Letter dated 4 July 1962, in Merton, *The School of Charity*, 145.

11. Letter dated 5 April 1963 to Archbishop Paul Philippe, then Secretary of the Vatican's Sacred Congregation for Religious, in Merton, *The School of Charity*, 165.

12. Letter dated 24 April 1963, emphasis Merton's), in Merton, *The School of Charity*, 167.

13. Merton, *The School of Charity*, 150-1 (emphasis Merton's).

14. Thomas Merton, *Dancing in the Water of Life: Seeking Peace in the Hermitage*, ed. Robert E. Daggy, Journals of Thomas Merton, vol. 5 (San Francisco: Harper, 1997) 34.

15. Merton, *CWA*, 135; and William H. Shannon, "The Second Vatican Council," *The Thomas Merton Encyclopedia* (New York: Orbis, 2002).

16. Merton, *CWA*, 23. His essay "Dialogue and Renewal" in this volume discusses the decree at length.

17. Thomas Merton, *Other Side of the Mountain: The End of the Journey*, ed. Patrick Hart, Journals of Thomas Merton, vol. 7 (San Francisco: Harper 1999), 282.

18. Merton, *CWA*, 216.

19. Merton, *CWA*, 41.

20. Merton, *CWA*, 176-7.

21. Thomas Merton, "Notes on a Philosophy of Solitude," *Disputed Questions* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1960), 177.

22. Linda Kulzer, "Monasticism beyond the Walls," *Benedict in the World*, eds. Linda Kulzer and Roberta Bondi (Collegeville: Liturgical, 2002), 5; and John Michael Talbot, "Call," http://www.johnmichaeltalbot.com/Reflections/index.asp?id=155 (accessed May 2008).

23. Eleven Lay Associates, "A Lay Response to the Reflections of Dom Bernardo Olivera on Charismatic Associations," *Cistercian Studies Quarterly* 32 (1997): 235-36.

24. Phyllis Tickle, Foreword in *Community of the Transfiguration: The Journey of a New Monastic Community*, by Paul R. Dekar (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2008), xi.

25. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Life Together*, trans. with an introduction by John W. Doberstein (New York: Harper & Row, 1954).

26. www.newmonasticism.org (accessed May 2008); Jason Byassee, "The New Monastics. Alternate Christian Communities," *Christian Century* 122, no. 21 (18 October 2005): 38-47; and Rob Moll, "The New Monasticism," *Christianity Today* 49 (September 2005): 38-46.

27. Jonathan R. Wilson, *Living Faithfully in a Fragmented World: Lessons for the Church from MacIntyre's After Virtue* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997), 76.

28. Evagrius, "On Prayer, *Philokalia*, 1, 62; cited in Holy Transfiguration Monastery, *The Beacons* (Breakwater, n.d.), 19; and Cunningham, *Merton and the Monastic Vision*, 188.

29. Rutba House, ed., *School(s) for Conversion: 12 Marks of a New Monasticism* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2005), xii-xiii; and interview with Leah and Jonathan Wilson-Hartgrove, Durham, NC, 14 June 2008.

30. Merton, *CWA*, 27 (emphasis Merton's).

Balthasar Hubmaier and the Authority of the Church Fathers

ANDREW P. KLAGER

In Anabaptist historical scholarship, the reluctance to investigate the authority of the church fathers for individual sixteenth-century Anabaptist leaders does not appear to be intentional. Indeed, more pressing issues of a historiographical and even apologetical nature have been a justifiable priority,[1] and soon this provisional Anabaptist vision was augmented by studies assessing the possibility of various medieval chronological antecedents.[2] However, in response to Kenneth Davis' important study, *Anabaptism and Asceticism*, Peter Erb rightly observed back in 1976 that ". . . one must not fail to review the abiding influence of the Fathers . . . [whose] monitions were much more familiar to our sixteenth-century ancestors than they are to us."[3]

Over thirty years later, the Anabaptist community still awaits its first published comprehensive study of the reception of the church fathers among Anabaptist leaders in the sixteenth century.[4] A natural place to start, however, is the only doctor of theology in the Anabaptist movement, Balthasar Hubmaier. In the final analysis, it becomes evident that Hubmaier does view the church fathers as authoritative, contextually understood, for some theological issues that were important to him, notably his anthropology and understanding of the freedom of the will, while he acknowledged the *value* of the church fathers for the corollary of free will, that is, believers' baptism, and this for apologetico-historical purposes. This authority, however, cannot be confused with an untested, blind conformity to prescribed precepts because such a definition of authority did not exist in the sixteenth-century, even among the strongest

admirers of the fathers. Authority for Hubmaier is set against his perception of the inflated authority of the papacy and unjustified authority of the scholastic theologians yet in compliance with a particularly stringent biblical hermeneutic. The result is a surprisingly high level of ratification of the Greek fathers specifically that has not yet been conceded among Anabaptist historians.[5]

General Context and Conditions

Because Hubmaier's growing humanist proclivities are in continuity with the general ethos of the Italian renaissance a generation or two before, not in intensity or comprehensiveness but in his solidarity with its methodological and ideological direction, it becomes necessary to explore the transmission of patristic texts from Byzantium into the translating flurry of the Italian renaissance and subsequently into northern Europe. In the first place, therefore, one must identify which writings of the church fathers were at least available to Hubmaier. In 1961, Paul Kristeller observed, "[I]t would be an interesting question, which to my knowledge has not yet been explored, whether or to what extent the newly diffused ideas of these Greek authors exercised an influence on the theological discussions and controversies of the Reformation period."[6] For our purposes, it is the events surrounding the Council of Florence-Ferrara in 1438 to 1439 and the fall of Constantinople in 1453, and in particular the translating activities in Florence, Venice, and on the island of Crete, that are most pertinent to a study of available patristic texts.

Commonly recognized as the Italian scholar most interested in translating the Greek fathers into Latin during the quattrocento, Ambrogio Traversari,[7] secured manuscripts from various libraries and translated treatises, letters, and sermons by Basil of Caesarea, Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Ephraem the Syrian, Pseudo-Dionysius, and his favourite, John Chrysostom as well as John Climacus' monastic classic, *The Ladder of Divine Ascent*.[8] Similar translating activity was undertaken by Leonardo Bruni,[9] the pupil of Michael Chrysoloras, and Niccolò de' Niccoli,[10] who was instrumental in the debates of the Council of Florence. Lorenzo Valla translated some of Basil's homilies,[11] and Theodore Gaza translated writings of the church fathers at the request of Pope Nicholas V.[12] The Cretan, George of Trebizond, translated works by Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, John Chrysostom, and Eusebius' *De praeparatio evangel ica*, which was printed in Venice in 1470 bereft of any of its more Arian

undertones. Trebizond also translated works by Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, and Basil of Caesarea, and in particular his important *Contra Eunomium*.[13] John Argyropoulos translated the very important *Hexameron* of St. Basil,[14] while the homilies, orations, and poems of Gregory Nazian zen occupied the time and translating energy of both Marcus Musurus,[15] and the Cretan copyist, John Simeonachis,[16] the former's translations being printed at the famous Venetian press run by Aldus Manutius who himself printed some of Origen's homilies and John of Damascus' hymns.[17] Verona of Guarino, Bessarion, Michael Chrysoloras, and Pietro Balbo of Pisa, among others, took up other translating projects as well.[18]

Addressing the reception of such translating efforts north of the Alps, Kristeller is keen to point out that "it seems safe to infer that [Erasmus] was familiar with the precedent [that the Italian humanists and Greek émigré scholars] had established as translators of Greek patristic writings."[19] These connections and this precedent, as is well known, helped compel Erasmus to produce some of the most important and impressive patristic translations and editions known to that time.[20] As well, from 1499 to 1520, Jacque Lefèvre d'Etaples and his circle of humanist scholars in Paris turned their attention to the fathers via Italian humanist intermediaries, as Eugene Rice contends, and made them more widely available as a result.[21] Two other northern humanist scholars with whom Hubmaier came into contact and corresponded and who concerned themselves with the church fathers are Beatus Rhenanus and Johannes Oecolampadius.[22] Beatus also interacted with the fathers by way of Peter Lombard's *Sentences* and Gratian's *Decretum*, producing an edition of the latter in 1511. This is significant since both of these works contain extensive citations of the church fathers, the latter on which Hubmaier especially depended as his own writings demonstrate.[23]

Balthasar Hubmaier's Access And Exposure To The Church Fathers

Hubmaier was exposed to the church fathers initially while a student at the universities of Freiburg-im-Breisgau and Ingolstadt, and later through contacts with noted humanist scholars who were either interested in the fathers orwho produced patristic editions of their own.[24] Although a markedly complicated matter, as a conduit for a specific kind of patristic awareness, humanism and the emerging *studia humanitatis* curriculum was nevertheless certainly at least a matter requiring attention at both universities from the beginning, as the university statutes, the hiring on of

prominent humanist professors, and the inclusion of humanist grammar manuals and classical literature in their library inventories can attest.[25] Their library indices also contain the writings of the church fathers that one might expect for sixteenth-century Roman Catholic universities,[26] while Hubmaier's patristic education developed predominantly under the tutelage of his mentor and eclectic theologian, Johannes Eck.[27] Eddie Mabry suggests that Eck familiarized Hubmaier with "humanism, scholasticism and nominalism, and late medieval Augustinianism."[28] Each of these Hubmaier was to either embrace or overtly reject, adding further elements to consider when evaluating his understanding of the authority of the fathers.

Humanism's imprint on Hubmaier's growing interest in the fathers and acknowledgement of their value is most palpable in the personal contacts that he accrued throughout his life. As a student at Freiburg, Hubmaier attended lectures by leading humanists Urbanus Rhegius and Johann Faber. While the cathedral preacher in Regensburg, Hubmaier met another humanist in Wolfgang Rychard, the two becoming very good friends. At Waldshut, Hubmaier wrote to Johannes Sapidus, with whom he maintained a close friendship. And, in July of 1522, Hubmaier wrote a letter to Johann Adelphi, a colleague of Rychard's in Ulm, in which he states that he had journeyed to Basel and met and struck friendships with Erasmus,[29] Heinrich Glarean, Konrad Pelikan, Beatus Rhenanus and other humanists.[30] He also corresponded regularly with both Oecolampadius and Zwingli. What is especially important here is both Hubmaier's growing interest in humanism and the possibility that he may have received editions of the church fathers from these humanists, particularly from Erasmus and Rhenanus in Basel and even more likely, acquiring copies of Oecolampadius' printed patristic editions during his sojourn in Augsburg on the way from Zürich to Nikolsburg.

As a result, Hubmaier was indebted to humanism's fascination with classical Christianity and *ad fontes* method for renewal, wherewith Hubmaier identifies the fall of the church, not with any Constantinian interference in ecclesial affairs,[31] but with the abuse of the sacrament of baptism, a misapplication that saw the rise of overt endorsement for the baptism of infants. For the perversion of the form of baptism Augustine was to take the fall, while, for Hubmaier, the Latin church in general seems to have played a unique role in the development of this exploitation.[32] Consequently, the "fall" of the church is not a matter of chronology, as it is for most Anabaptists, but a matter of geography, the

East garnering a more positive estimation.

The idiosyncratic nature of Hubmaier's *restitutio* gives content also to his perception of his own relationship to historical Christianity. While arguably somewhat artificial, Hubmaier was intent on defending his own orthodoxy and continuity with the historical Church. In his *Twelve Articles in Prayer Form*, a treatise prepared while imprisoned in the Wellenberg tower upon the fall of Waldshut, Hubmaier declares, "I . . . believe and confess one holy universal Christian church, [and] confess one Lord, one God, one faith, and one baptism."[33] Hubmaier also exhibits his allegiance to orthodox Christianity in his frequent rejections of various heresies of the past such as the Helvidians, Antidicomarians, Nestorians, Priscillians, Carpocratians, Novatians, and hemerobaptists, these matters conspicuously lacking any overt scriptural support by Hubmaier's standards and are in need of the voice of tradition for validation.[34] However, Hubmaier's insistence on altering important practices and rites of the church of his day, that of baptism being the most visible realization of this potential, somewhat overshadows his appeal to historical Christianity. It is certainly worth noting that the only two heterodox figures from the past that Hubmaier invokes in support of his reforms are Donatus and Pelagius, both authors of contentious affairs surrounding rebaptism and free will respectively that Augustine expended much time and energy refuting. How Hubmaier's patristic awareness via a *restitutio* framework illuminates not when, but where he understands the church to retain a clear expression of unity is a matter to which we will now turn our attention.

Hubmaier's Use And Understanding Of The Authority Of The Church Fathers

1. The Church Fathers and Scripture

The relationship between Scripture and the fathers is a very complicated one when examining the manner in which Hubmaier discusses the two together. One must account for Hubmaier's rhetorical intentions, whether the witness of the fathers is introduced externally, and what Hubmaier's attitude is towards the person responsible for introducing the fathers into the conversation. Generally, it is true that, as Hubmaier himself states, he will trust the fathers and councils "just as far as they use the Holy Scripture, and not more."[35] Ultimately, however, Hubmaier does indeed desire to invoke the witness of the fathers if used in tandem with

Scripture. It is therefore not one's use of the fathers that Hubmaier is objecting to, but an indifference towards Scripture, that is, the use of the fathers without consulting the Scriptures. For instance, when Oecolam padius invokes Tertullian to prove that baptism is not a mere covenant between Christians, Hubmaier replies: "You speak to me much of Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Augustine, councils, histories, and old customs. I must somehow think that you lack the Scriptures, which do not want to come out of the quiver."[36]

Hubmaier's preoccupation with Scripture, I believe, is the reason why he seems to favour the patristic homilies on Scripture, all of them without exception by Greek fathers, more than he does their theological works. In his dialogue with Zwingli on baptism, Hubmaier implores Zwingli to examine commentaries by Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, Theophylact, and John Chrysostom.[37] Hubmaier's treatise, *Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil,* written specifically to conscript those church fathers and contemporary teachers who complied with his own interpretation of Scripture, cites Origen's exposition of Luke, Romans, and Exodus.[38] Hubmaier also invokes Basil of Caesarea's *Contra Eunomium*, which has an exposition on Anabaptism's all important scriptural proof for credobaptism, Matthew 28:19,[39] for which Hubmaier also references Jerome as Origen's translator.[40] In addition, he discusses Basil's use of the figure of the flood in the Old Testament for baptism as it is also reported in 1 Peter 3:20[41] and mentions Athanasius and his interaction with Hebrews 6 and the first chapter of 1 Corinthians.[42] He appeals to Cyril of Alexandria's *Commentary on John* and to Theophylact's commentaries on Mark and Matthew.[43] Elsewhere, Hubmaier paraphrases a passage from Chrysostom's *Homily on Luke* and implores Oecolampadius to consult Origen's commentaries.[44]

2. The Church Fathers and Scholasticism

Hubmaier is also consistent in his negative portrayal of the scholastic theologians, mentioning by name Aquinas, John Duns Scotus, Bonaventure, and William of Occam, and does so because their teaching "does not spring forth from the Word of God."[45] In his *Ein einfältiger Unterricht* printed in Nikolsburg in 1526, Hubmaier describes the innovations of the scholastics as "weed[s], thornbushes, sticks, and rocks which they have thrown in here, so that three times as much work has become necessary before one can plant and build what has long lain waste,

deserted, and fallow."[46] And in his *Eine christliche Lehrtafel* published the same year, without mentioning any church fathers he describes the writings of Aquinas, Duns Scotus, Gabriel Biel, William of Occam, papal decrees, the "legends of the saints and other scholastics," as "previously our hellish scriptures."[47] When one considers that not once did Hubmaier invoke a scholastic theologian to support his own claims, as he does with the fathers, the contrast between the utility of the fathers and the futility of the scholastic dialectical and syllogistic manner of discovering truth begins to provide clues for how Hubmaier understands the authority of the fathers.

3. Greek Fathers versus Latin Fathers and the Question of Augustine

I have already noted how Hubmaier uses the scriptural commentaries of the Greek fathers to enhance his argument for believers' baptism. But for Hubmaier, and Anabaptism as a whole, believers' baptism is really a corollary of the freedom of the will, a subject matter to which Hubmaier devotes two significant works.[48] Historians have accounted for Hubmaier's understanding of the freedom of the will by appealing to his education in nominalism[49] or his confluence with humanism, and his reading of Erasmus' *De libero arbitrio diatribe sive collatio* in particular.[50] While not discounting the impact of these portals of influence on Hubmaier, another possible contributing factor may help explain why Hubmaier's understanding is, as Torsten Bergsten has observed, not exactly like Erasmus' or Luther's.[51] It proposes an anthropology different than that which is taught in nominalism. The rationale for remaining within a nominalist tradition so closely associated with the adulteration of Augustinianism and the "moderate" nominalism of Occam and Gabriel Biel, all of which Hubmaier overtly rejects in his own writings, is unclear. The problem arises when one is willing to acknowledge that Hubmaier doesn't actually quote any nominalist works, that there is no evidence to suggest that he consulted nominalist writings while producing his own treatises, and that those elements that are found in Hubmaier and in nominalism are matters of comparable vocabulary, and this being only of a "similar" nature, as Bergsten admits. Therefore, it becomes incumbent upon the historian to consider alternative venues and sources for those so-called nominalist characteristics in Hubmaier's understanding of the freedom of the will. It is a matter of identifying those writings that we know Hubmaier consulted, determining whether their anthropology and understanding of the freedom

of the will aligned itself with that of Hubmaier, and taking notice of Hubmaier's general attitude towards the sources identified, that is, whether it was positive. This option, I believe, is the Greek fathers as mediated by humanism and who Hubmaier quotes extensively in support of free will's corollary, believers' baptism.

Evidence that this is the case begins to emerge upon the examination of Hubmaier's use of Erasmus' *Diatribe*, and their mutual reliance on Origen as a corrective to the philosophy of Augustine. That Hubmaier consulted and depended heavily on Erasmus' *Diatribe* is beyond dispute, while his exposure to Luther's *On the Bondage of the Will* is also likely.[52] In this latter work, Luther endorses Augustine's substitution of "freewill" with "bondwill"[53] as well as his belief that "[f]reewill has no power but to commit sin,"[54] while alleging, "of the ecclesiastical writers, there [are] none almost, who have handled the Scriptures more foolishly and more absurdly, than Origen and Jerome."[55] Pipkin points out Hubmaier's verbatim quotation of Erasmus concerning the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, which is in reality an argument from Origen's *Commentary on John* as Erasmus himself states. Elsewhere, Hubmaier again quotes verbatim Erasmus' argument from a passage in Ecclesiasticus in which Erasmus declares, "Even if all this cannot be proved by clear scriptural testimony, it has been expounded with good foundation by orthodox Church Fathers." Also, in his first treatise on the freedom of the will, there is ample evidence to support Hubmaier's reliance on, as Luther puts it, "Origen's fable,"[56] in his explication of a trichotomous anthropology and the functions of the body, soul, and spirit within the framework of his understanding of the freedom of the will. As well, in his exegesis of Philemon 13 to14, Hubmaier implores his readers to "look at Jerome concerning these words," this probably being a reproduction of Origen's commentary.

Erasmus makes it clear that the Greek fathers espouse the freedom of the will more clearly than do the Latin fathers. After dividing the fathers into Greek and Latin, Erasmus observes, "If ingenuity and erudition contribute anything to scriptural interpretation, what could be more acute and perspicacious than the Greek mind?" while "it is obvious which men stand on the side of free will," these being the Greek fathers.[57] If it was not already assumed by observing his academic prowess, then it must by now be admitted that Hubmaier certainly would have understood the distinction between Greek and Latin patristic thought considering his close proximity to humanist activity and his reading of Erasmus' *Diatribe*. This reliance

on the Greek fathers was, as Henry Vedder observes, a way of escaping "the paralysing Augustinianism of Luther."[58]

Internal evidence must have the final word, however, and here the support is certainly not lacking. Hubmaier is noticeably consistent in his negative portrayal of Augustine and the Latin fathers generally, that refusing to take this into account would be a mistake. In his *Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein*, Hubmaier contends that the bishop of Hippo "destroys the Scripture and violates it against [his] own understanding."[59] Specifically, however, Hubmaier rejects the authority of Augustine because of the role he played in propagating the practice of infant baptism, a matter in which, as Hubmaier puts it, Augustine "greatly erred."[60] In his *Von der christlichen Taufe der Gläubigen*, Hubmaier references Augustine's letter to Peter Diaconus in which Augustine asserts the obligation to baptize infants by appealing to the doctrine of original sin.[61] It is in this treatise also that Hubmaier explains the role of both Cyprian and Augustine in inaugurating a historical trajectory favouring infant baptism that apparently had no prior precedent. Hubmaier claims in his *Recantation at Zürich* that "Augustine, and many others since his time . . . have been wrong about baptism,"[62] and later singles out Augustine for being directly responsible for the false conception of baptism that has dominated the "past thousand years."[63] Interestingly, Hubmaier declares his dissatisfaction with Augustine's explanation of the anthropological *reasons behind* infant baptism, and enlists St. Jerome, who he refers to as, "the holy teacher," endorsing his exposition on Matthew 28:19 and Mark 16:16, which are in reality translations of Origen's homilies and the latter a passage that Hubmaier uses in his treatise on the freedom of the will.[64]

Moreover, Hubmaier is noticeably uniform in his grouping of Latin fathers for the purpose of promoting caution when inciting patristic witness and his grouping of Greek fathers for affirming patristic fidelity to Scripture. Hubmaier is under the opinion that Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great, in addition to papal law and the scholastics have changed the scriptures "into a rope and net of confusion,"[65] evidently linking the Latin fathers to the papacy and to the scholastic outlook that Hubmaier routinely rejects. In an effort to direct Oecolampadius back to the clear words of Scripture instead of relying on the fathers exclusively, Hubmaier lists Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, and Origen,[66] the prolific Alexandrian theologian being invoked in this case only because Oecolam padius introduced him into the conversation earlier in support of the apostolicity of infant baptism. Also, it appears that in addition to Augus-

tine, Hubmaier could locate the incipient rumblings of infant baptism from the time of Cyprian,[67] another one of the great Latin fathers, and is far more regular in his suspicions concerning the reliability of the Latin fathers to comply with Scripture than he is with the Greek fathers.

That being the case, as evidence of his confidence in the Greek fathers, in his dispute with Zwingli on whether or not the baptism of John is the same as that of Christ and his apostles, Hubmaier declares, "I testify also to the judgment of the ancient and new teachers. Read Origen on the epistles of Paul, and on Romans 6 . . .; Cyril on John . . .; Theophylact on Matthew 3 and John 3; [and] Chrysostom."[68] Perhaps the most telling distinction Hubmaier makes between the Greek and Latin fathers is when upon disparaging the authority of such Latin fathers as Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine against Oecolampadius, Hubmaier asserts, albeit dubiously, that when applying the sacrament of baptism to infants, "the general institution of water baptism does not apply to them, also according to the understanding of Origen, Basil the Great, Athanasius, Tertullian, [and] Jerome," and confidently declares, "I want their own books to be my witness."[69] No doubt Tertullian is mentioned because his is, to Hubmaier, the most consistent of the Latin fathers in his belief that one should, as a rule, wait to be baptized,[70] while Jerome is at times an ally for Hubmaier likely because he is also the preferred father of Erasmus, particularly in his defense of free will, and on this issue is a father whom Luther opposes.

It is interesting to note given his preoccupation with Scripture that all of Hubmaier's references to the Greek fathers are to their commentaries on Scripture exclusively, save Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*, a couple tracts on baptism by Basil, and a letter to Serapion by Athanasius, while all references to the Latin fathers are to their theological treatises such as Augustine's letters to Boniface[71] and Peter Diaconus,[7272] and his Anti-Manichean writings,[73] Tertullian's *Libro de Corona Militis*[74] and *On Forgiveness*,[75] Jerome's *Against the Luciferians*,[76] and a report on the fourth synod of Carthage sent to Stephen by Cyprian,[77] as well as other various patristic citations gleaned from Gratian's *decretum*.[78]

Conclusion: The Authority of The Church Fathers

In closing, determining in what manner Hubmaier understands the authority of the church fathers is not a straightforward task, and it becomes quite evident that such a judgment cannot be reduced to a single statement. Notwithstanding this, when weighing all the evidence, it would appear that

Hubmaier does indeed recognize some authority in the Greek fathers, particularly as faithful exegetes of Scripture who exhibit authority in the same way that Hubmaier would acknowledge himself as an authority, while the Latin fathers, and Augustine specifically, must settle for a more cautious reception.

The potential impact on Anabaptist scholarship is significant;[79] one such example involves consideration of the unique tenets of Anabaptism compared to those of the magisterial Reformation, free will versus total depravity being a suitable example. As it is widely accepted that reformers such as Luther and Calvin were influenced by Augustine as mediated by late medieval Augustinianism, one begins to wonder whether the differences between Anabaptism and the magisterial Reformation can be in part explained by their preference for either the Latin or newly acquired Greek fathers as mediated through a humanistic lineage that extends from the translating effort of the Italian renaissance to its replication and spread into fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Germany.

But this investigation must also resolve the very definition of "authority." Too often, it seems, Hubmaier's seemingly inexhaustible dependence on Scripture will cloud the judgment of some historians who somewhat indiscriminately reject the notion that Hubmaier affirmed the fathers by juxtaposing his attitude towards Scripture with his admittedly less-pronounced reliance on patristic testimony. This assessment is unfair and largely out of touch with the common attitude towards the fathers that prevailed in the sixteenth century; indeed, even Erasmus, Beatus Rhe nanus, and Johannes Eck were adamant that the fathers should not go untested. It is therefore not an authority that renders compliance as automatic, not an authority that ignores the humanity of its transmitters, but an authority that takes seriously, and that purposefully and faithfully aligns itself with, the archetypal authority, that of Christ and his bride.

Endnotes

1. The first departure from the common negative portrayal of Anabaptism was Gottfried Arnold, *Unparteyische kirchen-und Ketzer-Historie* (Frankfurt, 1699). Arnold's more positive assessment did not gain traction until more affirming historical descriptions of Anabaptism came to a head with such twentieth-century studies as Cornelius Krahn, "A Historiography of the Mennonites in the Netherlands: A Guide to Sources," *Church History* 13, no. 3 (September 1944): 182-209; Walther Köhler, *Dogmengeschichte als Geschichte des Christlichen Selbstbewusstseins*, *Das Zeitalter der Reforma-*

tion (Zürich: Max Niehans, 1951); W.J. Kühler, *Geschiedenis der Neder landsche Doopsgezinden in de zestiende eeuw* (Haarlem-Tjeenk Willink, 1932); Ernest Troeltsch, *Die Sociallehren der christlichen. Kirchen und Gruppen* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1912); Nanne van der Zijpp, *Geschiedenis der doopsgezinden in Nederland* (Arnhem, 1952). Perhaps the study most responsible for the trajectory and historiographical framework for scholarship on the Anabaptists in the second half of the twentieth century is Harold S. Bender's 1943 presidential address to the American Society of Church History emphasizing nonviolence, discipleship, and community (*The Anabaptist Vision* [Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1944]).

2. Some more familiar examples of studies that investigate or propose a historiographical framework that affirms medieval predecessors to Ana baptism include Kenneth R. Davis, *Anabaptism and Asceticism: A Study in Intellectual Origins*, Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History, vol. 16 (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1974); Ludwig Keller, *Die Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien: in ihrem Zusammenhange* (Leipzig: Hirzel 1885); W.J. Kühler, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden in de zestiende eeuw*, 40-2; Werner O. Packull, *Mysticism and the Early South German-Austrian Anabaptist Movement, 1525-1531*, Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History, vol. 19 (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1977); C. Arnold Snyder, *The Life and Thought of Michael Sattler* (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1984). Brief summaries of scholarship on the medieval background to Anabaptism can be found in Thomas N. Finger, *A Contemporary Anabaptist Theology: Biblical, Historical, Constructive* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 51-54; and John D. Roth, "Recent Currents in the Historiography of the Radical Reformation," *Church History* 71, no. 3 (September 2002): 523-536.

3. Peter C. Erb, "Book Review: Anabaptism and Asceticism: A Study in Intellectual Origins by Kenneth Davis," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 50 no. 3 (July 1976): 254-5. Few studies concern themselves directly with Anabaptism and the church fathers: Andy Alexis-Baker, paper presentation: "Anabaptist Use of Patristic Literature and Creeds," Anabaptist Colloquium, Eastern Mennonite University (7-8 April 2006); Geoffrey Dipple, *"Just as in the Time of the Apostles": Uses of History in the Radical Reformation* (Kitchener, ON: Pandora Press, 2005), 72-6, 123, 157-9; Irvin B. Horst, "Menno Simons and the Augustinian Tradition," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 62, no. 4 (October 1988): 419-430; Andrew Klager, "Passive Sacramentalism and Ontological Soteriology in Hans Denck and Gregory of Nyssa," *Direction Journal* 35, no. 2 (Fall 2006): 268-278; Alan Kreider,"Christendom and Conversion: An Anabaptist Perspective," Paper presented at Mennonite-Catholic International Dialogue of the Mennonite World Conference (24-30 November 2000); and Dennis D. Martin, "Menno and Augustine on the Body

of Christ," *Fides et Historia* 20 (October 1988): 41-64.

4. The standard biographies include some early attempts to draw attention to Hubmaier's use of the church fathers: Johann Loserth, *D. Balthasar Hubmaier und die Anfänge der Wiedertaufe in Mähren* (Brno, 1893), 143ff.; Carl Sachsse, *Doktor Balthasar als Theologe* (Berlin, 1914; rpt. Aalen: Scienta Publishers, 1973) 33-8; Torsten Bergsten, *Balthasar Hubmaier: Anabaptist Theologian and Martyr*, ed. William R. Estep, Jr.; trans. Irwin J. Barnes and William R. Estep (Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1978), 280-4, 345-5, 361-6, 392-4. Other instances can be found in Rollin Stely Armour, *Anabaptist Baptism: A Representative Study*. Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History, vol. 11 (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1966), 49-54; annotations in H. Wayne Pipkin and John Howard Yoder, eds. and trans., *Balthasar Hubmaier*, Classics of the Radical Reformation, vol. 5 (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1989) [hereafter *CRR*]; Gunnar Westin and Torsten Bergsten, eds., *Schriften*, Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer, vol. 9 (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1962), 224-255 [hereafter *HS*]. The only comprehensive study closely related to my own, and one that I have not yet availed myself of other than the abstract, is a recent dissertation by Antonia Lucic Gonzalez entitled, "Balthasar Hubmair and Early Christian Tradition" (Ph.D. Diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 2008). However, from what I can gather from her abstract, Gonzalez's study appears to differ from mine in focus, direction, methodology, and contextual considerations. Still, some significant similarities do exist, not the least of which concerns Hubmaier's use of and attitude towards Augustine.

5. It is reassuring that within the past two decades some important studies have emerged on the reception of the church fathers during the Renaissance and Reformation: Irena Backus, "Erasmus and the Spirituality of the Early Church," In *Erasmus' Vision of the Church*, ed. Hilmar Pabel (Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth-Century Journal Publishers, 1995), 95-114; Irena Backus, "Ulrich Zwingli, Martin Bucer and the Church Fathers," in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol. 2, ed. Irena Backus (Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 2001), 627-660; Jacques-Guy Bougerol, "The Church Fathers and the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard," in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol. 1, 113-164; Barbara Fleith, "The Patristic sources of the *Legenda Aurea*: A Research Report," *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol. 1, 231-287; Olaf Kuhr, *"Die Macht des Bannes und der Busse": Kirchenzucht und Erneuerung der Kirche bei Johannes Oekolampad (1482-1531)*, Basler und Berner Studien zur Historischen und Systematischen Theologie, vol. 68 (Vienna: Peter Lang, 1999); Ann E. Matter, "The Church Fathers and the *Glossa Ordinaria*," In *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol. 1, 83-111; Eugene F. Rice, Jr., "The Humanist Idea of Christian Antiquity: Lefèvre d'Étaples and his Circle," *Studies in the Renaissance* 9 (1962): 126-160; Nikolaus Staubach, James C.G.

Greig, trans., "*Memores Pristinae Perfectionis* The Importance of the Church Fathers for *Devotio Moderna*," in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol. 1, 405-469; and Jean Werckmeister, "The Reception of the Church Fathers in Canon Law," *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West*, vol. 1, 51-81.

6. Paul Oskar Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought: The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanist Strands* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961), 80.

7. Deno John Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West: Essays on the Late Byzantine and Italian Renaissances and the Byzantine and Roman Churches* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 283.

8. Geanakoplos, Constantinople and the West, 284-5. Compare with Charles L. Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers: Ambrogio Traversari (1386-1439) and Christian Antiquity in the Italian Renaissance* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1977).

9. Irena Backus, "The Early Church in the Renaissance and Reformation," in *Early Christianity: Its Origins and Evolution to AD 600*, ed. Ian Hazlett (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1991), 298; and Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West*, 13, 49, 281, 285-7.

10. Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West*, 13, 56. Compare with Deno John Geanakoplos, "Italian Humanism and the Byzantine Émigré Scholars," in *Renaissance Humanism*, ed. Albert Rabil Jr. (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 356.

11. Geanakoplos, "Italian Humanism and the Byzantine Émigré Scholars," 361-2. Compare with. S. Camporeale, *L. Valla, umanesimo e teologia* (Florence, 1972), 429-30; and N.G. Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy: Greek Studies in the Italian Renaissance* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1992), 69.

12. Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West*, 22, 288; and Backus, "The Early Church in the Renaissance and Reformation," 297. Compare with Deno John Geanakoplos, "Theodore Gaza, a Byzantine Scholar of the Palaeologan Renaissance in the Italian Renaissance," *Medievalia et Humanistica* 12 (1984): 61-81.

13. Backus, "The Early Church in the Renaissance and Reformation," 298; John Monfasani, *George of Trebizond: A Biography and a Study of his Rhetoric and Logic* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 69-79; and Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers*, 225-6.

14. Geanakoplos, *Constantinople and the West*, 110; Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers*, 225-6; and Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy*, 87.

15. Deno John Geanakoplos, *Greeks Scholars in Venice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962), 157.

16. Geanakoplos, *Greeks Scholars in Venice*, 50-1.

17. Geanakoplos, *Greeks Scholars in Venice*, 138. Compare with Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy*, 141-2.

18. Compare with Backus, "The Early Church in the Renaissance and Reformation," 296; Wilson, *From Byzantium to Italy*, 14, 57, 62; Geanakoplos, "Italian Humanism and the Byzantine Émigré Scholars," 354-355, 359-64, 368-9; John Meyendorff, *Church and Society in the Last Centuries of Byzantium: Birkbeck Lectures, 1977* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979); and Robert S. Nelson, *Later Byzantine Painting: Art, Agency, and Appreciation* (Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2007).

19. Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Erasmus from an Italian Perspective," *Renaissance Quarterly* 23, no. 1 (Spring 1970): 8-9. Compare with Jan den Boeft, "Erasmus and the Church Fathers," 542; and Jozef IJsewijn, "Humanism in the Low Countries," in *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, vol. 2, ed. Albert Rabil, Jr. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), 156-215.

20. Compare with Backus, "Erasmus and the Spirituality of the Early Church," 95; Lewis W. Spitz, *Luther and German Humanism* (Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 1996), 400; and Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers*, 225.

21. Eugene F. Rice, Jr., "The Humanist Idea of Christian Antiquity: Lefèvre d'Étaples and his Circle," 140. Compare with Stinger, *Humanism and the Church Fathers*, 225-6.

22. Compare with John F D'Amico, "Beatus Rhenanus, Tertullian and the Reformation: A Humanist's Critique of Scholasticism," 38-9; Natalie Zemon Davis, "Gregory Nazianzen in the Service of Humanist Social Reform," 457-8; and John Dyck, "Johannes Oecolampadius: Lighthouse of the Reformation," 25. Beatus' edition of Tertullian's *opera* included twenty three of Tertullian's thirty three works. One of them was *de corona militis*, from which Hubmaier quotes ("Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 231; *CRR* 252).

23. John F D'Amico, "Beatus Rhenanus, Tertullian and the Reformation: A Humanist's Critique of Scholasticism," 47. "Ein einfältiger Unterricht," *HS* 291; *CRR* 320. Hubmaier was exposed to the writings of Gabriel Biel through the influence of his mentor, Eck, with whom Hubmaier studied Biel's commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, a theological textbook of the time, and of an earlier time, that contained numerous citations of the Fathers.

Eddie Louis Mabry, *Balthasar Hubmaier's Doctrine of the Church* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994), 5-6, 18. Also, Hubmaier many times indicates that the source for his citations of the fathers is Gratian's *decretum*, sometimes providing the precise reference location in the treatise itself or in his marginal notes. See also *CRR* 252, note 24. Compare with Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought*, 31.

24. Kristeller, *Renaissance Thought,* 81.

25. For general inquiries into humanist influence on university curriculum see Charles G. Nauert, Jr., "Humanist Infiltration into the Academic World: Some Studies of Northern Universities," *Renaissance Quarterly* 43, no. 4 (1990): 809-10; and Laetitia Boehm, "Humanistische Bildungbewegung und mittelalterliche Universitätsverfassung: Aspekte zur fgoezeitlichen Reformgeschichte der deutschen Universitäten," in *The Universities in the Late Middle Ages*, eds. Joseph Jsewijn and Jacques Paquet, Mediaevalia Lovaniensia, series 1, studia 6 (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1978).

26. The library inventories also demonstrate that Hubmaier must have been exposed to the church fathers while a student with its inventory including works by Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Clement of Rome, Augustine, Gregory the Great, Jerome, Ambrose, Dionysius the Aeropagite, John Chrysostom, Basil of Caesarea, Eusebius, Origen, Lactantius, and Cyprian, as well as patristic compilations such as Gratian's *Decretum*, Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, and the *glossa ordinaria*. Wilhelm John, "Das Bücherverzeichnis der Ingolstädter Artisten-fakultät von 1508," 389-408. For an indication of what was available while Hubmaier was a student at Freiburg-im-Breisgau, see http://www3.ub.uni-freiburg.de/index.php?id=1113. Additional sources include Wolfgang Kehr, hrsg., *Handbuch der historischen Buch bestände in Deutschland* (Hildesheim: Olms, Bd. 7: Baden-Württemberg und Saarland, 1994), 98-167; and Josef Rest, "Die älteste Geschichte der Freiburger Universitätsbibliothek," *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 39 (1922): 7-25.

27. A definitive biography of Eck with observations highlighting his humanism is Erwin Iserloh, *Johannes Eck (1486-1543) Scholastiker Humanist Kontroverstheologe* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1985), esp. 7-20. For descriptions of the contents of Eck's personal library to which Hubmaier must have been exposed, see Theodor Wiedemann, *Dr. Johann Eck, Professor der Theologie an der Universität Ingolstadt* (Regensburg, 1865).

28. Eddie Louis Mabry, *Balthasar Hubmaier's Doctrine of the Church*, 6. Compare with Carl Sachsse, *Doktor Balthasar als Theologe*, 120ff; William J. Courtenay, "Nominalism and Late Medieval Thought: A Bibliographical Essay," *Theological Studies* 33 (1972): 716-734; and Heiko A. Oberman,

"Some Notes on the Theology of Nominalism with Attention to its Relation to the Renaissance," *The Harvard Theological Review* 53, no. 1 (January 1960): 47-76.

29. For a comprehensive evaluation of Hubmaier's encounter with and dependence on Erasmus, see the recently published doctoral dissertation: Darren T. Williamson, "Erasmus of Rotterdam's Influence Upon Anabaptism: The Case of Balthasar Hubmaier" (Ph.D. diss., Simon Fraser University, 2005).

30. Mabry, *Balthasar Hubmaier's Doctrine of the Church*, 22-5.

31. That the Anabaptists typically located the so-called "fall" of the church with the conversion of Constantine, thus a matter of church/state relations, is a typical view: Franklin H. Littell, *The Origins of Sectarian Protestantism: A Study of the Anabaptist View of the Church* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964), esp. 65-6. Compare with Geoffrey Dipple, *"Just As In The Time of the Apostles": Uses of History in the Radical Reformation*, 105ff; Hans J. Hillerbrand, "Anabaptism and History," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 45, no. 2 (April 1971): 107-122; Franklin H. Littell, "In Response to Hans Hillerbrand," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 45 (1971): 377-80; John Howard Yoder, "Anabaptism and History: Restitution and the Possibility of Renewal," in *Umstrittenes Täufertum 1525-1975: Neue Forschungen*, ed. Hans-Jürgen Goertz (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1975), esp. 244-6. H.W. Meihuizen traced the origin of *restitutio's* modern usage to a footnote in Karl Wilhelm Bouterwek's *Zur Literatur und Geschichte der Wiedertäufer, besonders in den Rheinlanden*: H.W. Meihuizen, "The Concept of Restitution in the Anabaptism of Northwestern Europe," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 44 (1970): 141-3.

32. Zwingli accuses Hubmaier of believing that Pope Nicholas II initiated infant baptism; this Hubmaier flatly denies ("Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein," *HS* 198; *CRR* 212).

33. "Jch glaub . . . vnnd bekhenne ein heilige, allgmaine, Christenliche Kirchen . . . [vnd] veriehen ainen herren, ainen Gott, ainen glauben vnd ainen tauff." ("Die Zwölf Artikel des Christlichen Glaubens," *HS* 218; CRR 238).

34. "Ein Rechenschaft des Glaubens," *HS* 470-2; CRR 537-8; and "Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein," *HS* 185; *CRR* 193; "Eine Form zu Taufen,"*HS* 352; *CRR* 391.

35. "Von der Kindertaufe," *HS* 261; *CRR* 280. Compare with "Eine Kurze Entschuldigung," *HS* 274; *CRR* 300.

36. "Von der Kindertaufe," HS 267; CRR 290.

37. "Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein," *HS* 197; *CRR* 210.Pipkin believes that the Cyril mentioned here by Hubmaier is Cyril of Jerusalem; however, the evidence seems to point to Cyril of Alexandria. George of Trebizond translated Cyril of Alexandria's monumental *Commentary on John* into Latin, and it seems to be this commentary to which Hubmaier is referring. As for the work by John Chrysostom, Hubmaier merely says, "Chrysostom, Book 1, page 51, Book 2, page 47." It is virtually impossible to know for certain what Hubmaier is referring to here, but as George of Trebizond also translated into Latin Chrysostom's *Commentary on Matthew*, and since this commentary does indeed make reference to the distinction between the baptisms of John and of Christ, this would make it a likely candidate.

38. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 230; *CRR* 250.

39. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 230; *CRR* 250-1.

40. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 231; *CRR* 252.

41. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 230; *CRR* 251.

42. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 230; *CRR* 251.

43. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 231-2; *CRR* 253.

44. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: II," *HS* 244; *CRR* 265; "Von der Kindertaufe," *HS* 260; *CRR* 278.

45. "Achtzehn Schlußreden," *HS* 73; *CRR* 33. Compare with "Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein," *HS* 172; *CRR* 176.

46. "Ein einfältiger Unterricht," *HS* 295; *CRR* 326.

47. "Eine christliche Lehrtafel," *HS* 309; *CRR* 343. Pipkin notes here that Hubmaier was using a pun: *Lügend* (lying) for *legend*, and *höllisch* (hellish) for *heilig* (holy) (note 11).

48. Mabry claims, "[F]or Hubmaier the freedom of the will is a corollary to the doctrine of believer's baptism." Walter L. Moore, "Catholic Teacher and Anabaptist Pupil: The Relationship between John Eck and Balthasar Hubmaier," 74. "Von der Freiheit des Willens, (1527)"; and "Das andere büchlein von der Freiwilligkeit des Menschen (1527)."

49. Compare with Walter L. Moore, "Catholic Teacher and Anabaptist Pupil: The Relationship between John Eck and Balthasar Hubmaier," 68-97; Francis Oakley, "The Absolute and Ordained Power of God in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Theology," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 59, no. 3 (July 1998): 440-50, 453, 456, 457. In reference to the battle between the *via antiqua* (realism advocated by John Duns Scotus) and the *via moderna*

(nominalism of William of Occam), Mabry notes that through Eck, Hubmaier was educated in the later camp, that of the *via moderna* and was exposed to the "moderate school" of mainstream of late-medieval nominalism of Gabrieal Biel and John Gerson (*Balthasar Hubmaier's Doctrine of the Church,* 13).

50. Edward K. Burger, *Erasmus and the Anabaptists* (Ph.D. Diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 1977); Kenneth R. Davis, "Erasmus as a Progenitor of Anabaptist Theology and Piety," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 47, no. 3 (July 1973): 163-178; and Thor Hall, "Possibilities of Erasmian Influence on Denck and Hubmaier in their Views on the Freedom of the Will," 149-170.

51. Bergsten, *Balthasar Hubmaier: Anabaptist Theologian and Martyr*, 354.

52. Walter L. Moore, "Catholic Teacher and Anabaptist Pupil: The Relationship between John Eck and Balthasar Hubmaier," 72. Mabry states that Hubmaier's exposure to Erasmus' *Diatribe* was adequately proven by both Gerd Seewald and Thor Hall.

53. Martin Luther, *On the Bondage of the Will*, trans. Edward Thomas Vaughan (London, 1823), 137.

54. Luther, *On the Bondage of the Will*, 147.

55. Luther, *On the Bondage of the Will* , 247.

56. Luther, *On the Bondage of the Will* , 58-9.

57. Desiderius Erasmus, *Discourse on Free Will*, trans. and ed. Ernst F. Winter (New York: Continuum, 2004), 15-16.

58. Henry C. Vedder, *Balthasar Hubmaier, The Leader of the Anabaptists* (New York, 1905; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1971), 193.

59. "Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein," *HS* 184; *CRR* 192.

60. "Von der Kindertaufe," *HS* 261; *CRR* 279.

61. "Von der christlichen Taufe der Gläubigen," *HS* 154; *CRR* 139.

62. "Recantation in Zurich," *CRR* 152.

63. "Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein," *HS* 171; *CRR* 175.

64. "Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein," *HS* 205-6; *CRR* 221-222. Cf. "Das andere büchlein von der Freiwilligkeit des Menschen," *HS* 414-5; *CRR* 470.

65. "Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein," *HS* 172; *CRR* 176.

66. "Von der Kindertaufe," *HS* 267; *CRR* 291.

67. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 227; *CRR* 246.

68. "Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein," *HS* 197; *CRR* 210.

69. "Von der Kindertaufe," *HS* 267; *CRR* 292-3.

70. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 231; *CRR* 252.

71. "Von der christlichen Taufe der Gläubigen," *HS* 138; *CRR* 119.

72. "Von der christlichen Taufe der Gläubigen," *HS* 154; *CRR* 139.

73. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 228; *CRR* 247.

74. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: II," *HS* 244; *CRR* 265.

75. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 231; *CRR* 252.

76. "Ein Gespräch auf Zwinglis Taufbüchlein," *HS* 197; *CRR* 210. The only connection Hubmaier makes between a Latin father and Scripture is Jerome's interaction with Matthew 28:19, but this is Jerome's Latin translation of Origen's homily on Luke 3: "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: I," *HS* 231; *CRR* 252.

77. "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: II," *HS* 244-5; *CRR* 266.

78. "Von der christlichen Taufe der Gläubigen," *HS* 138, 153-4; *CRR* 119, 138-9; and "Der uralten und gar neuen Lehrer Urteil: II," *HS* 247; *CRR* 269-270.

79. Although alleging that much of Hubmaier's theology "was by and large bypassed by Anabaptists as something it would be better not to indulge in too deeply," a claim that continues to be reassessed especially in light of research into the Moravian brethren (37), Robert Friedman observes, "Hubmaier was a special type, greatly esteemed by Christian radicals but not really emulated and followed after. Many of his theological ideas crept into Anabaptist thinking, such as, for instance, his doctrine of the freedom of the will, or his teachings concerning the two ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper." If Hubmaier's impact on Anabaptism can be observed from the dissemination of his comprehensive teachings on the freedom of the will, the implications of a study of his use of the Greek fathers are significant (*The Theology of Anabaptism: An Interpretation* [Scottdale: Herald Press, 1973], 19).

CSCH President's Address 2008

"From the Edge of Oblivion": Reflections on Evangelical Protestant Denominational Historiography in Canada

BRUCE L. GUENTHER
Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary / Associated Canadian Theological Schools of Trinity Western University

---

Next to the banquet, my favorite part of the CSCH conferences has always been the presidential address. I've not only had opportunity to hear many of these presentations in person, but as one of the editors of the *Historical Papers,* I've also carefully read every one during the past fifteen years. They have invariably been thought-provoking, often entertaining, sometimes remarkably autobiographical and candid,[1] and several, even a little controversial.[2] These addresses reflect the diverse interests within our society, and the high level of civility and collegiality that has characterized interaction among members.

Like others who wove parts of their own story into their presentations, I too at times use personal experiences as a kind of "text," and my professional working space as the con"text" from which to offer observations. In this address I offer a range of reflections on evangelical Protestant denominational historiography in Canada by commenting, first, on my experience of ***working within*** an evangelical Protestant denominational world, second, ***teaching history***, including denominational history, within

this same world, and third, ***doing*** evangelical Protestant denominational history in Canada.

Working in an Evangelical Protestant Denominational Setting

Like a number of other CSCH members, I am employed in a confessional institution that prepares people for professional Christian ministry. I teach in a seminary consortium called the Associated Canadian Theological Schools (ACTS), which was started in 1988, and is made up of six evangelical Protestant denominational seminaries. While consortiums are not unique in Canada, the features that make ACTS unique is that all six denominational partners are Canadian evangelical Protestant, more specifically "Believers Church," denominations.[3] At ACTS tuition revenues are pooled and a common curriculum has been designed for all students, but each faculty member remains an employee of one of the six partners. Adding more complexity to the multiplicity of institutional relationships within ACTS, is the way the consortium simultaneously functions as the Graduate School of Theological Studies of Trinity Western University.[4]

I was hired by Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary (MBBS), when the seminary joined the ACTS consortium in 1999. MBBS was started in 1955 to serve the Mennonite Brethren churches in North America; its main campus is located in Fresno, CA. I came to this denominational seminary setting after having taught for almost ten years as a sessional lecturer in a variety of schools including several public universities – these years were, professionally, as a friend once put it, life on the "tenuous" track. I teach a variety of history courses that are a part of the common curriculum at ACTS, and one denominational course designed specifically for Mennonite Brethren students.

My employment within a denomination with a deep sense of history (more on this later) was from the outset accompanied by an expectation that a portion of my research time and energy would be used to serve denominational interests. I was immediately perceived as an "insider" within the denomination by virtue of my professorial appointment, despite the fact that I was a relative newcomer to the denomination at the time (I became part of a Mennonite Brethren congregation in 1993). My new identity as a Mennonite historian, and status as an expert in Mennonite history was somewhat ironic in that I had never taken a course in Menno-

nite history or theology, and had never even attended a Mennonite school. Nevertheless, nominations to an international Mennonite Brethren "Historical Commission," invitations to speak at denominational gatherings, and to write for denominational publications were quickly forthcoming.

Having become accustomed to the luxury of complete autonomy in selecting research projects, and the identity I wished to assume as an historian, these new expectations created some ambivalence. My lack of familiarity with the denominational story at the outset was at times an advantage in that it allowed me to approach the historical sources with the eyes of an "outsider." Involvement in Mennonite and denominationally-specific projects slowed my progress on other projects, but I tried to offset this by choosing projects that could be stretched in multiple directions. Although I still do not consider myself to be primarily a "denominational" or even a "Mennonite" historian, I now worry less about how others choose to identify me (the lack of anxiety might be partly related to having moved from the tenuous track to a tenure track position).

My willingness to use my expertise as an historian on behalf of the denomination was sharpened several years ago after coming across a provocative and memorable speech delivered by Richard W. Hamming, Professor at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, CA in 1986, entitled "You and Your Research."[5] He posed three rather pointed questions for his audience: "What are the most important problems in your field? Are you working on one of them? And if not, why not?" These questions are worth pondering not only by individual scholars in any discipline, but also by our society as a whole.[6]

Without claiming that the projects on which I'm currently working are *the* most important issues in the field, Hamming's challenge did prompt a greater degree of intentionality in selecting the issues I, as an historian, worked at within my particular institutional and denominational setting. During my participation in denominational events, I started to take particular note of questions that kept recurring from new incoming leaders. Many of these questions have been incorporated into my teaching, and some have been used as the focus of writing projects. For example, the perennial question, "Do I have to be a pacifist to be a Mennonite Brethren pastor?" prompted a review of the sixteenth-century Anabaptist, and the subsequent Mennonite, response to the use of "the sword," which revealed a much more variegated story than many denominational leaders know, or

in some instances, care to admit. The influx of new immigrants into Mennonite Brethren congregations, and the long-standing association in parts of Canada between "Mennonite" and one of several ethnic composites sparked an exploration of Mennonite Brethren identity, ethnicities, ethnocentrism, Canadian multiculturalism, and ongoing dilemmas of negotiating the relationship between religious faith and culture. Questions about how to lead Christian communities in a pluralistic, media-saturated, technological, multi-cultural society prompted a socio-cultural historical critique of how people within the Mennonite Brethren denomination have moved from being members of a geographically isolated and an ethnically homogeneous Christian community to becoming a multi-cultural Christian community that is actively engaged in all areas of Canadian culture.

William J. Bouwsma (who Doug Shantz cited in his CSCH presidential address in 2003) talks about the "obligation" historians have to meet "public needs"; historians are "properly the servants of a public that needs historical perspective to understand itself and its values."[7] Even though my primary area of expertise is not Mennonite Brethren history, as an historian hired by this denomination I resonate with the sense of obligation described by Bouwsma for using history to help this religious group understand better its place and experience within Canadian society, to help shape the identity and self-understanding of this particular religious group, while at the same time helping the scholarly community understand better the experience of this religious community. Instead of being anxious that involvement in denominationally-specific studies will lead to a kind of myopia or provincialism, my experience has given me a better appreciation for the opportunities that are present within denominational settings, and the reciprocity that is essential for connecting particular stories and experiences with the larger patterns in the history of Christianity in Canada, and in Canadian history and culture more generally.

Teaching History in an Evangelical Protestant Denominational Seminary

During the discussion following Ellie Stebner's president's address last year, someone asked, "Does one write and/or teach history differently for the academy than for the church?" The question generated considerable discussion: many, but not all, said no. I'd like to offer a perspective on this question in light of my experience of teaching at several public universi-

ties, and now within a denominational consortium.

For many years my approach to teaching history of Christianity has been influenced by George Marsden's idea of "methodological secularization." In offering historical explanations, Marsden encouraged Christian historians to suspend, if only temporarily for limited ad hoc purposes, attempts to identify metaphysical influences, and to concentrate only on identifying the "observable cultural forces" accessible to everyone that are at work in historical circumstances. The task of identifying the work of the Holy Spirit within historical circumstances is best left to the theologians.[8] This is not unlike, he argues, the task of a pilot when landing an airplane. "No matter how open the pilot may be to spiritual realities, we hope that he will rely on the radar and not just the Holy Spirit when trying to get safely to O'Hare." He differentiates between "methodological secularization" and "methodological atheism" in that the former does not require the Christian historian to deny that there are spiritual dimensions ordered by God in the affairs of humanity. Marsden writes,

> The pilot who follows the radar and the instrument panel may even sense those tasks differently if she believes she is ultimately dependent on God and that she has spiritual responsibility to her passengers. In academic work, such openness may have real impact on our theories, particularly in eliminating those that claim the universally accessible natural phenomena are all there is.[9]

Marsden sees the academy as a place where multiple perspectives should not only be permitted, but welcomed. I resonate with his observation that faith-informed views are not necessarily antithetical to scholarship, and his plea that public, pluralistic institutions should be more open to explicit discussions of the relationship between religious faith and learning. And I believe he is right in pointing out, as he puts it, that the "first principles" of naturalism are no more neutral than those derived from supernaturalism; broadly speaking "faith in something or other informs all scholarship."[10] But his methodological proposal for the bracketing of explicitly theological judgments from historical assessments perpetuates, implicitly at least, a dichotomy that distinguishes, on the one hand, between scholarship exhibiting a critical detachment associated with neutrality and therefore suitable for the academy, and, on the other hand, engaged faith-informed research that explicitly utilizes Christian "first principles" and is therefore

deemed unsuitable for the academy on the grounds that it promotes a particular ideology. For Marsden, "methodological secularization" is a necessary concession that makes it possible for people who differ about first principles to communicate and get along.[11]

For many years I used Marsden's strategy. In a public university setting it helped me, as a young sessional lecturer, avoid overt ideological conflict within the department in which I was teaching. In seminary settings it was helpful for holding in check attempts on the part of some ministry-bound students to short-circuit the hard work of historical research and analysis in favour of quick providentialist judgments and pronouncements (a reflexive tendency among some evangelical students). Even a temporary suspension of the gravitational pull towards theological explanations helps some students glimpse the contribution that socio-cultural historical analyses can offer to an understanding of historical events.

A response to the debate about the methodological differences between religious studies and theological studies by Ann Taves (Professor of Catholic Studies in the Department of Religious Studies, University of California in Santa Barbara) has been helpful in seeing the limitations of Marsden's methodological proposal for Christian historians who teach history. Taves observes that scholars who teach in theological schools "occupy a complicated institutional middle ground between the academy and religious communities." She writes:

> In theological schools, we routinely ponder the theoretical and practical meaning of established distinctions between theological studies and religious studies, the classical disciplines and the arts of ministry, the study of spirituality and spiritual formation. We often try to make sense of these distinctions, when we are not trying to throw them over altogether, by pointing to dichotomies – such as insiders and outsiders, theory and practice, detachment and engagement – that ostensibly inform them. In applying these distinctions, however, we typically get lost in endless intellectual snarls as these simple dichotomies simply refuse to make adequate sense of the complicated realities we are negotiating.[12]

In order to move away from these static dichotomies, which tend to anchor a person to a particular approach or identity, she proposes the use of a more dynamic, motion-oriented performance metaphor. She argues

that scholars in *both* the academy and the theological seminary need to use multiple "roles" that require at times an outsider-like detachment (that is, an approach that attempts to analyze and observe a phenomena, and to incorporate a multiplicity of perspectives),[13] and at times an insider-like kind of engagement (that is, the promotion of a particular ideal or view). The crucial distinction or boundary between the two different institutional settings is defined not by a particular method or ideological approach, she argues, but rather by the question of what sort of persons each institution is trying to form – "who are we forming for what end?" Those teaching in the humanities, in a public university, are participating in the formation of students in the liberal arts; those teaching in the seminary, are trying to form theologically informed and committed Christians, some of whom are preparing for professional ministry.

An historian in a public university assumes a detached "posture of non-alignment (outsiderness)" by giving serious, critical analytical attention to a phenomena, but then assumes an engaged posture when defining what Taves calls "constitutive terms," that is "the terms without which a discipline or tradition would not exist." Historians, whose key constituent term is, of course, history, have like all scholars a "role-specific obligation to define their constitutive terms." And when they do, they are no longer detached outsiders, but rather engaged insiders promoting an ideal, taking a stand, making a case, prescribing a perspective.

Similarly, in theological seminaries, scholars who are themselves committed to a particular tradition sometimes assume a detached posture for the purpose of listening to other, even competing, viewpoints about an historical phenomena, about religion, about spirituality, etc. Scholars in theological schools also have an obligation to define their constitutive terms, and not only disciplinary specific terms such as history, but also what it means to be Christian (and in my case, what it means to be Mennonite Brethren), and the relationship between these constitutive terms.

Students in every educational setting are served best when professors have the capacity to use interchangeably the roles of both the detached and engaged scholar in order to achieve institutional outcomes.[14] In a seminary it means teaching about the history of a particular denominational tradition by using all methods available to analyze and critique perspectives, transitions, decisions, practices in order to enhance an understanding of achievements as well as contradictions. It also means using the same

historical story to affirm beliefs, values and identities, and to assist in the theological and spiritual formation of those who are attempting to embody these ideals in the way they live and lead. So, in answer to the question raised last year, "does one write and/or teach history differently for the academy and for the church?" my response is a both no, and yes.

Doing Evangelical Protestant Denominational Historiography

Finally, a few observations about doing evangelical Protestant denominational history in Canada. There are well over 100 denominations in Canada today that are associated with evangelical Protestantism.[15] Many of these denominations have now reached their centennial anniversary, or are getting close, yet few have been the subject of sophisticated historical study.

The recent dearth of denominational histories is perhaps no surprise given the rather poor reputation of denominationalism during the twentieth century. Denominations have often been associated with divisiveness and schism. Richard Niebuhr's description of denominations during the apex of the ecumenical movement as "emblems of the victory of world over church, of the secularization of Christianity, of the church's sanction of the divisiveness which the church's gospel condemns" didn't help. For Niebuhr, denominationalism represented "the moral failure of Christianity."[16] In a study of denominationalism completed during the 1970s, Russell Richey describes how, "slurs on the denomination and denominationalism recur throughout religious literature, made as though they were so self-evident as to require no elaboration."[17] Interest in denominationalism has diminished further as loyalty to institutions, including religious institutions, has waned. For many, denominational identity is at best a secondary consideration when finding a church: church goers routinely use their experience as consumers to "shop" for a church in reasonable geographic proximity that will meet their "needs." It is no longer uncommon to have students in class who have been active in at least half a dozen (or more) denominations in their first 30 years of life.

For numerous reasons the writing of denominational history has not been popular among historians of religion. In the academy, the search for rubrics broad enough to include all expressions of spirituality, along with a preference for analytical approaches, and the trend towards studies of pan-denominational phenomena (for example, evangelicalism and gender),

weakened an interest in using denomination as a category of analysis. In his presidential address in 1995, Bob Burkinshaw identifies a variety of pan-denominational themes and directions in his survey of Canadian evangelical historiography. He makes the point "that much of the dynamic activity of twentieth-century evangelicalism will be missed if the focus remains exclusively on denominations."[18] His affirmation of the need for, and value of, broad thematic studies is well taken, but very few denominational studies have actually materialized in the decade since his address. The stories of denominations within scholarly studies of evangelical Protestantism in Canada are almost invisible, and as a result, so are some of the finer nuances within this multifarious religious phenomena.[19]

Scholars of religion have worked hard to demonstrate the relevance of religion for understanding human experience and events. Denominational studies sounds like a regressive attempt to move the study of Christianity back to its former isolation after having finally managed to escape, in the words of one of our past-presidents its "unacknowledged quarantine;"[20] or still worse, to return to an era when "church history" meant writing apologias for the defense and promotion of a particular tradition. Add to this the fact that many denominational histories are poorly written works of triumphalistic hagiography in which well-intentioned amateur historians have copiously compiled as much detail as possible concerning the people, places and events they wish to celebrate or commemorate. Such histories are an invaluable source of information to be sure, but they seldom offer answers to critical questions or situate a denominational story within a larger social-cultural, national or theological trends.[21] All of these factors have left denominational historiography, in the words of Henry Bowden, on the edge of oblivion.[22]

Evangelical Protestants themselves share some of the blame. For many the value of remembering forgotten historical figures and events pales in comparison to the priority given to evangelism, the bringing about of conversions. The intense pragmatism of many evangelical Protestants sees the study of history (and in some instances even the study of theology) as a curricular luxury within colleges and seminaries. The legacy of giving preference to piety over learning, to being satisfied with simplistic providentialist approaches to history rather than more substantive, nuanced, critically reflective analyses, takes generations to overcome. Many evangelical denominations have not, until very recently, had individuals with the necessary credentials to produce quality historical studies (and

some still do not). And producing good denominational histories requires money, not to mention attention to the preservation of sources.[23]

My own interest in denominational historiography preceded my employment within MBBS-ACTS, and occurred as an accidental consequence of my dissertation research. My dissertation examined the historical development of the Bible school movement in western Canada and used it as a window into the development of evangelical Protestantism in the region.[24] For decades the movement had been associated with large transdenominational schools such as Prairie Bible Institute, which by the end of the 1940s managed to attract nearly 1,000 students annually to the little prairie town of Three Hills, AB. The school was brought to the attention of the entire nation in 1947 when it was the feature story in *Maclean's Magazine*.[25] Just as the study of evangelical Protestantism in Canada was beginning to make its debut in the early 1990s, this association was unintentionally reinforced by John Stackhouse's introduction to evangelicalism in Canada that was based on selected transdenominational evangelical institutions and organizations.[26] A closer look at the demographics of the Bible school movement revealed the involvement of more than thirty different evangelical Protestant denominations prior to 1960 in western Canada alone. The cumulative enrolment in denominational schools outnumbered the cumulative enrolment in transdenominational schools by a ratio of two to one. In fact, the cumulative enrolment of all Mennonite schools made up approximately one-third of the enrolment of all Bible schools. Further investigation revealed some deep tensions between denominational and transdenominational expressions of evangelical Protestantism, which then became a theme in the study. All this to say, that evangelical Protestantism in Canada has been, and continues to be, much more denominational in its orientation than transdenominational.[27] This is not to minimize the significance of transdenominational tendencies or institutions and organizations, or to overlook trends that have reduced the differences and increased the levels of collaboration among some evangelical Protestant denominations. It is to emphasize that "denomination" is an important, but seldom used, category for analyzing the development of evangelical Protestantism in Canada.

The need for more studies of evangelical Protestant denominations in Canada was illustrated for me again when I had opportunity to be a part of the recently published "Christianity and Ethnicity" project.[28] The project design illustrates well the lacuna in the denominational studies of evangeli-

cal Protestant groups in Canada. All the historic "mainline" Protestant denominations – Anglicans, Lutherans, United Church of Canada, and Presbyterians – were allocated a chapter. The Roman Catholics were given two. Evangelical Protestants, with more than 100 denominations, were squeezed into one chapter. Had we had a better sense of the numerical demographics of the evangelical Protestant denominations at the outset the structure of the project might have been different.[29] The denominational (and transdenominational) scope of evangelical Protestantism in Canada made this chapter exceedingly difficult to write.[30]

What specifically could denominational studies offer to our understanding of evangelical Protestants in particular, and Christianity in Canada in general? The vast majority of evangelical Protestants practice their faith in congregations that are connected in some way to a larger denominational body. Without giving some attention to the organizational structures that contribute to a sense of identity, that define beliefs and convictions, and that help give expression to priorities and practices, it is not possible to understand fully the diversity among twentieth-century evangelical Protestants in Canada and around the world. Many independent mega-churches whose charismatic leaders once decryed denominations are part of networks and associations that organize conventions, and even produce publications and media products (for example, Willow Creek Association). Many of these new networks and associations are at least quasi-denominational in function.[31] Even though organizational structures may not be as tactile an artifact as prayerbooks or as visible as the architectural aesthetics of a building, they are every bit as much a part of the "material culture" of religion, and are a vital part of the complex interplay between religious convictions (beliefs) and the visible manifestation of religion.[32]

There are a few bright spots for denominational studies in North America. Notable is the Denominations in America series edited by Henry Bowden and published by Greenwood Press. The series publishes manuscripts that place the experience of major religious denominations in America within the broad context of social and cultural history. Almost a dozen works have been published in the last two decades (the most recent, *The Episcopalians*, in 2003). The efforts of Greenwood have been augmented by the work of scholars such as Edith Blumhofer and Grant Wacker, whose work on American Pentecostals serve as examples of the best kind of denominational histories.[33] A conference organized by Russell

Richey (Duke University) on "Reimagining Denominationalism," in the early 1990s produced a provocative collection of essays highlighting the need to recover denominational stories. In her essay in this collection, Nancy Ammerman comments that an interest in stories of particular groups "probably represents the broad-ranging retreat from universalism to particularity that is part of what we are coming to call 'postmodernity."[34] To-date such broad-based discussions of denominationalism among scholars of religion have not appeared in Canada – perhaps it is yet another example of how trends and themes within Canadian religious historiography typically lag behind those in American religious historiography.

There are two denominational families within the evangelical Protestant world in Canada that have more established historiographies that could (and should) serve as models for other denominations, namely the Baptists and the Mennonites. Although a good number of my research projects have explored aspects of the Mennonite experience in Canada, it was my entry into the Mennonite Brethren denomination that enabled a more direct involvement in its denominational historiography, and within the organizational infrastructure that has supported this historiography. This infrastructure includes at least four archival centres in North America, the online journal *Direction*, which has been in existence since 1972, an international "Historical Commission" that has a mandate to foster historical understanding and appreciation within the denomination, dozens of graduate students who either have or are currently completing theses or dissertations on topics related to the life of the denomination, scores of articles, biographies, primary source collections, and a range of monographs many of which have been produced by Kindred Press, a denominational publishing house, or Herald Press.[35] Since their origins in Russia in 1860, Mennonite Brethren writers have produced more than a dozen denominational histories, and are in the process of producing several more to commemorate their 150th anniversary in 2010. The Mennonite Brethren are a significant exception in the desert of evangelical Protestant denominational historiography in Canada.

What accounts for such prolificacy by a denomination with an attendance of only 50,000 people, and for its willingness to maintain an infrastructure for the preservation and writing of its history that rivals that of historic denominations in Canada that are multiple times larger? And what sets them apart from so many other evangelical Protestant denominations that have virtually no infrastructure in place for the writing of

history? First, the group has historically manifested a deep appreciation for, and commitment to, higher education. It has for many years had trained personnel and institutions interested in, and capable of, producing historical work.[36] Second, its sense of identity as a Christian community has been formed as much by story as by a set of common beliefs. The orientation towards using narratives for navigating tensions and transitions is a natural habitat for historians: not surprisingly, the denomination has produced far more historians and Bible teachers than theologians.

But challenges remain even within a denomination as committed to preserving and telling its history as the Mennonite Brethren appear to be. First, the denomination was begun in Canada largely by immigrants, and has experienced tremendous change during the past one hundred years. It has moved from being a culturally isolated and ethnically homogeneous religious community to being an urbanized, occupationally diversified, multicultural faith community. The telling of the denominational story must constantly be adjusted to incorporate new experiences, while maintaining its ability to anchor the denomination's theological identity in the face of new challenges.[37] The expectation for a newly hired historian like myself to get this balance "right" was spelled out rather explicitly by an older leader who approached me just prior to a presentation at a national denominational event, to say: "I'm very interested in hearing you tell the story because I'll be listening for what you include, what you exclude, and the spin you put on that which you do include!" I have intentionally tried to tell the denominational story in an invitational way, inviting people to become participants in the ongoing story of a particular "family," rather than as an elitist, triumphalistic apologia demonstrating the group's superior piety and theology. This adjustment is in line with an observation made by Martin Marty, who wrote "Denominations are not disappearing but changing, they are coming to be more like extended families – operating with memory and sensibility, ethos and kinship – than like creedal or other conformity engendering units."[38]

Second, the denomination has not been immune from the impact of living in a society dominated by technology, satiated with information, and shaped by visual media, which has resulted, in the words of one scholar, in the annihilation of history.[39] It is a challenge to convince some contemporary leaders that preserving the denominational story needs to remain an essential priority.

Third, the maintenance of an infrastructure that has facilitated a rich

denominational historiography also has a gravitational pull that can easily consume historians within the denomination who are willing to make a contribution, thereby creating a kind of parochialism that prevents one from being enriched by, and contributing to, the larger field of religious history. It is a constant challenge to convince denominational colleagues that spending time and energy on research projects that are part of the larger story of Christianity in Canada will also make the denominational projects on which I work more valuable. Keeping ones feet in both a denominational seminary world, and the larger academy requires balance and an eye for reciprocity. Insider status can be an advantageous position from which to access the rich literary and artifactual texture of the internal life of a denomination so that it can be used to inform the larger story of Christianity in Canada. And an understanding of the broad patterns and trends within Christianity in Canada can help situate a denominational experience and enhance denominational self-understanding.

Fourth, although many denominational leaders recognize the usefulness of an appeal to the past for reinforcing a sense of identity, and for addressing contemporary issues, few denominational leaders are aware of the deeper historiographical debates and their implications for the telling of the denominational story.[40] For example, leaders within renewal movements such as the Mennonite Brethren often manifest a "declensive tendency" as they shape their stories of the past. Changes in practice, modification of theological emphases, or the open acceptance of influences that cannot be directly traced to a group's founders, are interpreted as a deviation from a gold standard established at some designated point in the history of the movement. This has been particularly evident in the way some Mennonite Brethren in North America have interpreted the influence of evangelical Protestantism.[41]

For decades the prevailing interpretation among North American Mennonites of the sixteenth-century Anabaptist movement was shaped by Harold S. Bender's short address, "The Anabaptist Vision."[42] He identified three emphases as central and normative within "evangelical Anabaptism": discipleship, the church as a voluntary and separated brotherhood, and love and nonresistance in all relationships. Underlying Bender's interpretation of sixteenth-century Anabaptism was the assumption that the movement had started in its purest form in 1525 in Switzerland, spread to other parts of Europe where, in some instances, these offshoots deviated from the original expression. This succinct summary served as a kind of plumbline

for determining what could legitimately be considered Anabaptist. It was (and still is for many) the measuring stick used in Mennonite versus evangelical Protestant comparisons and assessments.

The work of James Stayer and others during the 1970s signaled a scholarly coup d'etat that marked the end of the historiographical monopoly enjoyed by Bender's "monogenesis" model in North America, and inaugurated in its place a "polygenesis" model.[43] These works highlighted the complexity and diversity of Anabaptist origins, ideas and experiences. Greater awareness of the theological diversity among sixteenth-century Anabaptists drew attention to the "confessional partisanship" by which previous Mennonite church historians had selectively endorsed those aspects of the sixteenth-century Anabaptist movement that they considered to be normative, and suppressed information that might challenge their intended version of events. The seismic historiographical shift created by the polygenesis model not only raised questions about the meaning of Anabaptism and the source(s) of Mennonite identity, but also prompted a more fundamental question: is it even possible to formulate an Anabaptist identity, and if so, on what basis? In the words of Rodney Sawatsky, "What is the hermeneutical key to determine normative Mennonitism?"[44] Many proponents of the polygenesis model were social historians who were more interested in the social, economic, religious and political aspects of the movement than they were in theological questions. After wrestling with the additional questions concerning the methodological relationship between history and theology, several Mennonite historians have tried to use the polygenesis model to work out a response.[45] The point is that although polygenesis historiography has generated considerable discussion among professional historians, very few Mennonite Brethren leaders know about this debate or care about the way in which it might effect their own self-understanding as "Mennonites."

Conclusion

In conclusion, I hope it is clear that I'm not suggesting that writing denominational histories is the only way, or necessarily even the best way, to study the history of Christianity in Canada. I'm asserting that denominational studies are a seldom-used (or seldomly used well) approach that can and should be used creatively and constructively to help us understand more deeply the subject(s) that we as learners, teachers, practitioners, and

scholars are seeking to understand better.

Endnotes

1. Particularly notable for their courageous candor are several addresses offered by members who did not, at the time, have an academic post, but who have manifested considerable determination and even entrepreneurial creativity in order to remain active contributors to the society and discipline (Marilyn Whiteley [2002], Peter Bush [2005], and Paul Laverdure [2006]).

2. The majority have used the occasion to offer a wide and provocative range of methodological and historiographical reflections on the study of Christianity in Canada. See for example Marguerite Van Die's discussion of religious experience (1992), Randi Warne's exploration of the relationship between economics and the study of religion (1993), Robert Burkinshaw's overview of evangelical historiography (1995), Beth Profit's inquiry into meaning and methodology (1996), William Katerberg's investigation of historical identity (1997), Paul Friesen's critique of "scientism" within religious historiography (1998), Sandra Beardsall historical sketch of CSCH's "three-headed" identity (1999), Jim Opp's look at the material objects and cultural practices in religious history (2000), Catherine Gidney's encouragement to use socio-cultural approaches within religious history (2001), and Doug Shantz' reflection on using history to serve the common good (2003).

3. The origin of ACTS was part of a broader trend as approximately a dozen evangelical Protestant seminaries were established in the latter half of the twentieth century.

4. The school was started in 1961 by the Evangelical Free Church of Canada as a two-year Christian liberal arts college; it was granted membership in the Association of Universities and Colleges in 1984.

5. The speech was delivered at a Bell Communications Research Colloquium Seminar in Morristown, New Jersey in 1986. For a transcript see http://www.cs.virginia.edu/~robins/YouAndYourResearch.pdf

6. For various reasons, including the transitory nature of leadership within CSCH and limited financial resources, issues within the history of Christianity in Canada are being addressed more substantively through special-topic conferences or projects that often involve individuals who are members of our society rather than by the activities of the society itself.

7. William J. Bouwsma, *A Usable Past: Essays in European Cultural History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 1.

8. Marsden briefly differentiates between the task of the historian and the task of the theologian: "since God's work appears to us in historical circumstances where imperfect humans are major agents, the actions of the Holy Spirit in the church are always intertwined with culturally conditioned factors. The theologian's task is to try to establish from Scripture criteria for determining what in the history of the church is truly the work of the Spirit. The Christian historian takes an opposite, although complementary, approach. While he must keep in mind certain theological criteria, he may refrain from explicit judgments on what is properly Christian while he concentrates on observable cultural forces . . . How one judges any religious phenomena will depend more on one's theological stance than on one's identification of the historical conditions in which it arose" ("Afterword," in *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism* [New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1980], 229-230). His approach is explained more extensively in *Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

9. Marsden, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship*, 91. The comparison between the task of the historian and the pilot are, however, categorically different: in landing a plane the pilot is performing a task that is skill-oriented, not unlike a mechanic fixing the brakes on a car, whereas the task of the historian is interpretation-oriented.

10. Marsden, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship*, 10-11. He argues that a Christian framework offers significance to one's work, as well as a motivation and a rationale for the selection of research issues/questions, but it does not determine the actual methods of historical investigation (91-92). He argues that the "technical dimensions" (61) of all scholarship needs to abide by the "usual standards" without elaborating on how those standards are determined (49).

11. Marsden anticipates criticism in a section entitled "Christian schizophrenia" (*The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship*, 55-57). His proposal has been widely debated: see for example, Christopher Shannon, "Between Outrage and Respectability: Taking Christian History Beyond the Logic of Modernization," *Fides et Historia* 34, No. 1 (Winter/Spring 2002): 3-12. A full analysis of Marsden's proposal is beyond the scope of this presentation.

12. Ann Taves, "Negotiating the Boundaries in Theological and Religious Studies," Unpublished manuscript, 2-3 (see http://www.religion.ucsb.edu/faculty/taves /GTU-FinalLecture.pdf).

13. This posture should not be confused with "objectivity, as if the scholar had no commitments or social location" (Taves, "Negotiating the Boundaries," 8).

14. Using the anthropological notion "multiplex subjectivity" ("Negotiating the Boundaries," 4), Taves notes that the more experience one has in shifting between different occupational or cultural worlds, each of which might require different identities, rules and obligations, the more easily one incorporates a multiplicity of roles in the classroom.

15. By "denomination" I mean the organizational form commonly used by Christian groups in North America. Russell Richey and Robert Mullin note that the category has served as the fundamental unit of religion in North America because of the way it successfully accommodated traditional religious claims and affirmations to the voluntarism and free association of a free society (*Reimagining Denominationalism: Interpretative Essays* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1994], 3).

16. *Social Sources of Denominationalism* (Hamden, CT: The Shoe String Press, 1954), 25.

17. "Foreword, in *Denominationalism*, ed. Russell E. Richey (Nashville: Abingdon, 1977), 3.

18. "Aspects of Canadian Evangelical Historiography," *Historical Papers: Canadian Society of Church History* (1995): 188.

19. In her presidential address in 1992, Marguerite Van Die used an essay by Ann Firor Scott, who observed how patriarchy made the activities of women invisible. Van Die argued that the influence of patriarchy is analogous to the secularity that has kept historians from recognizing and acknowledging the transcendent, spiritual dimension of people's spiritual experience ("Recovering Religious Experience: Some Reflections on Methodology," *Historical Papers: Canadian Society of Church History* [1992]: 156). Similarly, the preference for pan-denominational themes within Canadian religious historiography has sometimes obscured the significance of denominational structures and identities.

20. Ruth Compton Brouwer, "Transcending the 'unacknowledged quarantine': Putting Religion into English-Canadian Women's History," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 27, no. 3 (Fall 1992): 47-61.

21. Mullin and Richey differentiate between two types of denominational studies: internal materials, which focus "on things generated by the movement for its use and self-perpetuation," and external efforts, which depict or describe the denomination for an outside audience. Such external accounts "reach for

intelligibility, accent points of distinction, [and] defend the denomination from its critics" ("Introduction," in *Reimagining Denominationalism*, 5).

22. "The Death and Rebirth of Denominational History," in *Reimagining Denominationalism*, 17.

23. Approximately thirty-five evangelical Protestant denominations in Canada have in recent decades made an effort to produce a history volume. While all contain useful information, they vary considerably in quality: some of the better examples include Lindsay Reynolds, *Footprints: The Beginnings of the Christian & Missionary Alliance in Canada* (Beaverlodge, AB: Buena Book Services, 1981); *Rebirth: The Redevelopment of the Christian & Missionary Alliance* (Beaverlodge, AB: Evangelistic Enterprises, 1992); and Thomas William Millar, *Canadian Pentecostals: A History of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada* (Mississauga: Full Gospel Publishing House, 1994).

24. "Training for Service: The Bible School Movement in Western Canada, 1909-1960" (Ph.D. dissertation, McGill University, 2001).

25. James H. Gray, "Miracle at Three Hills," *Maclean's Magazine*, 15 December 1947: 16-56. The school's story was popularized within the Christian press was well: see for example J.H. Hunter, "With God on the Prairies: The Story of Prairie Bible Institute," *The Evangelical Christian* (August 1943): 337-340.

26. John G. Stackhouse, Jr., *Canadian Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century: An Introduction to Its Character* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 71-88; 131-137.

27. Significant attention is given to various evangelical Protestant denominations in the work of Robert K. Burkinshaw (*Pilgrims in Lotus Land: Conservative Protestantism in British Columbia, 1917-1981* [Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995]).

28. Paul Bramadat and David Seljak, eds., *Christianity and Ethnicity in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008).

29. For example, the attendance in the Fellowship of Evangelical Baptist Churches is approximately equal to that of the cumulative total of all Presbyterian churches; in fact, the cumulative attendance in Baptist churches is more than double that of Presbyterian churches. The cumulative attendance in Pentecostal churches exceeds the attendance of the United Church of Canada and the Anglican Church by more than 25%, and is more than the triple that of Presbyterian churches; the attendance in Christian and Missionary Alliance churches exceeds the cumulative total of all Lutheran churches in Canada.

30. Others have also struggled with managing the diversity among evangelical Protestants. Lloyd Mackey, founding editor of *Christian Info News*, who is very familiar with the contours of the evangelical Protestant landscape in Canada, organized his journalistic overview with only one chapter devoted to a particular denominational group, the Baptists (*These Evangelical Churches of Ours* [Winfield, BC: Wood Lake Books, 1995]). The conference organized by George Rawlyk that culminated in the publication of *Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience* (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1997) was a better mixture of comparative viewpoints, broad themes, and studies of specific denominational families and transdenominational organizations.

31. Examples include the Association of Vineyard Churches with over 1,500 congregations around the world, and the Association of Faith Churches and Ministers. Less structured are networks such as the emerging and emergent church movements, Ekklesia project, the Gospel and our Culture Network (missional church), and New Monasticism.

32. See Colleen McDannell, who argues that "religious meaning is not merely inherited or simply accessed through the intellect" (*Material Christianity: Religion and Popular Culture in America* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995], 272).

33. Edith Blumhofer, *Restoring the Faith: The Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, and American Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993); and Grant Wacker's *Heaven Below: Early Pentecostals and American Culture* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001).

34. "Denominations: Who and What are We Studying?" in *Reimagining Denominationalism,* 111.

35. Mennonite Brethren historiography is augmented further by an extensive infrastructure that undergirds the study of Mennonite history in North America more generally.

36. For more on the leadership role played by the Mennonite Brethren within evangelical higher education in Canada see Bruce Guenther, "Slithering Down the Plank of Intellectualism? The Canadian Conference of Christian Educators and the Impulse Towards Accreditation Among Canadian Bible Schools During the 1960s," *Historical Studies in Education* 16, No. 2 (2004): 197-228.

37. For a helpful description and critique of Mennonite Brethren historiography see Paul Toews, "Differing Historical Imaginations and the Changing Identity of the Mennonite Brethren," in *Anabaptism Revisited: Essays on Anabap-*

tist/Mennonite Studies in Honor of C.J. Dyck, ed. Walter Klaassen (Winnipeg: Herald Press, 1992), 155-169.

38. Martin E. Marty, Review of *Reimagining Denominationalism: Interpretative Essays*, eds. Robert B. Mullin and Russell E. Richey, *Christian Century* (7 December 1994).

39. D.H. Williams, *Retrieving the Tradition and Renewing Evangelicalism: A Primer for Suspicious Protestants* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 9-26. Williams echoes the observations of the French philosopher and sociologist Jacques Ellul made decades earlier in *The Technological Society* (New York: Knopf, 1964).

40. For a more detailed discussion of the implications of three current historiographical debates see Bruce Guenther, "Rediscovering the Value of History and Tradition," in *Out of the Strange Silence: The Challenge of Being Christian in the 21st Century,* ed. Brad Thiessen (Winnipeg: Kindred Productions, 2005), 187-202.

41. A fuller discussion of this issue within Mennonite historiography is included in Bruce L. Guenther, "Evangelicalism within Mennonite Historiography: The Decline of Anabaptism or a Path Towards Dynamic Ecumenism?" *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 24 (2006): 35-53; and Paul Toews, "The American Mennonite Search for a Useable Past: From the Declensive to the Ironic Interpretation," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 73, No. 3 (July 1999): 470-502.

42. "The Anabaptist Vision," *Church History* 13, No. 1 (1944): 3-24; and *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 18, No. 2 (1944): 67-88.

43. James Stayer, *Anabaptists and the Sword* (Lawrence, KS: Coronado Press, 1972); and James Stayer, Werner Packull, and Klaus Deppermann, "From Monogenesis to Polygenesis: The Historical Discussion of Anabaptist Origins," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 49, No. 2 (April 1975): 83-121. See also Werner O. Packull, "Some Reflections on the State of Anabaptist History: The Demise of a Normative Vision," *Studies in Religion* 8, No. 3 (1979): 313-323; James Stayer, "The Easy Demise of a Normative Vision of Anabaptism," in *Mennonite Identity*, 109-116; Werner O. Packull, "Between Paradigms: Anabaptist Studies at the Crossroads," *Conrad Grebel Review* 8 (Winter 1990): 1-22. For a short overview of the historiographical changes in Anabaptist studies see A. James Reimer, "From Denominational Apologetics to Social History and Systematic Theology: Recent Developments in Early Anabaptist Studies," *Religious Studies Review* 29, No. 3 (July 2003): 235-240.

44. Rodney J. Sawatsky, "The Quest for a Mennonite Hermeneutic," *Conrad Grebel Review* 11, No. 1 (Winter 1993): 3.

45. Arnold Snyder, "Beyond Polygenesis: Recovering the Unity and Diversity of Anabaptist Theology," in *Essays in Anabaptist Theology,* ed. H. Wayne Pipkin (Elkhart: Institute of Mennonite Studies, 1994), 1-34.

"We Wish to Inform You": Canadian Religious Reporting of the Rwandan Genocide

KATE BOWLER
Duke University

On 18 October 1994, Father Claude Simard, a Canadian priest of the Congregation of the Holy Cross, asked the intruding Rwandan soldiers if he might pray. The Quebec priest counted the Rwandans as his own people, and was one of the few foreigners who refused to leave when the slaughter began. And he survived, becoming one of the few missionaries to witness the massacre that left 800,000 Rwandans dead. When the post-pogrom government allowed reprisal on Hutus, Father Simard protested this new crop of murders, a bitter fact that had brought the Rwandan Patriotic Front soldiers to his dining room table. They ended his life with hammers as he bowed in prayer. Father Simard was among the nine Canadians who perished in the genocide and one of the many more who, since the 1960s, were closely involved in the religious and economic development of Rwanda. Religion opened the door for this fledgling post-colonial African nation to receive economic advantages. Canadians like Dominican Père Lévesque helped found the country's only university, the National University of Rwanda, where a new generation of Rwandan elites benefited from Canadian religious, educational and political networks. As a stable and efficient country with a small military force, this central African nation became the jewel of Canadian aid programs. As a largely Christian country, with 78% professing some denomination of the faith, it was also the pride of Canadian religious communities – particularly of Catholics and Adventists, the largest Protestant denomination in Rwanda.[1] But as Rwandans turned on their Tutsi minority, the upwards of $300

million that had built up Rwandan infrastructure now looked like Canadian fuel to the fires of the genocide.

This paper seeks to examine how Canadian Christians interpreted the genocide and their own churches' role in it, as told in the primary denominational periodicals of the Canadian religious press. In using Catholic, Mennonite, and Adventist denominational publications, I examine how these religious communities reported and interpreted the atrocity within the context of being both Christian and Canadian. Difficult questions pressed in. Was this "just another" story of Africans killing Africans, Hutus killing Tutsis, or believers killing believers? In other words, did denominations interpret themselves primarily as fellow Christians, implicated in a missionary legacy that made genocide possible? Or, was the story told to Canadians as Canadians, benevolent citizens eager to spread an empire of "humane internationalism" to a world of inhumane outsiders?[2] Each community first saw itself through the eyes of its own religious body, bounded by its media access, theological interests, and church hierarchy. As the decade wore on, however, these denominations began to reinterpret Rwanda as more than a Christian problem, but a Canadian failure. Alongside other Canadians, the failure of Canada's role as multilateral peacekeeper pressed religious communities to reevaluate how religious and national goals could work in tandem.

Rwanda as a Christian Problem

News pundits generally summarized the events of 1994 as a result of political failure, economic downturn, or tribalism surfacing since time immemorial. Yet the Rwandan genocide, unlike other holocausts in the twentieth century, arose not simply between religious communities but within them. As Timothy Longman writes, "In most communities, members of a church parish killed their fellow parishioners and even in a number of cases, their own pastor or priest."[3] And this tragic politico-religious reality was based, in part, on the history of missionary work that preceded it. Since the early 1900s, missionaries' longtime focus on converting political authorities yielded trickle-down conversions, making the country "one of the most Catholic societies in Africa."[4] In fact, in 1945, Rwanda was officially declared a Catholic country and a tacit marriage between the Catholic Church and state power began to emerge.[5] As a result, during the social revolution of 1959, wherein the Hutu majority assumed power over their former Tutsi overlords, the church

accepted the inversion rather than question the social script upon which it was established. Hence, the silent alliance between church and state helped Hutu leaders gain power as easily as it had once helped their Tutsi counterparts. For years after independence this relationship between the Catholic Church and state power remained strong.

With the ascension of President Habyarimana in 1975, himself a "devout Catholic," the church had become the most powerful non-governmental authority in the nation, further fortifying this reciprocal union between the Catholic Church and state power. The president leaned on churches for political support and the church yielded, even allowing high-ranking clergy to serve on the state's one-party Central Committee. The church duplicated the tribalism mandated by the government and disallowed Tutsis from regular positions in church leadership. Given this political milieu, when massacres of Tutsis erupted in the early 90s, presaging the eventual genocide, the churches' ensuing silence appeared promising to the political authorities. Yet, Tutsi believers still trusted in the independent power of the church, and sought despairingly to take refuge in its walls once the genocide began. According to most reports, as this sad predicament played out, more people were killed in church buildings than anywhere else. In a country where almost eighty per cent professed to be Christians, its churches failed not simply to oppose the genocide but, as the World Council of Churches report wrote, "the church itself stands tainted, not by passive indifference, but by errors of commission as well."[6]

Canadian Churches and the Public Face of Aid

As the media began to report the emerging tragedy, Canadian Christian charity poured out for Rwanda in epic proportions. The Canadian Catholic Organization for the Development of Peace (CCODP) along with other international relief agencies sprang into action after seeing the heartbreaking footage of hundreds of thousands of Hutu refugees fleeing into neighboring countries.[7] "Aid to Rwandan Crisis Pouring In," the *Catholic Register* proclaimed, as pleas for money and reports of refugee relief work.[8] Their "Development and Peace" program provided $8 million over the next six years for emergency relief programs. The Mennonite Central Committee, the humanitarian wing of Mennonite Canadians, launched a similar initiative with "Operation Healing Rwanda," a multi-million dollar effort to help the refugees.[9] The Mennonite press followed

the operation's every move with sustained attention as photos, maps, and special reports spurred this small denomination into supporting MCC's lead. In a special report a year after the genocide, the MCC summarized its efforts as follows: $7.8 million of charity funding provided the resources needed to operate four camps of up to six thousand refugees near Bukavu in southern Zaire.[10] Clothing, blankets, seeds, and cooking supplies accompanied tons of Canadian food stuffs and two six-person teams of Mennonites from North America, Europe, and Africa.[11] According to the same report, North Americans had donated $2.2 million and the Canadian International Development Agency provided matching funds. At the same time, the Seventh-Day Adventists also launched a rapid humanitarian response through Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA). ADRA oversaw numerous health initiatives aimed at saving the lives of Rwandan refugees in Goma and Bukavu through the construction of numerous clinics, schools, hospitals, and the training of 2000 health workers. They also assumed the gruesome task of burying the thousands of bodies that washed up on the shores of Lake Victoria.[12]

As the sheer size of this endeavor demonstrates, the misery of the refugees' plight did not go unnoticed. With over a million refugees in these camps, comprising nearly a third of Rwanda's Hutu population, the world watched in horror as the spectacle of the genocide transformed into a raw display of televised suffering. Having narrowly escaped the slaughter of thousands in their own country, the straggling survivors arrived only to find the refugee camps rife with cholera, water contamination, and gangrened wounds – a hell so perfect that, to the international community who watched, it eclipsed the misery left behind. Though the world had waited in silence as Hutu Power had done its worst, the power of these images prompted it to spring to life in response to the refugee crisis, becoming "the largest most rapid and most expensive deployment by the international humanitarian-aid industry in the twentieth century."[13] Led by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Catholics, Mennonite and Adventist agencies joined the more than a hundred relief agencies that followed in its wake to offer what aid they could give.

As the front lines of the RPF pressed into Hutu Power heartlands, millions of the fleeing Hutus poured into refugee camps. At times, whole communities herded as radio broadcasts convinced them that the Tutsi-dominated invading forces would not separate the guilty from the innocent. With the vast majority of Hutus having participated in the slaughter, many felt it necessary to lam or receive the brutal retaliation of

the Tutsi forces. Killers like Alphonese, a Hutu farmer speaking with an ADRA reporter, described the fear of encroaching retribution: "we were so disappointed we had failed. We were disheartened by what we were going to lose, and truly frightened by the misfortune and vengeance reaching out for us."[14] Attempting to respond to this crisis, however, the fact that these refugees "were people who had killed or had been terrified into following the killers into exile" put humanitarian organizations in the odd predicament of now feeding the perpetrators of the previous genocide – even while it had left the straggling Tutsi community in Rwanda to fend for itself during the explosion of violence earlier that year.

With such a complicated situation, religious communities in Canada struggled to convey the simplicity of its humanitarian goals with the complicated nature of this tangled humanitarian failure. In many ways they fell prey to the same prejudices of the secular media causing them present the narrative of this pogrom with purely political, rather than religious, dimensions.

Canadian Catholic Press on Rwanda

As Canada's largest and most influential newspaper for Catholics, the *Catholic Register* was an obvious choice for this study. Its sizable circulation and internet presence gave this periodical, owned by the archdiocese of Toronto, a vested interested in presenting a Catholic viewpoint to the almost thirteen million Canadians who call themselves members of the Church. It was this uncritical loyalty that tended to craft the Catholic media's presentation of the tragic events.

The *Register's* coverage of the genocide was late in coming. Weeks after it first began, news of "ethnic and political violence" in Rwanda appeared only as an appendage to a report on a Synod of African bishops.[15] Five weeks after President Habyarimana's assassination, signaling the start of the slaughter, Canadians heard their first Catholic explanation of the events – a complicated "massacre," as the Vatican called it. Described by the dissimulating Rwandan ambassador to Canada, it was cloaked as the spontaneous acts of misguided youth.[16] Due to the *Register's* delay in reporting, the genocide was nearly over almost before Catholic Canadians could read comprehensive coverage of the events.

Even after the slaughter transpired, the *Register*'s coverage thinly described what had taken place. Tutsis, butchered or surviving, received minimal coverage in the *Register*. For the first two months of the

genocide, the victims and perpetrators remained unspecified. In an ironic twist, those killed for their ethnicity were reported without it, as generic "Rwandan" deaths.[17] Though the language was condemning, it did not venture beyond the general: they were conveyed as "acts of violence," "fratricidal massacres," "tragedies," and "tribally motivated killings" that seem to have no history, no beginning and no end.

Yet throughout the genocide, Canadians heard the pope decry the violence in Rwanda with a clear, strong voice. On 23 April 1994 the *Register* first reported the crisis through John Paul II's call on Rwandans to end "ethnic and political violence in Rwanda where tens of thousands were reported killed or wounded in early April."[18] Moreover, he was forthright in using the term "genocide," a word forbidden to American diplomats as it could trigger binding political action by the United Nations.[19] The pope called it "a real and true genocide for which unfortunately even Catholics are responsible."[20]

Despite the strong denunciation of the Roman Curia, for the *Catholic Register* Rwanda proved to be difficult story to tell. Early indications that the church intended to be transparent about its role in the genocide soon sputtered and finally stopped. Though the pope made special mention of Rwanda's Catholicity, overestimating that seventy per cent claimed the church as its own, when it came to describing the genocide itself he depicted it as an inherently political struggle brought on by exacerbated ethnic tensions.[21] It was a political problem and the church called for political solutions by means of the intervention of the United Nations or the RPF to create safe zones for refugees. Even as reports began to surface of complicity by church leadership and laity, Vatican sources kept an eerie silence, and the *Register* offered little analysis of its own. Catholic news briefs cited Catholic chapels as massacres sites without comment. Though church officials begged the seventy-five per cent of native priests that fled the country to return, they remained silent as to why these priests might join the *genocidaires* in fleeing rather than stay. Even while the startling admission by RPF radio that their soldiers had killed the Archbishop of Kigali and several bishops under their protection – revenge for their alleged part in the genocide – met with outrage and condolences. No analysis of why Catholic clergy were facing retaliatory deaths came to print.[22] The Canadian Catholic press blithely maintained that "church officials had done everything in their power to save lives and protect people and fled the country only when their own lives were in danger."[23] With the same composed naiveté, two months after the RPF effectively

ended the genocide, the *Register* cheerily reported that church officials were calling for business as usual. Reports waxed poetic and inspirational as Canadians read about reunited families, charity concerts, and relief efforts. "The Church in Rwanda Must Rebuild," a headline read. And a visit from the CCODP reiterated that, "the church can play its logical role in the reconciliation effort."[24]

For the next few years, Canadians heard little about the aftermath of the volcanic unrest that had exploded in the Central African nation. Short updates were vague, confusing and tended to downplay the situation. Reports stated that Hutu refugees still waited in camps over the border, possible victims, possible perpetrators, but gathering to pray for reconciliation in their country.

Eventually, however, the truth of the atrocity and the role the church played in the killings began to manifest. Almost five years after the genocide, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, along with national courts from Rwanda, Switzerland, and Belgium, began to try some of the hundred thousand jailed Rwandans awaiting trial. From 1997 to 2001, about twenty priests and nuns were indicted on counts of genocide, setting off an intense volley of diplomatic negotiation, finger pointing, and publicity campaigns. Finally in 1998, the *Register* reported its first gruesome details of a Catholic priest's involvement in ordering his church's demolition with two thousand Tutsis huddled inside. The report included an addendum from a Vatican spokesperson, saying that *any* guilty party should be brought to justice.

However, when the Rwandan courts indicted Bishop Augustin Misago, making him the highest-ranking Catholic official to be charged with genocide, the Vatican went on the offensive and the *Register*'s coverage took a decisive turn. A flurry of reports from the Vatican news agency described it as a "defamatory campaign" designed by the Rwandan government to discredit the Catholic Church.[25] The paper followed the trial of the bishop with persistent attention as Misago stood accused of helping to plan the genocide and giving up three priests and thirty students to their killers. The *Register's* favorable coverage of the bishop seemed to be vindicated when, in June 2000, he was acquitted. Picturing a triumphant bishop outside the courtroom, the paper reported the Vatican's joy as well as a reminder that the trial had proven to be merely a political act, proving to exculpate the Catholic Church.

Any sustained relief for the church was short-lived, as a report commissioned by the Organization of African Unity pushed the Vatican

into a delicate balancing act. When the 296-page report, "Rwanda: The Preventable Genocide," was presented at the UN by Ambassador Stephen Lewis of Canada, it forced Catholics to face questions about the participation of church leadership in the pogrom as well as prompting a critical revision of their missionary legacy. As for the *Register*, it offered a lengthy rebuttal to the report, noting that the slain Archbishop, Vincent Nsengiyumva, had been reprimanded by the Vatican prior to the genocide for his political involvement while reminding readers that, though Bishop Misago had been charged with genocide, he had been exonerated. Official explanations noted that, "Though the killing was particularly thorough in the Misago's district," the paper reported, "the bishop was away from his diocese when the slaughter started."[26]

Adding to the increasing onslaught was the mounting attack on the White Fathers, the founding Catholic missionary order present from the first days of Belgian colonial rule. Gerald Caplan, Canadian academic and New Democratic Party (NDP) political strategist who authored the study, had singled out the White Fathers as being key players, saying they had "created a whole demented, racist mythology."[27] "White Fathers have been involved in reconciliation efforts in Rwanda for the last six years," retorted a White Fathers superior.[28] Angered pundit, Stephen Lewis, argued that "no apology has yet come from the French government or the Catholic church," indicating that the Vatican continued to dismiss the Catholic Church's intimate involvement in the brutality.[29] But *The Register* countered by stating that the pope had, in fact, apologized, continuing to stress the point that the post-genocide church helped to lead the way in reconciliation.

Commendably, the Catholic press did not shirk from reporting the difficult ensuing trials of Catholic clergy. Two nuns supplied the gasoline that burnt seven hundred Tutsi men to death in a locked garage, while a priest was convicted of bulldozing his own church in order to kill the Tutsis hidden inside.[30] Several months later, when the nuns were found guilty, the *Register* reported several explanations by Catholic officials. Calling the genocide a "situation of great confusion," it questioned the fairness of the trial in both the "singling out" of these nuns for punishment and holding it in a "country so far from Rwanda."[31] In explaining the actions of the Catholic Church, the press often quoted a papal address that "'all members of the church who sinned during the genocide must have the courage to face the consequences", but also that "the Catholic Church cannot be held responsible for the sins of its members." In doing so, the

press alternated between arguing that the church had taken responsibility, and that it need not take responsibility. While the Rwandan problem may have been a Christian problem, it was not a problem of the Catholic Church itself, only individual Catholics.

Given this checkered coverage, *The Catholic Register* appears to have steered a middle course with regard to its depiction of the events, when compared to the notably conservative magazine, *Catholic Insight*, which seemed more besieged, refusing to drop 'allegedly' when describing the convictions of two priests for genocide.[32] It also linked Caplan's unflattering portrayal of the Catholic Church to his pro-choice sympathies. Accusations of a difficult missionary past in Rwanda were roundly dismissed as being without evidence, owing to the fact that the Magis terium teaches the unity of all humanity. Only an article written February of 2007 reported the sentencing of a priest without disclaimers, unflinchingly describing Fr. Athanase Seromba's attempts to kill Tutsis in his own church, first by grenades and fuel, only to order a bulldozer to demolish the church at the structural weak points he pointed out when the first option failed.[33] *The Catholic Register* typically resisted inspirational fodder and assumed the heady task of reporting international news with Catholic content. However, it displayed great reluctance in examining the genocide as an inherently Christian problem. What little attention it gave was mostly devoted to the defense of the clergy. While it successfully demonstrated the gravity of the deaths of the eighty percent of the total Tutsi population, it offered Canadian Catholics few resources for understanding how those working shifts on death squads could pause daily for mass.

Mennonite Religious Press on Rwanda

The two largest Mennonite conferences, MB and MCC, each with around 35,000 members, produce the most widely-circulated Canadian news sources from a Mennonite perspective – the *Mennonite Brethren Herald* and the *Canadian Mennonite*, preceded by the *Mennonite Reporter* (which ended in 1997). Designed to be a denominational magazine, it contains heavy international content, as well as inspirational stories and local news. While it is biweekly and clearly not imagined to replace secular newspapers, it remains a primary source of information on how Mennonites address the world's problems, particularly through the Mennonite Central Committee.

The Mennonite press described the genocide through the eyes of their relief workers, peering into Rwanda from the Congo's hilly borders. The tragedies Mennonites witnessed were not a Tutsi minority hacked down on every street, but the millions of destitute pouring into an already fragile center of Mennonite faith. As Rwanda's western neighbor, it is home to the world's second largest Mennonite community and as such Rwanda's crisis surfaced as tangentially related to "brothers" and "sisters" in the faith. As they saw Rwanda from the sidelines, their depiction of the genocide remained narrow at best. Long after all major powers and humanitarian agencies had uttered the word "genocide," the Mennonite press continued to call it a "civil war," or "tribal violence." Like the Catholic press, the ethnic targets of this holocaust were often unreported. More disturbing was the tendency to view the genocide as a "tragedy between the Hutus and the Tutsis" – as if genocide is an act that demands two willing parties. As late as 1997, the *MB Herald* published a long, descriptive letter about the 1994 crisis, alleging "both Hutus and Tutsis have taken part in the killings."[34] Unlike other denominational publications, the Mennonite press offered sparse historical contextualization or even an overall portrait of its grim reality. Coverage read more like an inventory of donated items and funds to the refugee camps than a comprehensive explanation of a complicated slaughter. As such, causal explanations seemed haphazard. While later reports suggested that the genocide had political roots, the earliest reports suggest that spontaneous violence brought about by the president's assassination. It was as if Rwandans were susceptible to timeless tribal conflict. Some described the Hutus and Tutsis as being "in conflict for decades"; still others believed the Hutu Power propaganda that suggested Tutsis shot down the plane themselves.

Overall, the Mennonite religious press wrote about what it knew best, compassionate action. The vast majority of reports documented aid to the refugees, assuming them to be the original victims. Though depicted as replete with the sorrow of the time, the Mennonite periodicals also conveyed these moments as the start of a new collaboration. In their pages, the organization and maintenance of refugee camps became a shared project between Zairian and Canadian Mennonites, as Canadian Mennonites found themselves working side by side with another robust Mennonite community from the other side of the world. Their involvement in overseeing refugee camps in eastern Zaire had been a bittersweet celebration of shared Mennonite goals.

As the decade wore on, reports continued to describe Congo as the primary casualty of suffering begun in Rwanda.[35] But in doing so, they also resisted the impulse of other Christian communities to treat Rwanda as a problem with an easy solution. While some reports waxed inspirational claiming – a year after the bloodshed – celebratory accounts of Hutu and Tutsi youth working side by side, most did not. As pacifism is a key article of Mennonite faith, refugee camps became fertile ground for reconciliation as an alternative Christian response to violence. Immersing themselves in peace and reconciliation programs, they assumed the long drudgery of unravelling "timeless" problems.

While MCC's initial response to the crisis led them to assume direct oversight of refugee camps, MCC soon transitioned to a "bridge-building" role of peacemaking and reconciliation, settling in for the years of gritty work ahead. In doing so, Mennonites appeared to be among the first to recognize the significance of their Christian commitments particularly as grounded in peacemaking. Mennonite Brethren official, John Redekop, described Christianity at war with itself as an "incomplete gospel": "the widespread scandal of Christians physically fighting fellow Christians brings shame on the followers of Jesus and cripples their witnessing." He argued that Mennonites fill the great need to bring about reconciliation among Christians, "especially among those who have allowed national, ethnic, linguistic or tribal identity to become primary." While past missionaries brought a gospel that was too "vertical, emphasizing one's relation to God but not to others," Mennonites could bring a "horizontal" gospel, thick in community relationship.[36]

While the Canadian Mennonite press largely glossed over the difficult reality that the refugee camps brimmed with killers, a few hints suggested that the Mennonites' role in the Congo put their Christian convictions to the test. As Eric Olfert, director of MCC in Africa, observed, food relief efforts were intended to be linked with peace and reconciliation. However, the Congolese army had failed to disarm the refugees, making MCC camps the new homes for rogue Hutu militias. Though some relief agencies withdrew in seeing rampant militarization, Mennonite peace workers continued to feed soldiers. Ongoing Hutu attacks against the new Rwandan government converted Mennonites' goodwill efforts into launching pads of military action.[37] Their moral dilemma grew with time as refugees themselves became human shields for the Interahamwe, leverage useful even years after the genocide.

For Mennonites, the story of Rwanda was told about and from the

refugee camps in which they worked. In telling the story of the Rwandan genocide from the borders of Zaire, the Canadian Mennonite press elided the centerpiece of the story – the story of the Tutsis, dead or surviving left behind. But what they saw, they remembered. In one cataclysmic moment, millions of Rwandans flooded in Mennonite lands. Their response reflected their belief that with a truly nonviolent Christianity, one of lasting peace and reconciliation, this tragedy could be ended once and for all.

The Adventist Press and Rwanda

For a Canadian perspective on Adventist issues, believers turned to the monthly *Canadian Adventist Messenger*. Coupled with its American sister-publication, the *Adventist Review,* Adventists fortified their religious convictions with the global perspective of the official General Conference. Though both publications offer internationally-minded and comprehensive coverage, its mandate to "inspire, educate and encourage" led more liberal Adventists to found *Spectrum*, as a "candid but loyal" alternative.

Naturally, the Adventist press was quick to report their own tragic suffering, elaborately describing the events of the early days of the genocide as they unfolded. Of particular concern was the status of Adventists' Rwandan infrastructure with hospitals, schools and missionary centers at sudden risk. Initially, Adventist Rwandans were assumed to be the victims. The news and church officials watched Rwanda closely for signs of hope, eager to share each inspiring story of survival to a waiting world. Though fixated on Rwanda itself, the press eagerly reported Adventist Church leadership in the international community. Robert S. Folkenberg, General Conference president, joined the outcry against the slaughter and called upon the United Nations to restore peace in Rwanda.

Before the civil war touched down on Rwandan soil, the small nation had been hailed by Adventists as "Africa's Adventist Island."[38] This central African nation was a rare success for the Adventist community, with over 300,000 baptized believers claimed for the church. But while the Canadian Adventist press signaled escalating ethnic violence, particularly as it encroached upon the established infrastructure of hospitals, schools, and missionary outreach centers, like other religious denominations they were more interested in growth and numbers.[39]

Until the genocide, the Adventist Church in Rwanda had been one of the fastest growing in the world, with one in twenty-seven Rwandans

claiming this ecclesial affiliation as their own. For this sectarian denomination, eager to establish mainstream credibility, this high concentration of converts to the faith quickly proved to be a lamentable numbers game. The burgeoning number of Adventist converts had to be counted among the one million Hutus accused of killing their pastors, neighbors, and friends. As J. J. Nortey, president of the Africa-Indian Ocean Division, observed, "I understand that perhaps 90-95% of our members were Hutus and lived mainly in the northern section of the country."[40] While early reports speculated that Adventists were less likely to have joined the fray, Adventists found they could claim no abstention from the collective guilt. Even in the Adventist areas, Nortey admits, "the killings were as bad as those in the rest of the northern region."[41] With approximately 99 per cent of Tutsis slaughtered in the northern "Adventist ghetto," some 10,000 killed in total, Adventists struggled to account authentically for the 100,000 Adventist Rwandans who fled into exile. Only *Spectrum*, the beleaguered left-leaning Adventist periodical, dared to say why: "Some of the 10,000 to 40,000 Adventists killed in the Rwandan genocide died at the hand of fellow Sabbathkeepers,"[42] leading many of the participants in this killing to flee out of fear of the witnesses left behind.

As the decade wore on, Adventist officials struggled to acknowledge that the church itself was found wanting. The Canadian Adventist press could not explain the failure of Adventist belief to make a difference. At times, the failure of Rwanda appeared to be largely the result of tribalism, at times the international community, and at times Christianity itself. The General Conference president issued a strong response as he spoke to Adventist pastors in Rwanda: "I have come to one conclusion – the gospel did not fail. The cross of Christ did not fail, the Holy Spirit did not fail – *we* failed! You and I failed! We, as pastors, failed. Christian clergy and priests and pastors failed!"[43] The true failure, he argued, is the failure of an inauthentic Christianity, "the result of unconverted people who carried the name of Christ."[44] While the press reported church officials' grief that Adventism brought an incomplete Christianity to Rwanda, confession did not come easily. As the editor of *Spectrum* argued, "No Adventist is known to have confessed to any killings."[45]

Over time the Adventist church, like others, appeared eager to leave the past behind them and trade grim reports of refugee suffering for inspirational accounts of fresh progress. But the uncomfortable role of Adventist pastor, Elsaphane Ntakirutimana, in the genocidal slaughter of thousands of men, women, and children in Rwanda continued to revive the

issue of the church's culpability. On 12 April 1994, around 2,000 Tutsis fled to the headquarters of the Adventist mission where they hoped they would be spared. The president of the mission, Pastor Ntakirutimana, along with his son refused to treat the wounded and conspired with Hutu militiamen to promote their imminent deaths. Seven Tutsi pastors assumed leadership within the condemned compound and wrote the following letter to the president:

> Our dear leader, Pastor Elizaphan Ntakirutimana, How are you! We wish you to be strong in all these problems we are facing. We wish to inform you that we have heard that tomorrow we will be killed with our families. We therefore request you to intervene on our behalf and talk with the Mayor. We believe that, with the help of God who entrusted you the leadership of this flock, which is going to be destroyed, your intervention will be highly appreciated, the same way as the Jews were saved by Esther. We give honor to you.[46]

One survivor remembers the pastor's response: "Your problem has already found a solution. You must die." While the General Conference officials clearly distanced themselves from commenting on the innocence or culpability of their mission president, the pastor's conviction by United Nations Crimes Tribunal became a drawn out spectacle enacted on the world stage. The Adventist press reported minimal details alongside letters of protest from angered parishioners and even the pastor's son himself, blaming the press for reporting it at all. Like the Catholic press, the Adventist magazines struggled to account for the reality that the church itself seemed to be on trial.

The Canadian Adventist press successfully offered the most comprehensive and grisly coverage of the horrifying and systematic work of genocide. But just as the Rwandan killings were acknowledged to be a *Christian* problem, the result of an unconverted church, it now needed a Christian solution. Though Adventist officials admitted too great a preoccupation with numerical growth, they felt that new construction, healing and hope yielded fresh revivals. In 2004, the church claimed 50,000 people had embraced Adventism and a "new life for Rwanda."[47] As the problem of the genocide could be 'solved' in Christ's name, past and present presidents of the Africa-Indian Ocean Division of the Adventist church urged the church to move on. "Our approach is to forget the past and begin afresh," describes division President A.J. Daniel, "It is not easy to preach to the deeply aggrieved people in Rwanda after hearing of such

atrocities. But we must forgive those who hurt us. We must forgive anyway."[48] Theirs was an eager mission to spiritually re-baptize a body of divided believers and begin again.

As time wore on, this commitment to begin afresh allowed the Adventist media to graphically describe the realities of the genocide and to provide a possible Christian closure, even while they still struggled to come to grips with their denomination's role in the atrocity. Unlike the Catholics and the Mennonites, Adventists continued to see their Christian ideals as in tandem with the policies of Canadian international intervention. While Catholics and Mennonites failed to completely encapsulate the totality of the tragedy, eventually both communities came to look beyond a purely Christian solution to the devastation to view Rwanda as an inherently Canadian failure as well.

Rwanda as a Canadian Failure

As the Rwandan genocide began to imprint itself on the minds of Canadians, a macabre scene of holocaust, the Canadian religious press began to see it not only as a Christian problem, but as a Canadian problem. Consequently, by the early years of the new millennium, the state of Canadian self-identity appeared to be in crisis. Rwanda did not fit into the Canadian political imagination. A failure in equity with regard to humanitarian aid, United Nations intervention, and robust international multilateralism, Rwanda was a perfect storm of Canadian desires falling short.

With Romeo Dallaire at the helm of the United Nations' failed intervention, UNAMIR, and numerous Canadians acting in key positions, the genocide created far-reaching implications for Canadian politics. Since Canadian Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson first popularized the term "peacekeeping" in the late 1950s, Canadians hinged their national identity to this global role. Popularized historical vignettes captured in Canadian "Heritage Minutes" celebrate Canadian soldiers, capped in UN blue berets, quieting the violence in the Congo with diplomatic finesse. Such tales of heroism shaped the imagination of Canadians, who think of themselves as a mediating middle power. While popular sources continued to preach that Canadians regularly make up ten per cent of peacekeeping forces, contrary to prominent Canadian self-perception recent studies showed otherwise. According to a 1997 survey, seventy per cent of Canadians identified "peacekeeping" as a primary national identity marker.[49] For Canadians, the

role of peacekeeper brought pride and a particular international orientation. Hence, with deteriorating confidence in its own mandate, Canada's vision of itself as a multilateral peacekeeper was in a state of profound disjuncture. Facing this situation, the Canadian state had to choose between two models: an Americanized army, broad and blunt, or a niche military, small, wieldy, and highly specialized. With dramatically insufficient military funding, Canadians would need to demonstrate the political will to either stop allowing America to effectively underwrite its defense, or employ small special ops and authorize them with the force to accomplish peacekeeping goals abroad.

The 1990s had seen Canadian peacekeepers in hasty and haphazard missions with inconclusive results. Furthermore, with the world's opinion of the efficacy of the United Nations dwindling, Canada's heavy investment in UN multilateralism was not paying off. While André Ouellet, foreign minister to the UN General Assembly, heralded Rwanda as the catalyst for the Canadian government's decision to press for UN peacekeeping reforms, polls reported a continual decline in Canadian confidence in the UN.[50] Though Rwanda was described as a sobering lesson for peacekeeping, Canada committed fewer and fewer of its citizens to the endeavor. In 1993, ten thousand of the eighty thousand individuals serving under UN command were Canadian. By 2007, with only .2% of Canadians as peacekeepers, the UN has simply stopped asking Canada to participate.

As political scientists Andrew Cooper and Dane Rowlands argued, Canada is "going through a period of profound anxiety, critique, and reconsideration. All of the accepted images of why and how Canada should play an international role have been eroded if not completely shattered."[51] After years of deteriorating confidence in the United Nations, Canada appears to be at a crossroads. Its previous model of peacekeeping, classic United Nations Chapter Six defenders of peace agreements, had been rendered defunct in a new multinational and porous economy of peace. Not only was Canada not playing the global role it once had, but others were starting to notice. As one strategist described, "Canada will continue to be irrelevant unless there is a political will to change. Today it adopts high moral standards from a safe distance."[52] Once national sources of collective pride, peacekeeping and diplomatic prowess now seemed exposed to global scrutiny. Canada, as the most influential middle power in Rwanda and a major broker in multilateral negotiations, found Rwanda to be an embarrassment of epic proportions that prompted the country to question its role in international intervention.[53]

Initially the Canadian religious press reported their denominational missionary efforts as working in tandem with Canadian ideals. Both as Christians and as Canadians, nationally and religiously, their generosity was well documented. In some cases CIDA channeled funds through their religious agencies in order that both might achieve their goals. But by the close of the 1990s, worries surfaced in the Catholic and Mennonite press which suggested that perhaps Canadian solutions may not satisfy the gospel's requirements. When the UN adopted Lloyd Axworthy's initiative, entitled "The Responsibility To Protect," Canada again appeared to be on the front lines of multilateralism. While religious communities concurred with its purpose to ensure that the Rwandan genocide would never happen again, it questioned Canadian methods that tended to spurn the possibility of military risk.

The Catholic press, though largely preoccupied with the trials of its own leadership, began to question Canada's international role after Rwanda. Some questioned Canada's commitment to its own "responsibility to protect." While regular columnist, Father Raby, grumbled in his headline that, "I'd unite with UN if it weren't so useless," others worried that Canada's ongoing lack of human security agenda for the Sudan proved its lack of political will to take necessary measures.[54] Yet the Catholic community found an unlikely hero in Romeo Dallaire, the broken UN commander who witnessed Rwanda's tragic downfall. As a Catholic with a compassionate drive to prevent another atrocity, the Catholic press reported Dallaire's rallying cries for action in Darfur. Further, three Catholic organizations joined a group of lobbyists to invoke the "Responsibility To Protect" in order to prevent an inevitable genocide in the Sudan.[55] These new initiatives brought about an unusual degree of Catholic candor. Reporting on Dallaire's testimony at the Catholics in Public Life Conference, the Catholic media relayed a startling admission of Catholic responsibility in Rwanda led to a self-indictment: "All of Rwanda is under judgment and, also, the countries that did nothing and now hypocritically bemoan their inaction. All of us are under judgment."[56]

Though the Mennonite press had initially floundered in describing the nature of the crisis, later reports yielded an intense grappling with the issue of Mennonite responsibility in Canadian initiatives. Much of the controversy revolved around constructing a faithful response to the new "responsibility to protect." Some saw Rwanda as an argument for the role of policing to restrain harmful forces. Others sympathized with the need for military intervention in order to stop ethnic cleansing, but worried

about the free license a "protection mission" may grant. While many spoke of the political subversiveness of forgiveness, the genocide in Rwanda perpetually surfaced as a reminder of the possible limits of pacifism.

In Rwanda, an artificial divide separated Hutu from Tutsi, as this common people shared the same language, music, customs, rites of passage, and religion. Marking Hutu from Tutsi became a national preoccupation, an arbitrary marker without discernible physical or cultural features. Such a mythology captures the political and social imagination, and is itself borne out with real, even deadly, consequences. As one observer of Hutu Power's motivations observed, the engine of the slaughter was not economic or even primarily political. Common people, coached by political authorities, eagerly took up a distorted view of Tutsis as the foil of Hutu greatness. As such, "they killed each other to upbraid a vision they had of themselves more than any physical resources."[57] In Canada, as in Rwanda, mythology equally captured the national imagination, shaping or distorting Canadians' vision of themselves.

To understand what happened in those one hundred bloody days in 1994 one must expand the geography of genocide. First, it is necessary to see the failure of humanity as lying beyond central African tribalism and influenced by the myriad ecclesial, national, and international actors, which made these conditions possible. Second, by using the Canadian religious press one sees how "Rwanda" is constructed through the lens of denominational interests, giving life and meaning beyond the original site. As believers suffused their hopes for Rwanda with Canadian form and content, they soon discovered the limitations of their Christian vision and national self-identity. As Canadian foreign policy was constructed abroad through religious aid and at home in the press, religious bodies remained a vital part of constructing and interpreting public discourse about Rwanda.

Endnotes

1. Rwanda, mistakenly, is called Africa's most Christian country, with the percentage of Christians estimated to be roughly 90%. The World Christian Database offers a corrective through a detailed breakdown of each denomination broken down by geography. In 2005, 78.1% of Rwandans identified themselves as Christian; 46% of all Rwandans say they are Catholics ("Rwanda," *World Christian Database* [Leiden: Brill, 2007]).

2. While the sundry sources and authors that comprise religious publications do not directly speak to the *intent* of a community, these reports offer a window into the interests, worries, and insider-conversations of Canadian Christians as they sought to understand an unthinkable tragedy.

3. Timothy Longman, "The churches and the Genocide in the East African Great Lakes Region," in *In God's Name: Genocide and Religion in the Twentieth Century*, eds. Omer Bartov and Phyllis Mack (New York: Berghahn Books, 2001), 140.

4. Timothy Longman, *In God's Name,* 141.

5. While I implicate Catholicism as the primary religious and political vehicle for colonial rule, Protestant missionaries emerged in the 1930s as religious actors willing to play by the same rules.

6. "Rwandan churches culpable, says WCC," *The Christian Century,* 24-31 August 1994, 778.

7. *Catholic Register*, 21 May 1994.

8. *Catholic Register*, 13 August 1994.

9. "MCC Response to Rwanda," *MB Herald*, 26 August 1994.

10. John Longhurt, "Rwanda: The Story One Year Later," *Mennonite Reporter*, 31 July 1995.

11. "Rwandan refugee effort continues in Zaire," *Mennonite Reporter*, 3 October 1994, 4.

12. "A blood bath to remember," *Canadian Adventist Messenger*, August 1994; "ADRA starts field hospital for Rwandan refugees," *Adventist Review*, 25 August 1994; and "ADRA's mission of mercy" *Canadian Adventist Messenger*, July 1994.

13. Philip Gourevitch, *We Wish To Inform You That Tomorrow We Will be Killed With Our Families* (New York: Picador Press, 1998), 165.

14. Jean Hatzfeld, *Machete Season: The Killers in Rwanda Speak* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005), 244.

15. *The Catholic Register*, 23 April 1994.

16. *The Catholic Register*, 14 May 1994.

17. The number of deaths cited by the *Register* tended to be unrealistically low for the duration of the genocide.

18. *The Catholic Register*, 23 April 1994.
19. On June 10, a press briefing by the United States' State Department was still using the approved phrase "acts of genocide may have occurred."
20. *The Catholic Register*, 28 May 1994, reporting a 15 May speech.
21. *Catholic Register*, 28 May 1994.
22. *Catholic Register*, 18 June 1994; and *Catholic Register*, 25 June 1994.
23. *Catholic Register*, 1 October 1994.
24. *Catholic Register*, 8 October 1994.
25. *Catholic Register*, 26 April 1999; *Catholic Register*, 3 May 1999; and *Catholic Register*, 31 May 1999.
26. *Catholic Register*, 24 July 2000.
27. "Report calls for Church to admit role in Rwandan genocide," *Catholic Register*, 24 July 2000.
28. *Catholic Register*, 24 July 2000.
29. *Catholic Register*, 24 July 2000.
30. *Catholic Register*, 23 April 2001.
31. "Nuns Guilty in Rwandan Genocide," *Catholic Register*, 18 June 2001.
32. "1998 record so far (missionaries and clergy assaulted)," *Catholic Insight* 6, no.5 (June 1998): 19-21.
33. "Catholic priest guilty of genocide," *Catholic Insight* 15, no.2 (February 2007): 34(1).
34. *MB Herald,* 5 November 1999.
35. "Zaire's war engulfs Mennonites communities," *MB Herald,* 16 May 1997; and *MB Herald*, 4 February 2000.
36. *MB Herald,* 9 February1996.
37. "Situation grim in Bukavu find MCC visitors," *Mennonite Reporter*, 9 December 1996.
38. James Fly, "Africa's Adventist Island," *Adventist Review*, 9 February 1984.

39. "Churches, college outgrow facilities," *Adventist Review*, 29 July 1993; and "Rwandan civil war touches Adventist College," *Adventist Review*, 8 April 1993.

40. "Out of Tragedy, a New Vision," *Adventist Review*, 24 November 1994.

41. "Out of Tragedy, a New Vision," *Adventist Review*, 24 November 1994.

42. Roy Branson, "Never Again," *Spectrum*, June 1996.

43. Robert Folkenberg "GC President speaks out about Rwandan atrocities," *Adventist Review*, 7 March 1996.

44. Folkenberg "GC President speaks out about Rwandan atrocities."

45. Branson, "Never Again."

46. Philip Gourevitch, *We Wish To Inform You That Tomorrow We Will be Killed With Our Families* (New York: Picador Press, 1998), 42.

47. Michele Stotz, "New Life for Rwanda," *Adventist Review*, 2004.

48. Alita Byrd, "Sabbath slaughter SDAs and Rwanda," *Spectrum*, June 1996, 8.

49. Michael Valpy, "The Myth of Canada as Peacekeeper," *The Globe and Mail*, 28 February 2007.

50. Valpy, "The Myth of Canada as Peacekeeper."

51. Andrew Cooper and Dane Rowlands, eds., *Canada Among Nations 2005: Split Images* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005), 3.

52. Jennifer Welch, "Reality and Canadian Foreign Policy," in *Canada Among Nations 2005*, 29.

53. Howard Adelman, "Canadian Foreign Policy in Rwanda," *The Path of a Genocide: From Uganda to Zaire* (Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2000), 185.

54. "Father Raby, I'd unite with UN if it weren't so useless," *Catholic Register*, 30 June 2006.

55. Michael Swan, "Canada must accept 'responsibility to protect,' in Dafur," *Catholic Register*, 13 October 2006.

56. Michael Higgins, "Fiction can delve into the heart of darkness," *Catholic Register*, 13 July 2006.

57. Gerard Prunier, *The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide* (Hong Kong: Columbia University Press, 1997), 40.

The Place of Church History in the Rise of Evangelicalism

DARREN W. SCHMIDT
University of St Andrews

In February 1737, Dr. Isaac Watts, the English Dissenting minister and hymn-writer, wrote on behalf of himself and his associate Dr. John Guyse to American Benjamin Colman in response to reading a version of Jonathan Edwards' account of revival in Northampton, Massachusetts. "We are of [the] opinion," Watts penned, "that so strange and surprising work of God that we have not heard anything like it since the Reformation, nor perhaps since the days of the apostles, should be published, and left upon record with all its attending circumstances . . ."[1] Later that year, the two Englishmen introduced Edwards' complete *Faithful Narrative of the Surprizing Work of God*, and included in their preface the words: "never did we hear or read, since the first ages of Christianity, any event of this kind so surprising as the present narrative hath set before us."[2] Frank Lambert has recently argued that this sort of historical appeal can be taken to encapsulate early evangelicals' understandings of the place of the Anglo-American Revival[3] within sacred history. "Awakeners," says Lambert, "could point to only two truly extraordinary Works of God: Pentecost and the Protestant Reformation."[4]

With this in view, one might be tempted to think that evangelicals in the eighteenth century had a simplistic interpretation of church history, or that they only trumpeted the interpretation originating in the sixteenth century, that Protestantism represented a renewal of authentic, ancient Christianity after a long period of decline and corruption. This assumption seems to be borne out in scholarship. Despite significant academic

attention in recent decades to the Revival in Britain and North America and its place at the fountainhead of evangelicalism, only a few writers make even brief mention of church history as having played a role in early evangelical thought and life.[5]

Eighteenth-century sources, however, give a more dynamic picture; a search finds that evangelical historical interpretations were substantial and were authored by key leaders. John Newton produced his *Review of Ecclesiastical History* in 1770, the first volume of an unfinished project. In 1774, John Erskine in Edinburgh published Jonathan Edwards' *History of the Work of Redemption*, which Edwards had delivered as a sermon series in 1739. In the 1780s, John Wesley broadcast his view of church history in several sermons and issued a four-volume *Concise Ecclesiastical History* (1781) abridged from the work of respected scholar Johann Lorenz von Mosheim. At the end of the century, two important works appeared from evangelical Anglican perspectives: Joseph and Isaac Milner's four-volume *History of the Church of Christ* (1794-1809), and Thomas Haweis' three-volume *An Impartial and Succinct History of the Rise, Declension and Revival of the Church of Christ, from the Birth of Our Saviour to the Present Time* . . . (1800). From this list alone we can infer that the history of the church was a significant part of discourse by prominent, even central, individuals within early evangelicalism.

My interest here, however, is several other sources that not only assist in amplifying the importance of church history for evangelicals, but also push forward the point at which it emerged as a factor. As has been ably demonstrated by scholars, in the 1740s and 1750s Protestants on both sides of the Atlantic perceived a widespread religious awakening and formed associations with each other, in effect fashioning an "evangelical" religious impulse and identity.[6] In the midst of this religious excitement, published reflections by several evangelical leaders indicated a keen attention to church history. These sources evince not a simple regurgitation of traditional Protestant conceptions, but a real engagement by evangelical leaders with historical Christianity informed especially by the drama surrounding the "historic" events which they had experienced in the Revival.

Thomas Prince, Sr. and "The Endless Increase of Christ's Government" (1740)

An early example of historical interest arises with Thomas Prince,

Sr., a Congregational minister in Boston. On 25 May 1740, on the important occasion of an annual conference of ministers from Massachusetts Bay, Prince delivered an address entitled "The Endless Increase of Christ's Government," based on the text of Isaiah 9:7 – "Of the increase of his government there shall be no end."[7] After setting out a theological framework concerning Christ's eternal existence and role as mediator between God and humans, Prince spent more than half of his sermon attempting to trace the "endless increase" of Christ's dominion on earth and in heaven. That this goal was ambitious and difficult to realize in one sermon is an understatement: Prince himself qualified that his conclusions were not based on revelatory knowledge, but rather were hints drawn "from the appearance of the worlds about us, from the probable suggestions of reason on them, and the analogy of nature"; he had "only just opened the field of this immense vision, wherein we may wander to eternity."[8]

Prince focussed primarily on the spread of the gospel in the time of Christ and the apostles. But he also summarized, in sweeping fashion, subsequent ages of the church, casting their chronology in terms of a geographical progression.[9] First, Christians were scattered like seed within the Roman Empire. Then the church prospered surprisingly within this field, through three centuries of persecution culminating in the conversion of the emperor, Constantine. The figure of Constantine looms as the only individual named after Christ and the apostles: he not only halted persecution, but, in Prince's words, he "openly worships Christ as Lord of all, throws down his crown before him; and not only resigns his whole power and empire to him, but also spreads his kingdom to the remotest nations."[10] This expansion continued through the centuries, east through Bohemia, Poland and Russia, north through Germany, Denmark and Scandinavia, and west through the British Isles to the New World.[11] He left off with a novel interpretation of the course of more recent history, with an eye fixed firmly on stirrings of revival in the New World: "I shall only here observe, that as in the mysterious depths of wisdom, but in spotless justice, our divine Redeemer has been for several ages removing the light and grace of his kingdom from the eastern parts of the earth; so, like the apparent course of the sun, he comes on and rises on the western regions; and perhaps . . . he may be now opening a way to enlighten the utmost regions of America: And this may be his chief design in these great events." Prince speculated that this westward march of Christ's kingdom would continue, all the way back to its source in Jerusalem, at which point

a "conflagration" would usher in the millennial reign of Christ.[12]

William Cooper and The Distinguishing Marks (1741)

William Cooper, Prince's colleague in Boston, likewise ruminated on history in a conspicuous place: his preface to Jonathan Edwards' *The Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the Spirit of God* (1741). Besides issuing a call for the collection of contemporary narratives of religious conversion, he framed Edwards' own analysis of "revival" with a panoramic sketch of the work of God in history, progressing in stages from the Hebrew patriarchs and Moses through Christ to his own day.

Each stage, for Cooper, constituted an increase in glory, like a dawning sun that overwhelms or eclipses the light of the stars.[13] Within this overall scheme, he represented history from the time of Christ to the present as a series of dramatic renewals separated by long stretches of decline. He wrote that after the "large effusion of the Spirit" and dawn of the "Gospel light" at Pentecost, gradually the Spirit withdrew, and thus the effectiveness of the gospel waned, and "the state of Christianity withered in one place and another." At the Protestant Reformation, "Gospel light" again "broke in upon the church, and dispelled the clouds of antichristian darkness that covered it," bringing powerful preaching, conversions, and transformed lives. Yet, according to Cooper, the Protestant churches also eventually lapsed into a "dead and barren time," marked by absence of the Spirit's influence, either few or doubtful conversions, and a listless Christianity. Cooper concluded, however, with a bold assessment of the religious awakening that was the subject of Edwards' scrutiny, echoing what Watts and Guyse had written in relation to the earlier Northampton revival: "The dispensation of grace we are now under is certainly such as neither we nor our fathers have seen; and in some circumstances so wonderful, that I believe there has not been the like since the extraordinary pouring out of the Spirit immediately after our Lord's ascension. The apostolical times seem to have returned upon us . . ."[14]

Initially Cooper's sketch sounds much like earlier Protestant ones depicting a glorious early Christianity, a painfully long season of declension under the weight of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and a turning of the tables with the Protestant reformers. But in important respects he developed this view. Relatively new was the admission that Protestantism itself had faltered. Michael Crawford indicates that by the early eighteenth century, "Protestants had come to the realization that the

Reformation as a period of more than usual activity of God's Spirit had come to an end."[15] This awareness no doubt contributed in part to the excitement surrounding the revivals and a belief that God was doing an even greater work than the Reformation in their midst. Cooper's parallel between the Revival and Pentecost was drawn not glibly out of ignorance, but rather specifically in the context of historical reflection.

John Gillies' Historical Collections (1754)

The most substantial early evangelical interpretation of church history is found in a two-volume work by John Gillies, a Church of Scotland minister (1742–96) in Glasgow, entitled *Historical Collections Relating to Remarkable Periods of the Success of the Gospel, and Eminent Instruments Employed in Promoting It*, produced in 1754.[16] As the title of his work suggests, Gillies collected and compiled historical material from a variety of sources.[17] One might be tempted to overlook such a derivative work. But evidence indicates that within evangelical circles, Gillies' volumes had an enduring influence. Gillies was a well-connected evangelical: associate of Wesley, biographer of Whitefield, correspondent of Edwards, and central figure in Scottish and international revivalist networks.[18] Almost a century later, in 1845, the influential Scottish minister Horatius Bonar republished Gillies' work, with the observation that it had been "known and prized by the Christian Church."[19] As recently as 1981, a facsimile edition was issued by the Reformed evangelical publisher, Banner of Truth, and a Korean translation was produced in 1992.[20]

Gillies, prior to entering into the history itself, clearly set out his perspective. His volumes' frontispiece highlighted Matt. 28:19-20, which included Christ's promise to be with his followers "always, even to the end of the world." In his preface in the first volume, subtitled "Of the Characters and Uses of this Kind of History," Gillies established his interest in "historical narrations of the success of the gospel," and suggested a pattern for sacred history. The "most threatening dangers and lowest times have frequently been soon followed with the most signal appearances" in favour of the gospel, as evidenced by Israel's exodus from Egypt and return from Babylon, the spread of the early Christian Church, and the Protestant Reformation. When the Church's "power is gone, and she seems in imminent danger of being consumed," then God, in fulfilment of his promises, "seasonably interposes; and the time of need proves

the time for the Lord to work."[21] Gillies also speculated, in anticipation of his second volume concerning the revivals of the 1730s and 1740s, that "the times of the greatest and most extensive flourishing of the gospel promised to the church in the last days" might be imminent.[22]

Our main interest is in Gillies' construal, in his first volume, of Christianity's "success" in the first seventeen centuries of its history.[23] He highlighted the rapid spread of Christian belief in the first three centuries, and especially Christianity's advancement through times of both suffering and intermittent peace.[24] According to his sources, God's hand was displayed in the eventual banishment of pagan religion from the empire, even in the grisly fates of emperors who had persecuted the Church.[25] Gillies inserted a rare editorial comment on Constantine: despite the vast expansion of Christianity under his reign, "it must be owned," he observed, "that his heaping so much wealth and honour upon church-men, and his blending the church and state together, did, through human corruption, great hurt to Christianity."[26]

Gillies, intent on drawing out success stories from the past, seems to have been confounded with the Middle Ages. In a volume just shy of five hundred pages, he treated the fifth through thirteenth centuries in a single page, and prefaced his discussion with a blunt apology: "That the Reader may not be surprised to find so little said upon such a number of centuries, it is proper to observe, that this period does not afford much matter upon the success of true Christianity." He contended himself with a few references on the presence of ancient churches in India and Ethiopia, both of which condemned "the errors and corruptions of the church of Rome," and a reiteration of the common British Protestant interpretation that Celtic Christianity was of a more pure quality than the Roman variety which eventually dominated via Canterbury.[27]

Next Gillies' collection featured the medieval groups traditionally seen by Protestants as precursors to the Reformation. His presentation of Waldensians and Albigensians highlighted their antiquity, popularity, and "constancy in suffering for the truth." The imagery of Gillies' source was vivid: the Waldensians had arisen "when the darkness of Popery had overspread the Christian world," and the Albigensians, who differed "only in name," had "lay hid like sparks under the ashes" until the time of Luther.[28] These and others, such as Wycliffe, Hus, and Jerome of Prague, who voiced opposition to Rome, were people whom God had raised up to stem the tide of Antichristian corruption, who stood as evidence that God had preserved a "seed" or a "true church" through the Middle Ages.[29]

To this point Gillies offered what looks like the traditional Protestant perception of a small, persecuted remnant standing against medieval Catholicism. But he also included a fascinating excerpt from the 1606 work of Anglican divine Richard Field, entitled *Of the Church*. Field had argued the common enough view that the Church of England maintained true, ancient Catholic Christianity, in contrast to the Roman Church. But Gillies highlighted his more novel position:

> Altho' we do acknowledge WICKLIFF, HUSSE, JEROM OF PRAGUE, &c. to have been the worthy servants of God, and holy martyrs, suffering for the cause of Christ against Antichrist, yet we do not think that the church was to be found only in them, or that there was no other appearance or succession of the church and ministry, as the Papists falsely charge us; for we believe that they who taught and embraced those damnable errors which the Romanists now defend, were a faction only in the church, as were they that denied the resurrection, urged circumcision, and despised the apostles of Christ in the church es of Corinth and Galatia.[30]

Curiously, then, despite a fairly traditional depiction, Gillies here assented to a more complex and irenic view that the current of "true" Christianity flowed not only on the fringe of the institutional Church, but also within "mainstream" Catholicism, in spite of anti-Christian elements.

What follows is a reasonably predictable account of the centuries from the Reformation to Gillies' own day, but cast in distinctly revivalist language. Gillies cast Luther's emergence as a fulfilment of prophecy,[31] and the Reformation generally as a special effusion of the Holy Spirit, or a "high spring-tide of the power and efficacy of the word." In contrast to the preceding ages of "darkness" and hidden faith, the Reformation was the "dawn" of a "blessed day," when God "visibly rent the heavens, and caused the mountains [to] flow down at his presence, with so solemn a down-pouring of the Spirit following the gospel, as there could be no standing before it, but cities and nations were subjected to so marvellous a power, to the embracing of the truth."[32] Gillies continued to trace the Protestant stream through the seventeenth century, highlighting stories of particularly "zealous" ministers in Britain and New England (typically Presbyterians and Puritans) and "awakenings" such as in London with the outbreak of a plague in 1665, in Halle, Germany under Lutheran Pietists, and in the rise of religious societies in the British Isles.

It is important to consider Gillies' historical presentation found in

the first volume of his *Collections* in the light of the second, which exclusively gave recent revival accounts.[33] The effect is a continuous narrative of revival in the Church, but with the emphasis most heavily on the present day. Crawford comments: "Gillies's collection gives the impression that the first seventeen centuries since Christ were but a prelude to the extraordinary activity of the Spirit in the eighteenth . . ."[34] But one should not interpret this as an undervaluing of Gillies' historical effort. From this work he extrapolated a pattern of recurring and progressive revival that lent weight to recent accounts of revival, and heightened the sense of eschatological import.[35]

Crawford observes Gillies' conviction "that God is working in history, and that his kingdom will spread gradually by means of revivals until it encompasses the globe."[36] The influence of Gillies' revival-centred historical interpretation is suggested by the words in the 1840s of the sympathetic Horatius Bonar, who described Gillies as zealous in "search[ing] out the times of refreshing enjoyed by the churches in other days" for the benefit of the contemporary Church, and who called his *Historical Collections* "by far the fullest and completest History of Revivals of Religion."[37]

Comparison

Several common features emerge from these three examples. One notices, first of all, the consistent interest in the *spread* of Christianity, the interest to identify its leading edge. Gillies' rendering called this the "success of the gospel." In Cooper's summary, manifestations of the Spirit, widespread conversions, and proclamation of the gospel were key criteria for depicting the landscape of church history. Prince uniquely represented Christianity's expansion as a traceable historical movement from east to west. But his interpretation shared with the others an inherent idea of progress, an upward trajectory in history despite setbacks.

Related to progress is a shared impression of eschatological moment. This is most evident in Prince's image of the gospel sun, rising in Jerusalem and now arching from Western Europe to the New World towards a millennial kingdom.[38] But Cooper and Gillies also indicated development in the historical Church's seasons of blessing and in the weight which they gave to contemporary events.

These interpretations demonstrate continuities and developments in comparison with traditional Protestant views. Cooper and Gillies

especially, in line with their forebears, portrayed a picture of vital Christianity in early centuries, followed by a long season of decline, and then a new burst of life with the Reformation. A comparatively novel element was their continued identification of declension and renewal beyond the sixteenth century, so that one beheld not simply a golden age, a period of darkness, and the dawn of a new, Protestant day, but rather a repeating cycle which culminated (perhaps finally, in these leaders' views) in the transatlantic Revival. Prince's sermon clearly reflected an interest in placing contemporary events in a much wider context. And while on the surface his interpretation appears quite different from the traditional rendering, it nonetheless implied a storyline of Christianity's expansion in Europe and subsequent decay as the vanguard of the Spirit marched westward.

Implications

Several broader arguments are warranted in regard to the significance of the evangelical turn to church history amidst the religious awakenings and rise of evangelicalism. In the first place, consider the frequent recurrence of historical treatments and especially the prominent authorship of this discourse. Besides the household names of Edwards, Newton, and Wesley, or the influential Milners and Thomas Haweis, other leading ministers – Prince and Cooper in Boston, John Gillies in Glasgow – drew attention to the Christian past.[39] To scholarship on the forging of transatlantic networks and the crafting of an evangelical ethos in the eighteenth century[40] could be added, as an important facet, a vital interest in church history.

It is one thing to notice the preoccupation; a more challenging task is addressing the question of why this occurred. Undoubtedly a mixture of factors was at work. One general aspect is the use of history in giving identity to the fledgling evangelical movement. More specifically, this turn to past expressions of Christianity speaks to a defensive effort against the impression of evangelicalism as a novelty, akin to the stance of sixteenth-century Protestants in response to the question, "Where was your Church before Luther?" Evangelicals were, after all, derided as "enthusiasts," and examples of historical precedent either gave them legitimacy or, at worst, company in a long line of reformers and radicals. There seems indeed to have been a perceived need for continuity, not only out of a practical desire for credibility, but also from a theological conviction that God was

continually present in His Church, even if this Church was reduced to a maligned, persecuted remnant. Gillies' work, as we have seen, inscribed from the outset Christ's promise of his presence. He and other evangelical leaders searched out historical examples which they believed mirrored their own situation, and they expressed their views in the language of divine providence.

Clearly one of the most important factors in evangelical leaders' turn to history is their perception of the contemporary transatlantic Revival. The sense of wonderment at whether anything like what they were witnessing had happened before is highly visible in early sources, including what we have seen in Prince, Cooper, and Gillies. But Lambert's assertion, referenced above, that evangelicals drew parallels only with Pentecost and the Protestant Reformation is misleading. Rather, we find the rapid development from early articulations of this nature to Gillies' comprehensive compilation in 1754. Crawford argues that with the outbreak of widespread revival, evangelical leaders "attempted to assess its meaning not only for their own localities, but also for all of Christianity," and then after the excitement had subsided, expanded this into a more complete historical picture.[41] This more compelling position can be further nuanced with the point that an historical interpretation which made the "revival" theme key appeared already within the crucible of the Revival itself. I have highlighted two brief examples from 1740 and 1741; but it is useful to remind that Jonathan Edwards presented his vision of the redemptive "work of God" in history to his congregation already in 1739, in response to the more localized awakening of the mid-1730s. These early reflections lacked much in the way of historical detail. But they indicate the establishment of a pattern that was enshrined in the influential volumes of John Gillies; indeed, Bruce Hindmarsh refers in passing to the *Historical Collections* as "a landmark work in evangelical revival historiography."[42]

An important finding from Hindmarsh's research with evangelical correspondence networks and conversion and revival narratives is the expanding sense among evangelicals that they were part of an international work of God.[43] Sources such as the ones we have introduced above warrant carrying this point further, that the broadening perspective among evangelicals was not only geographical, from individual conversion narrative to localized revival narrative to a story of transatlantic revival, but also chronological, from depiction of a contemporary revival to a comprehensive historical account.[44] We find among early evangelicals, I

would argue, a novel interpretation of church history which reworked the traditional Protestant conception of a golden apostolic age, a long, dark age of Roman Catholic corruption, and a glorious Reformation. Evangelicals, themselves reacting against perceived religious declension in Britain and the New World and spurred on by their experiences, developed an historical vision which established religious revival as a central interpretive criterion, and depicted a cycle of declension and renewal progressing towards, in their view perhaps culminating in, evangelicalism itself.

Endnotes

1. Cited in the editor's introduction, in *The Great Awakening*, ed. C.C. Goen, vol. 4 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1972), 36.

2. Cited in the editor's introduction, in *The Great Awakening*, ed., C.C. Goen, vol. 4: 130.

3. Capitalized "Revival" throughout refers to the religious awakenings which occurred, according to both contemporary and scholarly accounts, in the 1730s and 1740s in Britain and North America. These events entailed both renewed Christian commitment by those already within the Church, and new participation by some previously outside the Church; thus the term implies more than simply "revivification" of those who had declined or lapsed in Christian faith or practice. Unless defined otherwise, lower-case "revival" refers to the phenomenon in general terms but involving the same aspects, renewal and new converts. One of the arguments to be developed here is that evangelicals looked for instances of "revival" in history that corresponded with what they experienced in the Revival. For an eighteenth-century definition along these lines, see Solomon Stoddard, *The Efficacy of the Fear of Hell, to Restrain Men from Sin. Shewed in a Sermon before the Inferiour Court in Northampton. Decem. 3d. 1712* . . . (Boston, 1713), 52-53. Available at Eighteenth-Century Collections Online.

4. Frank Lambert, *Inventing the "Great Awakening"* (Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press, 1999), 27; see 4, 19, and 255 for reiterations.

5. These authors are cited below.

6. On correspondence and publishing networks, see Susan Durden [O'Brien], "A Study of the First Evangelical Magazines, 1740-1748," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 27, no. 3 (1976): 258-74; Susan O'Brien, "A Transatlantic Community of Saints: The Great Awakening and the First Evangelical Network, 1735-1755," *American Historical Review* 91, no. 4 (1986); Michael

J. Crawford, *Seasons of Grace: Colonial New England's Revival Tradition in Its British Context*, Religion in America (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 156-57, 172-74, 223-33; Frank Lambert, *Pedlar in Divinity: George Whitefield and the Transatlantic Revivals, 1737-1770* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 73-75; Lambert, *Inventing the "Great Awakening,"* 151-79; D. Bruce Hindmarsh, *The Evangelical Conversion Narrative: Spiritual Autobiography in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 67-72; and Mark A. Noll, *The Rise of Evangelicalism: The Age of Edwards, Whitefield and the Wesleys*, History of Evangelicalism (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 118. The latter work also is helpful as a recent treatment of the Revival and creation of an evangelical consensus.

7. Thomas Prince, "The Endless Increase of Christ's Government," in *Six sermons by the late Thomas Prince, A.M. one of the ministers of the South Church in Boston. Published from his manuscripts* . . ., ed. John Erskine (Edinburgh: printed by David Paterson, for William Martin, 1785), 1-39. Available at Eighteenth-Century Collections Online. Erskine includes a prefatory glimpse of Prince's life and work (iii-xvi); according to this account, Prince maintained a lifelong historical fascination, especially in chronicling New England's religious and civil affairs (v).

8. Prince, "Endless Increase," 34, 35.

9. Prince's account of Christ's government in the lower world runs from pages 18 to 29, but includes only three pages (25 to 27) on the history from post-apostolic days to his own.

10. Prince, "Endless Increase," 25-26, quote at 26.

11. Prince, "Endless Increase," 27. Prince somewhat atypically gave no denunciation of the Catholic "dark ages" and limelight on the Reformation. But his geographical sketch still may reflect this traditional rendering by deftly avoiding Europe's enduring centres of Catholicism, such as Italy, Spain, and France.

12. Prince, "Endless Increase," 27-28. In the final section of his sermon, Prince pondered on the enlarging population of heaven from creation to the end of time, and included a brief exclamation on the Christian historical era which reflected his theme of progress: "But what increasing multitudes in every age and nation, since for above 1700 years, have been continually saved, and transported to him in that growing world above!" (Prince, "Endless Increase," 29-34, quote at 32).

13. Cooper, preface to Jonathan Edwards, *The Distinguishing Marks Of a Work of the Spirit of God*, in C.C. Goen, ed., *The Great Awakening*, vol. 4, *The Works of Jonathan Edwards* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1972), 215.

14. Cooper, preface to Jonathan Edwards, *The Distinguishing Marks*, 216-17. George M. Marsden highlights Cooper's historical sketch but uses it primarily to comment on his interpretation of contemporary events and implicit criticism of fellow ministers who did not support the Revival. Cooper's historical depiction, in its broad temporal scope, division into progressive "dispensations," focus on the Spirit's role in conversion, and language (for example use of light / darkness imagery, or particular Scripture references), seems to echo Jonathan Edwards' 1739 sermon series on the "History of the Work of Redemption." Cooper rubbed shoulders with Edwards, but there is no direct evidence of his familiarity with Edwards' historical interpretation (*Jonathan Edwards: A Life* [New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2003], 235-36).

15. Crawford, *Seasons of Grace*, 129.

16. John Gillies, *Historical Collections Relating to Remarkable Periods of the Success of the Gospel, and Eminent Instruments Employed in Promoting It . . .* (Glasgow: printed by Robert and Andrew Foulis, 1754). Available at Eighteenth-Century Collections Online. Gillies added an *Appendix* in 1761, and, in the year he died, 1796, his associate John Erskine of Edinburgh published a ninety-three page *Supplement to ... Historical Collections*, based on Gillies' notes. These latter additions focused almost exclusively on contemporary stories.

17. Gillies conveniently listed the majority of his sources at the front of the volume.

18. Crawford, *Seasons of Grace*, 225, 231, 233, 307 n. 42; and David W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London & New York: Routledge, 2002), 33. Crawford describes Gillies in the decade of the 1750s as "the focal point of the British/American evangelical connection for collecting and publishing religious intelligence" (233).

19. John Gillies, *Historical Collections Relating to Remarkable Periods of the Success of the Gospel* (Kelso, Scotland: printed at the Border Watch Office, 1845), 584. This edition included the content of the *Appendix* and *Supplement*. Bonar's basic biographical details can be found in Hew Scott, ed., *Fasti Ecclesiæ Scoticanæ: The Succession of Ministers in the Church of Scotland from the Reformation*, rev. ed., 7 vols., vol. 2, Synods of Merse and Teviot-

dale, Dumfries, and Galloway (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1917), 74.

20. John Gillies, *Historical Collections of Accounts of Revival* (Fairfield, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1981), and Gillies, *18-segi ŭi widaehan yŏngchŏk puhŭng*, ed. Horatius Bonar, trans. Nam-Joon Kim (Sŏul: Tosŏ Ch'ulp'an Sollomon, 1992).

21. Gillies, *Historical Collections*, 1:x. In support, Gillies referenced Deut. 32:36 and Psalm 119:126.

22. Gillies, *Historical Collections*, 1:x. Gillies cited Sir Isaac Newton as his authority, in reference to his *Observations upon the prophecies of Daniel, and the Apocalypse of St. John. In two parts* (London: printed by J. Darby and T. Browne; Dublin: printed by S. Powell, 1733). Information from the English Short Title Catalogue, British Library, http://estc.bl.uk/ (accessed 15 February 2007).

23. Gillies' construction was based on some of the best and most popular of the sympathetic sources available. These tended to be respected works by well-known Presbyterians or Puritans, who, for the most part, shared an anti-Catholic but otherwise temperate spirit and a sense of God's providential hand in the English or Scottish Protestant tradition. Older sources included moderate Puritan Samuel Clarke's *General Martyrologie* (first published 1660) and *The Lives of Sundry Eminent Persons in this Later Age* (1683), and Presbyterian Robert Fleming's *The Fulfilling of the Scriptures* (1669). Contemporary sources included Wesley's noticeably eclectic and catholic *Christian Library* (1749-55), and two works by Gillies' fellow Church of Scotland ministers: Robert Millar's erudite *History of the Propagation of Christianity, and Overthrow of Paganism* (1723), and Benjamin Bennet's *A Memorial of the Reformation* (first published 1717). *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, s.v. "Bennet, Benjamin (c.1674-1726)," "Clarke, Samuel (1599-1682)," "Fleming, Robert (1630-1694)," "Millar, Robert (1672-1752)" http://www.oxforddnb.com/ (accessed 14 February 2007).

24. Gillies, *Historical Collections*, 1:1-20, esp. 16.

25. Gillies, *Historical Collections*, 1:18-20.

26. Gillies, *Historical Collections*, 1:20-21, quote at 21 n. 'b'. John Wesley echoed this judgment, in highly dramatic terms, in the 1780s. See especially his 1783 sermon entitled "The Mystery of Iniquity," in *Sermons*, ed. Albert C. Outler, vols. 1-4 of *The Works of John Wesley* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1984-1987), 2:462-63.

27. Gillies, *Historical Collections*, 1:29.

28. Gillies, *Historical Collections*, 1:30-33, quotes at 30, 33. Gillies drew this material from Clarke's *General Martyrologie*.

29. Gillies, *Historical Collections*, 1:35. Gillies' source here is Millar's *Propagation of Christianity*.

30. Gillies, *Historical Collections*, 1:35. Gillies drew Field's interpretation from Clarke's *Martyrologie*.

31. Gillies, *Historical Collections*, 1:57, also 57 n. 'a' and 'b,' in which Gillies linked Luther's first opposition to Rome with the Waldensian renewal in France 350 years prior (interpreted as Revelation's three and a half days), and with Hus's martyrdom 100 years prior (in reference to Hus' alleged prophecy from his martyr's stake, which Gillies included at page 39).

32. Gillies, *Historical Collections*, 1:127.

33. Gillies drew material for the second volume extensively from early evangelical magazines offering revival accounts, including the Boston *Christian History* produced by Prince and his son Thomas, Jr., as well as substantial tracts from the journals of Wesley (over fifty pages) and Whitefield (almost thirty pages). On the magazines, see the authors referenced at note #6, above, and discussion below at note #35.

34. Crawford, *Seasons of Grace*, 226.

35. In this sense, Gillies' volumes can be seen as an expansion of the combination of contemporary accounts of revival with historical material found in early evangelical magazines. Most prominent in this respect was *The Christian's Amusement containing Letters Concerning the Progress of the Gospel both at Home and Abroad etc. Together with an Account of the Waldenses and Albigenses* . . . produced by Calvinist Methodist John Lewis in London beginning in September 1740. Besides the ancient spiritual ancestry implied by Lewis' treatment of Waldenses and Albigenses, his early issues also included excerpts from, or recommendations of, sixteenth- and seventeenth-century divinity. After George Whitefield adopted the magazine in 1741 and contemporary revival narratives multiplied, its historical content waned. Durden [O'Brien], "First Evangelical Magazines," 257 n.5, and analysis 258-66. Lambert, Inventing the "Great Awakening," 173, characterizes Gillies' work as motivated by a growing evangelical need for a narration of "revival as a coherent story linked across temporal as well as spatial boundaries."

36. Crawford, *Seasons of Grace*, 226.

37. Gillies, *Historical Collections (Bonar ed.)*, xv, 584, also 556: "a work in which is contained a fuller and completer history of the wonderful doings of the Spirit of God than any other extant." Bonar does not offer any explicit comparison, but his statements imply a familiarity with other evangelical church histories.

38. Prince's ambitious eschatological framework and cosmic proportions combined with his keen eye to contemporary events corresponds with the view of his New England colleague, Jonathan Edwards. See *A History of the Work of Redemption*, ed. John Frederick Wilson, vol. 9 of *The Works of Jonathan Edwards* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1989).

39. To this list could be added John Erskine of Edinburgh, who spearheaded the publication of Edwards' *History of the Work of Redemption* and edited and published the supplement to Gillies' *Historical Collections* (along with a eulogizing of the late author).

40. See note #6.

41. Crawford, *Seasons of Grace*, 223.

42. Hindmarsh, *Evangelical Conversion Narrative*, 195, n. 6.

43. Hindmarsh, *Evangelical Conversion Narrative*, 71.

44. Hindmarsh highlights the heightened eschatological expectation which accompanied the emergence of conversion narrative in Cromwell's Puritan England and expansion in the eighteenth-century revivals. He comments, "Millennialism, charismata, and revival have often appeared side by side in the course of history, but the web of international religious news available in the eighteenth century heightened expectations with an up-to-the-minute sense of contemporaneity. In an unprecedented way revival was now concentrated in time and extended in space" (see *Evangelical Conversion Narrative*, 72). I would not deny the emphasis placed by evangelicals on current events and their sense that conversions were multiplying exponentially – this is clearly their preoccupation. But eschatological expectation included, perhaps even grew out of, reflection on the past, and thus the evangelical perspective should not be seen as limited to the here and now.