HISTORICAL PAPERS 2007
Canadian Society of Church History

Annual Conference
University of Saskatchewan
27-29 May 2007

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

Commemorating the Contribution of John Webster Grant to Canadian Religious Historiography: Four Views

CSCH President's Address

Please Note

The following papers were presented to the Canadian Society of Church History, but were not made available for publication: Gordon L. Heath, "Half-Breeds and Rebels: Canadian Baptist Newspapers and Constructions of the Riel Rebellion in 1885"; Marcus Meier, "Jane Leade's Spiritual Diary 'A Fountain of Gardens' – Autobiographical Reflections in the Age of Enlightenment"; Douglas H. Shantz, "The Harvest of Pietist Theology: The Intersection of Mystical Protestantism and Enlightenment Thought in the Autobiography of Friedrich Christoph Oetinger (1702-1782)"; James Robertson, "His Dominion vs. New Ireland: The Ontario Protestant Response to the Fenian Invasion of 1866"; Robynne Rogers Healey, "Putting Peace into Practice: Cold War Quaker Experiments in Civil Defense"; James Enns, "Saving Germany: North American Mennonite Missionaries in the Post-War Protestant Heartland"; Brian Froese, "'Our Christians': Mennonite Missions and Cultural Encounters in British Columbia"; and Royden Loewen, "The Diasporic Imagination of Old Colony Mennonites in Mexico, 1930-1950."

Medicare Crisis and Faith Crisis: The United Church of Canada and the 1962 Saskatchewan Doctors' Strike

SANDRA BEARDSALL
St. Andrew's College

During a lunch break at a Saskatchewan United Church meeting a few years ago I mentioned that I was interested in the church's response to the crisis that erupted at the introduction of universal medical care in Saskatchewan in 1962. "Oh, you won't find anyone willing to talk about *that*," a woman snapped. "That's a very painful subject." Others around the lunch table nodded. It had been over forty years, but the topic was still too difficult to broach. Of course, I became more curious. I advertised through United Church channels, asking for people willing to share any memories of the time, and began to research the issue.

I discovered that the Medicare Crisis has not generated much scholarly interest since the late 1960s. When it does surface, however, it indeed evokes strong reactions, and not just in church circles. For example, I discovered a little debate unfolding in the margins of a university library copy of a 1967 book: *Doctors' Strike: Medical Care and Conflict in Saskatchewan*. On 6 November 1984, D. Love, BA, BComm, inscribed the half-title page with his assertion that one of the authors, Samuel Wolfe, had been a doctor brought in by the Saskatchewan government as a strikebreaker, making the book therefore "biased in its conclusions against doctors." On 3 April 1988 an anonymous reply appeared, urging D. Love: "Get your facts straight." This reply rightly goes on to situate Wolfe as a University of Saskatchewan professor who had been in place long before the strike began.[1] Another example is the reaction to – and the hasty

suppression of – the television mini-series, *Prairie Giant: The Tommy Douglas Story*, which provoked vigorous response due to small errors of fact relating to the Liberal Premier and agriculture minister, James Garfield (Jimmy) Gardiner.[2] Like the physician's little hammer for testing reflexes, it seems that when it comes to the doctors' strike of 1962, all it takes is one tap, and a knee invariably jerks.

My curiosity about the United Church's reactions stems from my interest in the way this Canadian-born denomination has navigated the choppy seas of its short history, at both magisterial and congregational levels. In this paper, after briefly tracing the history of medicare in Saskatchewan and the United Church's official views on the subject, I will report what I have discovered so far about that negotiation, both in my initial research and in the response I received in presenting that research, concluding with some interpretation.

Background: The Story of Saskatchewan Medical Care and the United Church's Position up to 1962

The story of medical care in Saskatchewan mirrors the development of the province more generally: a litany of creative and often cooperative solutions to the well-known challenges of prairie settlement, helped along with a prescriptive rhetoric of "prosperity and progress."[3] In 1915, the council of Rural Municipality #211, meeting at the town of Holdfast, voted to use tax revenue to pay a retainer to the local physician. Thus began nearly three decades of experiments in the provision of medical care to Saskatchewan residents. Legislation to regulate such plans passed in 1916, and they spread throughout the province. Doctors still collected additional fees from patients, but had a guaranteed annual income.[4] During the 1930s, as rural families and communities struggled to pay their bills, physicians began to advocate for health insurance plans and fee-for-service payments to replace the municipal doctors' schemes. The Liberal provincial government of the time supported voluntary health insurance plans, some of which became local health insurance cooperatives.[5] Doctors' organizations tended to oppose cooperative insurance plans, preferring to set up their own insurance schemes.[6]

While these measures served as forerunners, it was the decisive 1944 Saskatchewan CCF party provincial election victory that led more directly to the introduction of universal medicare. Premier T.C. (Tommy) Douglas

promised that his party would set up medical, dental, and hospital services "available to all without counting the ability of the individual to pay."[7] Lacking the funds to enact the plan immediately, the CCF passed a Hospitalization Act in 1946, and that same year also created the Swift Current Health Region in southwest Saskatchewan, designed to be a template for the rest of the province with its universal medical-dental coverage, wholly funded through taxes. Once again, doctors and private insurance companies resisted this development.[8]

In 1959 Douglas announced that his government was ready to enact a universal medical care plan. The CCF fought the 1960 provincial election largely on the medicare issue, while the Liberals, backed by the Canadian Medical Association, ran an anti-medicare campaign. The CCF won its fifth consecutive provincial mandate with an increased majority in the legislature, and formed an advisory committee to help draft the medicare bill.

The Thompson Committee, consisting of twelve members, six of them physicians, fell into conflict, and as a result produced three reports, rather than one, in the fall, 1961. The majority report favoured government-paid universal health care coverage, overseen by a public commission. A minority report advocated voluntary private medical insurance, with government subsidies for the poor. Its signatories were the three physicians on the committee who represented the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and the member who represented the Chamber of Commerce. A third, dissenting, report, from the representative of the Saskatchewan Federation of Labour, called for universal health care with doctors on salary, administered directly by the Department of Public Health.[9]

On the basis of the majority report, the government introduced the Saskatchewan Medical Care Insurance Act in October 1961, only days before Tommy Douglas was to resign officially as premier, in order to lead the federal NDP. Left to enact the legislation was Saskatchewan's new premier: former education minister Woodrow Lloyd, a United Church layperson.

During the years leading up to the 1961 legislation the official United Church position – at both the national and provincial levels – endorsed government-paid universal health care. In 1952 a General Council (national) resolution called for "an integrated and contributory National Health Insurance program."[10] A 1954 report expanded on the

church's expectations of national health insurance.[11] A 1960 General Council resolution supported a national health insurance plan and explicitly commended "Saskatchewan for taking steps to implement such a program."[12] In May 1962 the national church expressed similar convictions in a brief to the Royal Commission on Health Care (the "Hall Commission").[13]

Regionally, the Saskatchewan Conference of the United Church "strongly" approved the province's Health Services Plan in 1948, and in 1956 and 1957 continued to endorse the hospital insurance plan, noting only that it wished to see the plan extended to mental health and tuberculosis care.[14] The official record, then, did not diagnose the possibility of an outbreak of dissention.

The Strike and the Church's Responses

Stories of the weeks leading up to the doctors' official withdrawal of services, and of the strike itself, are dramatic and arresting. The facts are straightforward: the Saskatchewan College of Physicians and Surgeons, supported by the Canadian Medical Association, objected to the Medical Care Insurance legislation; attempts to negotiate failed; and on 1 July 1962, the day the legislation was to take effect, the majority of doctors of the province registered their refusal to cooperate by withdrawing all but some emergency services. A negotiated settlement, called the Saskatoon Agreement, ended the strike on 23 July 1962. The agreement gave minor concessions to the physicians, but essentially left the Act, with its universal, tax-funded medical care, intact.

Behind that bare evidence, however, lay bitterness, intrigue, suffering, and even death. A Hutterite baby died of meningitis on the first day of the strike. His desperate parents, after driving many miles from their colony, were turned away from one, and then another clinic, both closed for lack of doctors, and their infant son died in the car on the way to the Yorkton hospital,[15] an emblem of the vulnerability faced by all Saskatchewan residents that July. Opponents of the legislation used almost exclusively the language of freedom: the freedom of doctors to offer the highest possible standard of care, the freedom of patients to choose, the freedom of both doctors and patients over against the strictures of "socialistic medicine."[16] Universal health care would limit freedom of choice; a better solution was to offer limited assistance to the poor, and let other citizens

buy private insurance.

The province's major newspapers launched virulent attacks against the legislation, regularly rehearsing the dangers of government interference, bureaucracy and socialism.[17] Athol Murray, the outspoken Roman Catholic priest, took the rhetoric to dangerous, and possibly drunken, heights. In a 6 July 1962 address in Saskatoon, carried live over radio, he warned of imminent violence and bloodshed, and commented:

> There are three Reds here. I can't see them. I can smell them . . . Tell those bloody Commies to go to hell when it comes to Canada. I loathe the welfare state and I love the free-swinging freedom. I am seventy and I'll never ask you for the Old Age Pension. To hell with it – I want to be free . . . We Catholics are in the majority now but I don't know if we can provide the needed leadership. I know the Protestants have not given us much."[18]

Citizens' groups, backed by business owners and Liberal party supporters, formed "Keep our Doctors" committees to fight medicare. Other citizens formed pro-medicare Community Clinics, some of which survive today. Nurses, given no official voice, but caught in the middle of the conflict, were divided in their stances.[19] Some doctors conveniently took vacations, a few gave their normal service despite their hostility to medicare, a few visited their patients furtively, and about thirty-five of the province's 725 working physicians cooperated fully with the plan. During the job action, about ninety pro-medicare physicians arrived from Britain to fill gaps and work in the community clinics.

And what did the United Church have to say? The 1962 Saskatchewan Conference annual meeting occurred in late May, at the peak of pre-strike anxiety. After protracted debate, the Conference, which consisted of the province's clergy and a roughly equal number of lay delegates, voted to affirm the church's "broad position" on medical insurance. It stated that it respected the desire of both the government (universal availability) and the medical profession (highest standards). It urged negotiation, and even offered to mediate. Finally, it asked congregations to provide "redemptive fellowship" in the hostile climate of the dispute.[20] In other words, it backed away from its earlier stance, which had unambiguously advocated universal medicare, in order to claim a reconciliatory position.

In the next three years, Conference presidents also spoke in

assuaging tones. In 1963 President J. D. McMurtry's report called for an end to "the Bitterness of our present political climate."[21] In 1964-65 following its annual meeting, the Conference president met with the Liberal Premier, Ross Thatcher and his cabinet, beginning the "Brief Committee" process that continues in Saskatchewan to this day.[22] The following year, however, Premier Thatcher failed to show up for the scheduled meeting with United Church representatives, and Conference President Bruce Wartman reported that when the meeting did eventually happen, Thatcher told the United Church to stay out of political issues such as Medicare. "He said the United Church was playing the socialist line."[23] Four years later, it appears that church leaders had revived the United Church's more radical vision.

A few Saskatchewan United Church folk did answer my plea for stories of the strike. However, most still refused to speak "on the record" or to be named publicly. One was a doctor who had taken holidays during the strike period. He had, however, supported the job action, because he feared, under medicare, the loss of fraternity that he experienced with his medical colleagues. A minister who had been a seminarian at the time of the strike recalled being told not to take sides. "Any minister who wanted to keep his pulpit wouldn't have said very much," he told me.

While there were minor skirmishes in United Church congregations, the most pronounced rift came at Lakeview United Church in Regina. Serving an upper middle class suburban neighbourhood, Lakeview was the church home not only of a number of doctors' families, but also of civil servants and of Premier Lloyd himself. Parishioners recall that the minister, Reid Vipond, spoke mildly in favour of the Medical Care Act in a sermon – although I have not yet discovered exactly what he said. (Vipond died in 2001.) As a result, a number of physicians and their families left the congregation and did not return.

Those most willing to speak with me were United Church members who had also been CCF party organizers and activists, particularly those from the Swift Current Health Region, who saw themselves as the true pioneers of universal health care. For these people, the Christian message was clearly bound up with the question of health care access. "It seems it would be hard not to support something intended to help people," said Cliff Murch, a farmer from Lancer who had caught the CCF vision when he returned to Saskatchewan after fighting in World War II. "I left a hopeless dried up province when I went to Europe," Murch told me. "I

returned to a place with a future."[24] For Cliff Murch and his wife Jean, the lack of solidarity in the 1962 United Church Conference statement came as a blow. A neighbouring farmer, who was the local congregational lay representative to the Conference meeting, came to the Murch farm to break the news. "He knew how upset we would be," said Jean Murch, "so even though he wasn't the type to visit, he came over to tell us." Other United Church CCFers agreed that they experienced their denomination as having "dropped the ball" on medicare.[25]

What had the activists wanted from their faith community? In a radio and television address delivered on 9 May 1962, Woodrow Lloyd quoted from some of the "many encouraging letters, telegrams and telephone calls" the government had received concerning the medical care bill. He was able to list Farmer's Union Ladies' Lodge, a Wheat Pool Committee, a farmer, and a clergyman among his supportive correspondents.[26] An open letter addressed to the medical profession, dated 15 May 1962, and signed by the clerk of the Saskatoon Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church, stated that a province-wide medical care plan was inevitable, and that the presbytery was "in complete sympathy and agreement" with the expressed purpose of such a program. It called on the doctors to use every means possible to reach an agreement with the government.[27] That was the sort of support that the embattled CCF needed, and which United Church CCFers had expected from their official decision-makers.

Interpreting the United Church's Responses

This shift of policy, and the acute distress the crisis caused for church people, deserves some interpretation. Most denominations comprise members whose political views range across a spectrum, so on one hand, it is not surprising that officially the United Church took a conciliatory middle road. However, the United Church, particularly in Saskatchewan, bears a more complicated pedigree. Sociologist Stewart Crysdale argued that Saskatchewan was a "special case," the only jurisdiction in North America that embraced the social gospel politically.[28] While recognizing that the "social gospel" never was one thing, and that it traveled a gamut of political and theological expressions in its short life, I have found that prairie United Church people do identify with a prairie socialism grounded in what they call the Social Gospel. To this day, the links between the CCF/NDP and the United Church in Saskatchewan are strong ones. The

current Premier and one of his cabinet ministers are Saskatoon-trained ordained United Church ministers. Before 1962 support for universal medical care was not seen as contentious, but as a natural extension of the United Church's social concern.

The United Church also inherited, however, the centrist liberalism of North American Protestantism. United Church congregations on the prairies have tended to understand their vocations in terms of building community – which situates them as a classic "denomination" in a sociological sense: "securing peace and harmony through location of the broadest, uncontentious common ground."[29] Diana Butler Bass, who researches and writes in the area of congregational studies, characterizes American Protestantism by generation, naming the long period of the 1870s through the 1950s as the era of "social churches." Social churches, says Bass, are oriented to home, family, and parish hall. The church not only supports, but actually *is* a civic organization.[30]

For much of the twentieth century, the Saskatchewan United Church could function as both a child of the Social Gospel and as a "social church," using Kingdom rhetoric to forge a broad consensus around the well-rehearsed themes of a "Christian Canada."[31] With the eruption of the medicare crisis, however, the church's liberal role as a "social church" collided with its radical social gospel legacy. The institutional United Church in Saskatchewan was forced to choose. In the midst of conflict it chose, not without debate, the "social church" option.

This narrative has another layer to unpack, however. When I presented this research to United Church audiences, I met with some distress. "But that's not how it was at all," some people told me. They remember the introduction of medicare as a time of personal radicalization. They recall President McMurtry's 1963 call for an end to the "bitterness" not as a pacifying address but as an emotional pro-medicare manifesto. They are disappointed to hear the 1962 resolution characterized as softening the United Church's pro-medicare position. Many mainstream United Church members, lay and clergy, appear to have erased for themselves any conflict between the contested demands of the Medical Care Act and the conciliatory role of the "social church." They have constructed an ecclesial identity for the United Church that is both radical and moderate, on the edge but not alienating, one which suggests that if Jesus did indeed come to bring "not peace but a sword," surely the sword wasn't intended actually to hurt anyone.

Perhaps, then, the discomfort I encountered in my attempts to discuss the medicare crisis with United Church folk stemmed from both shame and denial: shame that their church compromised on a position that has essentially become a Canadian value and norm, or shame that their church community was threatened with division, or both; and denial that any of it really happened. Is this a dominant motif in United Church theology and identity? Is this how religious groups generally maintain contradictory self-conceptions?

A Thunder Bay Postscript

One day in August 2006 I stood in a field on the edge of Lakehead University, just outside the Bora Laskin Gym. A few minutes before, inside the gym, I had watched a commission of the 39th national General Council of the United Church of Canada debate a resolution asking the church to withdraw from investment in Israel. Now I was trying to mollify a group of upset Toronto Jews who had made the long trek to Thunder Bay in the hope of seeing the United Church pass the divestment motion. "They gutted it!" one woman despaired. "There was a perfectly good motion to divest, and they watered it down to nothing!" She was right. By accepting conciliatory amendments, the commissioners had removed the teeth from the original motion, leaving a sincere but ineffectual "on the one hand/on the other hand" resolution in its place. What intrigued me, though, was that most of the commissioners appeared to have no idea what they had done. They believed – and still believe, as I have spoken with some of them about it – that they took a radical stand that day.

I left the unhappy Jewish group and set out across the field. A young man walking toward me stopped to chat. A doctoral student in forestry, he had arrived from China just one week before. Canada was most interesting he said. He was looking forward to learning more about this nation. What, for example, he asked me, gesturing toward the gym, is going on in that building?

Where to begin? Where to begin?

Endnotes

1. Marginal markings in University of Saskatchewan library copy of Robin F. Badgley and Samuel Wolfe, *Doctors' Strike: Medical Care and Conflict in Saskatchewan* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1967), half-title page.
2. Kevin DeWalt, producer, *Prairie Giant: The Tommy Douglas Story* (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 2006).
3. Bill Waiser, *Saskatchewan: A New History* (Calgary: Fifth House Ltd., 2005), 2.
4. Stuart Houston, *Steps on the Road to Medicare: Why Saskatchewan Led the Way* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002), 28-37.
5. Stan Rands, *Privilege and Policy: A History of Community Clinics in Saskatchewan* (NP: Community Health Cooperative Federation, 1994), 24-25.
6. Robin F. Badgley and Samuel Wolfe, *Doctors' Strike: Medical Care and Conflict in Saskatchewan* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1967), 16.
7. R. Tyre, *Douglas of Saskatchewan: The Story of a Socialist Experiment* (Vancouver: Mitchell Press, 1962), 13; cited in Badgley and Wolfe, *Doctors' Strike*, 17.
8. Aleck Ostry, "Prelude to Medicare: Institutional Change and Continuity in Saskatchewan, 1944-1962," *Prairie Forum* 20 (1995): 96-97.
9. Badgley and Wolfe, *Doctors' Strike*, 36-38.
10. *Record of Proceedings*, 15th General Council of The United Church of Canada (1952), 58, 183.
11. *Record of Proceedings*, 16th General Council of The United Church of Canada (1954), 401-2.
12. *Record of Proceedings*, 19th General Council of The United Church of Canada (1960), 79, 101.
13. For text of this brief see *Telstar – Tell Peace!* 38th Annual Report, 1963, of the Board of Evangelism and Social Service, The United Church of Canada, 218.
14. *Record of Proceedings* (ROP), Saskatchewan Conference of The United Church of Canada. Also see *ROP* 1948: 25, 52; *ROP* 1956: 25, 95; *ROP* 1957: 24, 26-7.

15. Badgley and Wolfe, *Doctors' Strike*, 61.

16. See E.A. Tollefson, *Bitter Medicine: The Saskatchewan Medicare Feud* (Saskatoon: Modern Press, 1963). During the 2006 American election campaign I noticed that anti-medicare television advertising used similar devices: ominous music and shadowy visuals of computer operators, with a voice-over threatening that proponents of medicare "want to put your health in the hands of some government bureaucrat."

17. Particularly graphic were the editorial cartoons in the *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix* in the months leading up to the strike. See Sebestyen, *Is There a Doctor in the House? A Case History, in Cartoons, on Saskatchewan's Medical Care Plan, by Sebestyen* (Saskatoon: Saskatoon Star-Phoenix, 1962).

18. *Saskatoon Star-Phoenix*, July 1962, quoted in Badgley and Wolfe, *Doctors' Strike*, 77-78.

19. A collection of nurses' recollections of the strike indicates deeply divided opinions, even two decades after the action. See Alice E. Caplin, *Nurses and the Medicare Crises 1962* (Saskatoon?: n.p., 1989).

20. *Record of Proceedings,* Saskatchewan Conference 1962: 16, 65-66.

21. *Record of Proceedings,* Saskatchewan Conference 1963: 104.

22. *Record of Proceedings,* Saskatchewan Conference 1965: 94.

23. *Record of Proceedings,* Saskatchewan Conference 1966: 86.

24. Author interview with Cliff Murch, Lancer, SK, 23 October 2005. Also, interview with Lester and Audrey Jorgenson, Abbey, SK, 23 October 2005.

25. Author interview with Don Leitch, Unity, SK (by telephone) March 2005; and with Jim Osborne, Saskatoon, March 2005.

26. W.S. Lloyd, "Progress Report on Medical Care" (9 May 1962). Manuscript in author's possession.

27. Quoted in *Regina Leader-Post*, 15 May 1962, in Saskatchewan Federation of Labour pamphlet (n.d.).

28. Stewart Crysdale, "The Sociology of the Social Gospel: Quest for a Modern Ideology," in *Religion in Canadian Society*, ed. Stewart Crysdale and Les Wheatcroft (Toronto: Macmillan, 1976), 428-32.

29. Roger O'Toole, Douglas F. Campbell, John A. Hannigan, Peter Beyer, and John H. Simpson, "The United Church in Crisis: A Sociological Perspective on the Dilemmas of a Mainstream Denomination," *Studies in Religion* 20, no. 1 (1991): 153.

30. Diana Butler Bass, *The Practicing Congregation* (Herndon, VA: Alban, 2004), 17.

31. Oscar Cole-Arnal argues convincingly that the Methodists actually showed hostility toward the radical social gospel, noting particularly the experiences of J.S. Woodsworth, Salem Bland, and William Ivens. See "The Prairie Labour Churches: The Methodist Input," *Studies in Religion* 34, no. 1 (2005): 3-26.

Belgian Catholic Relations with "Others" in Western Canada, 1880-1940

CORNELIUS J. JAENEN
University of Ottawa

Belgians arrived in western Canada when the Catholic hierarchy was largely francophone, identified with selective immigration and an ideology of agriculturalism. Francophone Catholics were the dominant European element in the west in the fur trade and initial settlement periods. Following the Red River resistance movement and the creation of the province of Manitoba in 1870, the Catholic Church sought to retain its prominent role through the repatriation of Franco-Americans and the recruitment of francophone European Catholic agricultural settlers. This immigration effort extended to Belgium, perceived as an orthodox Catholic realm, populated by two ethnic groups – Walloons and Flemings – and the home of the Séminaire Anglo-Belge of Bruges and the American College of the University of Louvain that trained clergy specifically for North America.

The resulting emigration did not always correspond to the clerical vision in the Canadian west. The majority of early French-speaking Walloon immigrants, for example, were more often involved in coal mining than farming and their religious views and practices usually were controversial. On the other hand, the Flemish-speakers were interested in taking up homesteads, or establishing themselves as dairy farmers near St. Boniface/Winnipeg. These Flemings were conservative Catholics, a number who also spoke French, but they were not the first choice of the colonizing clergy who wanted francophones. The immigration agents who worked with the clergy were interested in maintaining a francophone

Catholic balance with the incoming anglophone settlers from Ontario and immigrants such as the Icelanders, Mennonites and Doukhobors. The latter ethnic groups were able to establish bloc settlements that greatly aided ethno-religious identity maintenance. Belgian immigrants, however, had no ethnic reserves or bloc settlements. They also lacked what sociologist Raymond Breton has called "institutional completeness," that is, the organizations that would provide most of the services – economic, educational, social, recreational, and religious – required by members of the group.[1]

St. Boniface, a francophone centre, was their port of entry and the area of greatest concentration of population. Their settlement pattern can be identified in five sectors: firstly, an urban core in St. Boniface/ Winnipeg of business and labour with suburban dairymen and market gardeners; secondly, a southern Manitoba concentration of Flemish farmers around St. Alphonse, Somerset, Swan Lakes, Mariapolis, Holland; thirdly, a chain of Walloon parishes extending westwards from Bruxelles, MB to Grande Clairière, Deleau, Bellegarde (Antler), Cantal (Alida), Wauchope, Forget, laid out by the abbé Jean Gaire; fourthly, the Belgians scattered throughout francophone parishes such as Prud'homme, Ferland, Gravelbourg, Morinville, Falher; fifthly, ephemeral Belgian populations involved in coal mining at Nanaimo, the Crowsnest, Drumheller, or sugar beet growing and refining around Fort Garry, MB and Raymond, AB.

Belgian Catholic relations with "others" can therefore be further categorized under three headings: firstly, relations with the Native peoples of western and northern Canada; secondly, relations with other Catholics such as the Irish, Hungarians and "Ruthenians"; thirdly, relations with non-Catholics, notably Protestants, Mormons and Eastern Orthodox. Missionaries, among them Belgians, hard on the heels of fur traders and voyageurs, preceded settlers. Settlers arrived when the image of Catholicism in the region was that of a "French church" that was coming under scrutiny from Rome and criticism from Catholics who did not identify with a French-Canadian "nationalist" ideology. Walloons, settled among Quebec and European francophones identified with the linguistic, educational and cultural aspirations of their communities. But Flemings in rural communities, surrounded by anglophone settlers and newcomers in the process of anglicisation, maintained their Catholicism without at the same time adopting the ideology of the hierarchy and francophone clergy. In other words, the social distance from the dominant Anglo-Canadian culture, in a multicultural context, was less pronounced for Flemings than

for Walloons. In coal mining areas, the immigrant workers came from syndicalist and anti-clerical populations in Italy, Slovakia and Wallonia in particular. Even in the sugar beet culture, field and refinery workers tended to identify the Church with the capitalist owners and repressive authorities.

Relations with First Nations

Belgian missionary work in the Americas began in 1493 when two Franciscans from Ath accompanied Columbus on his second voyage to the New World. Belgian Récollets and Jesuits were active evangelizers and explorers in New France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, their activities taking them into the upper Mississippi and Saskatchewan valleys. In 1845 Pierre Jean De Smet S.J. and his assistant Nicolas Point evangelized in the Kootenays, Banff and Jasper. During the last decades of the nineteenth century, Bishops Charles-Jean Seghers from Ghent and Jean-Baptiste Brondel from Bruges, both associated with the American College at Louvain, initiated extensive evangelization of Native communities on Vancouver Island and along the coast northwards to Alaska. They recruited numerous missionaries, including the noted Father Brabant. Shortly after residential schools were introduced in the west in 1884, Father G. Donckele taught at Cowichan, and then served as principal of the Kuper Island Residential School in British Columbia from 1890 to 1907. He insisted that in addition to academic and religious subjects, children be instructed in various trades by competent lay persons under the supervision of Father Van Nevil. These pioneer missionaries were succeeded by Fathers of the Company of Mary [SMM] from 1907 to the outbreak of World War I.[2] At the Kyuquot Mission, Father H. Meuleman founded the school serving 450 people, was succeeded as director by Father E. Sobry in 1897, who erected a new school, church and rectory described as "unique in their kind" and without equals in western Canada. The Belgians were more interested in providing literacy skills and practical knowledge than in assimilating the Native children to the dominant Anglo culture. They were very proud of the fact their approach was apparently superior to that of their Protestant rivals because they enjoyed better funding, good facilities, itinerant priests and a well-focussed school curriculum.[3]

The Oblates of Mary Immaculate (OMI), who arrived in 1845, had the largest contingent of Belgian missionaries in western Canada. At least thirty laboured in the region before 1940, ranging from teaching at St.

Louis College in Victoria, the St. Patrick Orphanage in Prince Albert, the Blue Quills School in St. Paul, the Hobbema Industrial School, to parish charges. They learned the Native languages and composed dictionaries and grammars.Mathias Kalmès, for example, in addition to teaching at four different residential schools left seven manuscripts in Native languages. Most arrived with ultramontane views garnered in Europe and Quebec. However, they quickly became more liberal as they began to appreciate many qualities in the life-style and belief system of the First Nations. They were under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of St. Boniface but they maintained a certain degree of independence even within the Oblate order. In 1865, Florent Vandenberghe, on a canonical visit to Red River Colony, proceeded westwards to inspect the school for French and Cree children at Fort Edmonton and the mission at St. Albert. The local bishop, Mgr Grandin, saw the possibility of recruiting some clergy in Belgium, and was able to return with fifteen missionaries. He confided that he preferred candidates from Flanders because "they can speak Flemish and that is why they easily learn English and German."[4] Among the recruits were Brothers Henri Scheers and Leonard Van Tighem. Henri Scheer went to Lac la Biche in 1874 and continued to labour in the North-West Territories until 1904. Leonard Van Tighem, a cabinet-maker, was ordained a priest in 1882, and the following year travelled three months by ox-cart from St. Boniface to St. Albert, then proceeded to take charge of an unfinished residential school at the junction of the Bow and High rivers. He taught a dozen children in the mornings and in the afternoons made doors and windows for the mission house and church. He found his small log cabin "less comfortable than an animal shelter." Raised in a pious conservative Flemish family, he was unhappy initially in primitive circumstances "among people who are near heathen, work on Sundays . . . drink excessively . . . play pool . . . blasphemies illustrate and embellish their conversation . . . they possess not even a small garden or tree."[5] He knew little English so he found it difficult to deal with anglophone officials but was at home ministering to the Quebec Voltigeurs battalion stationed at Fort MacLeod to keep watch over the Piegan and Blood reserves during the North-West Rebellion. He felt strongly that the ranchers needlessly hoarded large tracts of land, while at the same time the Blackfoot tribes ought to have their traditional hunting and horse raiding channelled into sedentary farming. In 1888, his superiors appointed him pastor at Lethbridge, a multi-ethnic parish made up largely of immigrant coal miners. There arose a problem of prostitution centred on the Blackfoot

reserve south of the town, which "made it easy for female members of the tribe to slip into town in the evening, or for whites to come out" to the reserve. The Protestant clergy thundered against the immorality of Van Tighem's congregation, so he supported a North-West Mounted Police plan to appoint band leader Calf Shirt a police scout to deal with the situation. The result of the investigation, to Van Tighem's delight, was that it was Protestant males who were identified as the chief offenders.[6] Besides his manual skills and scholarship, Van Tighem was an avid horticulturalist. He tended a productive orchard and vegetable garden using irrigation, proving to the ranchers that the region could grow more than coarse grasses. With the help of Captain R.B. Deane of the North-West Mounted Police he founded the first school of agriculture south of the Red Deer river.[7]

His brother, Victor Van Tighem, as a lay member of the Oblates, came to the Piegan reserve near Fort MacLeod in 1887, planted a large vegetable garden to feed the school's children, learned English in order to teach the few who attended classes more or less regularly. These children followed the example of their parents and were, he concluded, "only good for eating, drinking and smoking pipes." The disappearance of the bison had encouraged dependency on government food aid and prompted Van Tighem to observe that "they like us due to their self-interest." Nevertheless, when Hayter Reed of Indian Affairs introduced a supposedly "new improved system of farming" for the reserves to promote self-sufficiency, Van Tighem noted that only small hand tools such as hoes, rakes, sickles, scythes were issued and herds were limited to a few cows for household purposes. He concluded that government officials had little understanding of how to promote industry, had little sympathy for the poverty of his charges, and most certainly were more interested in protecting farmers and ranchers from any possible competition from the Natives were they to become proficient farmers.[8]

Roger Vandersteene began his illustrious and controversial career studying Cree at Grouard in 1946 with the conviction that "a Fleming understands better than anybody else that the language of a people is its main artery." The Cree called him Ka Nihta Nehiyawet, which translates as "the one who really speaks Cree." His understanding of and admiration for Cree symbolism and spirituality led him to create a syncretic Cree liturgy, an innovation that won the respect of his parishioners but disturbed his conservative superiors. Although Cree tunes and drumming were accepted, his other innovations were rejected. He was installed a Cree

elder and medicine man and before he died in 1976 he gave his medicine pipe to an old friend, Harold Cardinal, who had ceased attending mass. It was common knowledge that Vandersteene was an ardent Flemish nationalist who had participated in an alleged pro-Nazi movement for the creation of a separate Flemish state. It is also significant that the Belgian missionaries in the Prairie missions were mostly Flemings, while those in the northern missions were almost all Walloons. Vandersteene as a Fleming among the northern Cree was in a francophone region with francophone superiors who disapproved of his independent approach to mission work.[9]

Relations with "Other" Catholics

Belgian missionaries and parish priests served a wide range of ethno-cultural communities. The French Oblate, Albert Pascal, future bishop of Prince Albert, advised Prime Minister Laurier in 1896 that the Dominion government should recruit immigrants of diverse ethnic backgrounds and should provide advisors, teachers and doctors with appropriate language skills. Pascal departed from French Canadian objectives, had personally learned several Native languages, and taught in English. This was a multicultural approach, long before its time, which a number of Belgians shared.[10]

An example of this outreach to other ethnic groups was the ministry of the abbé Jules Pirot, a Walloon nationalist, who served the Hungarians at Kaposvar (1904-15) and Esterhazy (1919-54) in their mother tongue while writing poetry in his Walloon dialect. He believed that all groups valued their mother tongue and this should receive some official recognition. "How often in a country where English predominates," he said, "I saw Hungarians, Slavs, Germans, French run to me beaming because I spoke their language."[11] Early assessments by religious superiors in Belgium that Pirot possessed no ability for evangelization could not have been more erroneous. From Kaposvar he established ten missions nearby and six further west where settlement was just beginning. He was also an unofficial colonizing agent, bringing out eighteen Walloon families, including his own family and the Vanderhaeghes, whose grandson GuyVanderhaeghe would have a distinguished literary career. During his pre-war ministry at Kaposvar, he was firmly opposed to Hungarian bilingual schools and this controversy ended after Pirot volunteered to serve as a chaplain with the Canadian ambulance corps in France during

World War I. He returned to Esterhazy as parish priest in 1919, where he served for thirty-five years while extending his labours to the Hungarians at Lipton, Cupar and Markinch. He was fondly regarded not only as a devoted pastor, but also as a model horticulturalist, a great hunter, a kindly and simple man of learning who could be most stubborn. He never lost his love for the natural beauty of the Prairies, writing to his friends in Belgium about the marvels of prairie flowers, colourful songbirds, delicious wild fruits, wide horizons, flaming sunsets and dazzling northern lights.[12]

Somewhat different was the experience of the Belgian Redemptorists who were asked by Archbishop Langevin in 1893 to take charge at Brandon of four missions of the "Ruthenians" [Ukrainians] and Poles at Huns Valley, Shoal Lake, Glenella and Rossburn. William Godts and Edouard Verlooy undertook the task and were soon joined by Achille Delaere of West Flanders, who was sent to Galicia in 1898 to learn Polish and Slovak. The challenge was that these Ukrainian Catholics had their own liturgy in Old Slavonic, rites common to the Eastern churches, a married secular clergy, yet were in full communion with Rome since 1596. Four problems awaited the Belgians: first, resistance to any effort to Latinize them; second, the attraction of the Russian Orthodox Church whose rites the "Ruthenians" from Galicia shared; third, the proselytizing of Presbyterian-trained clergy who had established a puppet Independent Greek Church; and last, a strong hostility between Poles of the Latin rite and Ukrainians of the Greek rite. Moreover, Delaere found soon after arriving in the west that he should have learned Ukrainian instead of Slovak. The Belgians could not count on help from Eastern Europe because the Propaganda Fide decreed in 1894 that only celibate priests were permitted to minister in North America. When two more Belgian Redemptorists arrived in Brandon in 1902, they were assigned to the English work

Delaere found a formidable adversary in a schismatic/heretical movement: "the people are very spoiled by this kind of Doukhobors that [Bishop] Seraphim has pretended to ordain. The battle will be a long one." This renegade Orthodox priest, who styled himself a metropolitan bishop, "has ordained about one hundred men who are simple workmen, who can barely read and write, and who travel among the people to deceive them." His contempt for these itinerant lay preachers was captured in the phrase, "Ordination costs fifty dollars."[13] The Presbyterians took advantage of the situation, gave some elementary training to the least ignorant at Manitoba College and then organized the Independent Greek Church in 1904, when

Seraphim left Canada. At this time, Delaere was joined by four Belgian Redemptorists and they founded a monastery at Yorkton, but he recognized that if they were to enjoy any success they needed to adopt the Ruthenian rite and preach in Ukrainian.

Two years later, Delaere received an indult from Rome permitting him to adopt the Ruthenian rite for a five-year period, follow the Julian calendar, say mass in Slavonic, administer communion in both kinds, administer confirmation immediately after baptism, and wear the traditional Eastern Church vestments. But on no condition was he to marry, nor were his colleagues included in this indult. The Ukrainian community was disappointed that the priests could not marry and was indignant that the episcopal corporation held the title to all church property, the practice everywhere in Canada outside Quebec. Delaere sensed continuing hostility and confided to his Provincial in 1908: "What disillusionments and mortifications! What interior and exterior struggles one has to carry out here. It is so depressing to have to work for a backward, headstrong, and quarrelsome people, a people without any inclination and without respect for the priest."[14] His compatriot, Hendrik Boels, was also permitted to pass over to the Greek rite, but still the Ukrainians perceived the situation as one in which they were served by foreigners in a Latin Church context. Delaere was sensitive to the need for a Ukrainian Catholic diocese, quite distinct from French-dominated hierarchy reminiscent of Polish domination in the Galician homeland. He was encouraged somewhat by the fact that the American episcopacy, dominated by the Irish who insisted on creating an anglophone American institution, had to accept Rome's intervention and appointment of a Greek Catholic bishop. This prelate, Bishop Ortynsky, predicted that unless the Canadians organized a Ukrainian diocese "the great masses will be swallowed up by schism [Orthodoxy] or by Protestantism."[15] The council of Catholic bishops meeting in June 1909 identified two problems: the danger of introducing a married clergy; and the territorial rather than ethno-cultural diocesan organization. At the local practical level, Delaere, as superior in the Yorkton district, was faced with trying to have a parish erected to serve both Poles and Ukrainians in the Rama and Dobrovoda districts. He thought of having two priests, a Latin rite and a Greek rite priest, but the Poles objected vociferously. When Nykyta Budka was appointed bishop of the Ukrainian Catholics in July 1912, Delaere's problems were not resolved entirely. Budka was a Ukrainian nationalist who did not hide his feelings that foreigners, like Belgians, did not

understand Ukrainians. Delaere thought that it would be wise to organize a distinct Eastern rite branch of the Redemptorist order. In 1913, he obtained permission from Rome to establish a Ukrainian Catholic monastery in Yorkton to house five Belgian Redemptorists who had passed over to the Eastern rite. By 1914, there were three married priests serving the Ukrainian Catholics, all married before converting to Catholicism.

When a Belgian priest in a sermon at Hafford in 1918 declared that those who sent their children to a public school or a Ukrainian *bursa* were in danger of hellfire, the Ukrainian intelligentsia meeting in Saskatoon organized the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Brotherhood. Its objective was to "remove from our church celibacy . . . [and] to send the French-Belgian missionaries to preach the Roman faith among their own people or among the heathen."[16] Eventually North American seminarians circumvented the celibacy rule by going to the Soviet Union for ordination. More troubling was the reorganization of the Independent Church by Wasyl Swystun, widely believed to be an atheist, under the title Independent Ukrainian Orthodox Church. A training school for teachers and clergy, with some Anglican support, was organized by Swystun in Saskatoon. The Redemptorists redoubled their efforts as more monks arrived from Belgium, Noel Descamps was named superior at the Yorkton monastery, a second house was founded at Komarno to serve the Interlake district of Manitoba by Achiel Delaere, and a third monastery was established at Ituna under Louis Van den Bossche.

Storm clouds remained on the horizon. In April 1921, Joseph Bala, a Ukrainian Redemptorist, arrived at Yorkton and the parishoners of Ituna and Goodeve in particular wanted the Belgian missionaries to relinquish their charges. Bishop Budka calmed the storm by appointing Bala pastor at Ituna. The superiors in Belgium thought that instead of continuing in parish work the Belgians ought to turn to preaching missions. The Ukrainians continued to clamour for their own ethnic clergy until in August 1928 the Yorkton Belgian Vice Province was suppressed, on orders from Rome, and the English-speaking Canadian Redemptorists took over. The Belgian Redemptorists, including Delaere, returned to Belgium. Bishop Budka tendered his resignation. Delaere felt lost in his native land and proceeded to Galicia. In 1931 it was decided to attach the monasteries at Yorkton and Ituna to the Galcian Vice Province and so Delaere returned to Saskatchewan to end his days in obscurity and prayer.

The Flemish parishioners in St. Boniface petitioned for and obtained

their own ethnic parish within the cathedral parish in October 1912. Ten years later, it took on a deeper Flemish character when Capuchin monks from Blenheim, Ontario, established a monastery next to Sacred Heart Belgian Church, took charge of the parish, and began language classes and cultural activities. This isolated them from the francophones. When the parish was closed in 1955 because of insufficient support, most Flemings joined anglophone parishes. The Capuchins, meanwhile, had opened a monastery at Toutes Aides to serve northern Metis communities and served a parish in a multicultural working-class parish in Transcona, a railway hub.

Relations with non-Catholics

Belgians did not emigrate from a country noted for its religious diversity. This was reflected in the overwhelming adherence to Roman Catholicism of those who came to western Canada. A few Belgian Protestants went to the United States, a few Belgian Jews settled in Montreal, and among the Walloon miners there were a few agnostics and atheists. In the European Catholic hierarchy, the Belgians usually took the tolerant liberal position on dogmatic and diplomatic issues. In general, Belgians in Canada, both the clergy and laity, adopted a more liberal position on issues than either their French Canadian or Irish coreligionists. However, they were discriminated against, as were other Catholics, by the colonization boards and societies, the school systems, the Conservative party, the Protestant clergy and organizations (including temperance societies), and the Ku Klux Klan. The latter, in supporting J.T.M. Anderson's electoral campaign in 1930, called for the deportation of all Catholics born outside Canada. The young John G. Diefenbaker was the voice of moderation in Conservative ranks at this time. The Belgian Capuchin monastery in Manitoba had a fiery cross erected on its grounds in 1931.[17]

Most Protestant efforts directed at Belgians were ineffective. The Belgian evangelist, E. Petrequin, who followed miners from Pennsylvania to the Crownsnest, met with little success.[18] Pastor J.E. Duclos of the Presbyterians held successful evangelistic campaigns in Edmonton, Bonnyville, Cold Lake and St. Paul-des-Métis, which attracted a few Belgian families.[19] The lodges attracted Belgians, in spite of church warnings, because they offered insurance. The left-wing socialist organizations and political parties also enjoyed some success because they

agitated for better working conditions, including safer work sites.

Most opposition was less overt. In southern Alberta, coal miners, beet growers and workers felt pressure from Mormons whose highly organized social, sports, recreational and cultural activities all attracted youth. As a highly disciplined and generally progressive group, Mormons pursued aggressive evangelization through fraternization. Leonard Van Tighem, as pastor at Lethbridge, was particularly concerned about intermarriage with non-Catholics. The Apostolic Delegate Diomede Falconio carried out a survey of the region in 1900-01 to gauge the extent of such proselytization. Not surprisingly, in March 1908, a papal encyclical on the dangers and prohibition of such marriages was read from all Catholic pulpits.[20]

Finally, mention must be made of the Belgian bishops in western Canada who initiated relations with "others" and those more recently who contributed enormously to renewal and outreach. Charles-Jean Seghers and Jean-Baptiste Brondel of the archdiocese of Oregon, later of Victoria, were outstanding architects of a multi-lingual and multicultural colonial church. The so-called "Belgian connection" at the Second Vatican Council, consisting of Archbishop Maurice Baudoux of St. Boniface, his successor Antoine Hacault, Bishop Remi De Roo of Victoria, and Noel Delaquis of Gravelbourg, made a notable contribution. They submitted no fewer than twenty-three written texts and among their innovative ideas were the use of vernacular languages in the mass and breviary, updating of pastoral care, and the promotion of Biblical studies. Cardinal Soenens of Brussels gave them effective support. Baudoux had promoted multicultural media rights, Hacault the bilingual projects, and De Roo the liberalization of social and economic policies. They all worked on ecumenical projects as well. It was an extraordinary example of outreach to the wider western Canadian community.[21]

The skein of historical events we have identified was composed of threads of nationalistic, ethnic, linguistic, denominational, racial and cultural sentiments. Walloon and Flemish nationalists encountered Hungarian, Polish and Ukrainian nationalists in an environment in which French-Canadian nationalism was challenged by powerful Anglo-conformist forces. Cree and Slavonic struggled with Latin imposition. Roman and Greek Catholics were opposed by Orthodox, Presbyterians and Mormons. In this melee, the Belgian clergy were able to retain their own flocks and reach out to the wider community.

Endnotes

1. Raymond Breton, "Institutional Completeness of Ethnic Communities and the Personal relations of Immigrants," *American Journal of Sociology* 70 (1964): 193-205.

2. Letters of G. Donckele to Indian Affairs, 1893-1907, Add. Mss. 1267, Provincial Archives of British Columbia, Victoria, BC.

3. E. Sobry, "The West Coast Missions," *Historical Number of the British Columbia's Orphans' Friends* (December 1913): 67.

4. Mission de la Congrégation des Missionnaires Oblats de Marie Immaculée (Paris, 1878), 319. There was also a need for priests to serve German settlers in Saskatchewan.

5. Van Tighen to Leduc, 11 November 1883, HEF3282, L57C3, Archives Deschatelets (Ottawa).

6. Hugh A. Dempsey, *The Amazing Death of Calf Shirt and Other Blackfoot Stories* (Saskatoon: Fifth House, 1994), 147.

7. Information communicated by Mary Eggermont-Molenaar, Calgary, who has edited Leonard and Victor Van Tighem's papers and diaries (see Mary Eggermont-Molenaar and Paul Callens, ed., *Missionaries Among the Miners, Migrants, and Blackfoot: The Van Tighem Brothers' Diaries, Alberta 1875-1917* [Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2007]).

8. Sarah Carter, *Lost Harvests: Prairie Indian Reserve Farmers and Government Policy* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990), 209-10.

9. Earle H. Waugh, *Dissonant Worlds. Roger Vandersteene Among the Cree* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1996), 32-36, 90-93, 313, 322-35.

10. Pascal to Laurier, 18 November 1896, MG15, Laurier Papers, No 420689, Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa, ON.

11. Lucien Léonard, *Un Litérateur Wallon au Canada* (Namur, n.d.), 60-63.

12. Jules Pirot, *Contes dau lon et did près* (Gembloux, 1950), 8-9.

13. Achille Delaere, *Memorandum of the Attempts of Schism and Heresy among the Ruthenians (commonly called Galicains) in the Canadian Northwest* (Winnipeg: West Canada Publishing Company, 1909), 42; and Delaere to Langevin, 11 April 1904, Fonds Langevin, L331132, Archives du Patrimoine,

Sain-Boniface, MB.

14. Jozef De Vocht, *Eternal Memory: Father Delaere & Canada's Ukrainian Catholic Church* (Yorkton: Laverdure & Associates, 2005), 113.

15. De Vocht, *Eternal Memory*, 131.

16. "The Turbulent Arrival of Orthodoxy on the Prairies," *Alberta in the 20th Century*, vol. 5, *Brownlee and the Triumph of Populism*, ed. Ted Byfield (Edmonton: United Western Communications, 1996), 168-69.

17. Keith Wilson and James B. Wyndels, *The Belgians in Manitoba* (Winnipeg, 1974), citing diary entry from Father Chrysostom, 13 March 1931.

18. Communication from Allen Seager, 7 August 1984.

19. Unpublished address by Miss Canavan, 1, 5, 10, 17-18, 75, 387, United Church Archives, Box UC50, Provincial Archives of Alberta, Edmonton, AB.

20. St. Paul's Church, Lethbridge,Codex historicus 7.220, Provincial Archives of Alberta, Edmonton, AB; and Anne Freemantle, ed., *The Papal Encyclicals in their Historical Context* (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1956), 235-43.

21. Terence J. Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002), 288-96; and Bernard Daly, "The First Reception of the Council," *Mission: Journal of Mission Studies* 10, no. 2 (2003): 214-15.

The Pursuit of Solyma: Johann Heinrich Jung-Stilling's Letters as Part of His Spiritual Autobiography

SERGEY PETROV
University of Calgary

Johann Heinrich Jung-Stilling's novel *Heimweh* (published in 1794-96) stirred up an enthusiastic response in Germany and beyond. His idea of Solyma, the far-away land of peace, the refuge of all true Christians at the end of time, was a major theme of Jung-Stilling's thinking in the latter period of his life. The importance of Solyma is far greater than one might normally expect of a literary image. It was instrumental in launching large scale historical developments such as the migrations and colonization efforts of German radical chiliasts to Russia from 1814 till as late as the 1880s. In addition, through Russian translation of his works Jung-Stilling's idea of Solyma incited chiliastic enthusiasm and subsequent internal migration of Russian non-Orthodox believers to the Caucasus in pursuit of the millennial kingdom in 1830s.[1]

In spite of the fact that the theme of Solyma was so central to Jung-Stilling's *Weltanschauung* in his later years, it has been largely neglected by the scholarship on the German writer and theologian. Hans W. Panthel, in his article on Jung-Stilling's apocalypticism and Tsar Alexander I of Russia, and Andrei Zorin in a recent article on a similar topic, examined links between Jung-Stilling's eschatology and such issues as the victory over Napoleon and the Holy Alliance between Christian monarchs of Austria, Russia, and Prussia.[2] However, they failed to fit the idea of Solyma into the picture. Any talk of Jung-Stilling's chiliasm will be incomplete unless the notion of Solyma is incorporated into the discussion. Tatjana Högy devoted a section to the notion of Solyma in her study on

Jung-Stilling and Russia;[3] however, she did not look beyond the text of *Heimweh*. According to Högy, Jung-Stilling always insisted on a purely spiritual meaning of his *Heimweh*, which at the same time contradicted his "prophetic feeling."[4]

I will show that Jung-Stilling's correspondence reveals the dynamic development of Solyma in Jung-Stilling's thought. A closer analysis of Jung-Stilling's letters reveals that there were at least three distinctive phases in the author's approach to Solyma. Jung-Stilling, who at first regarded Solyma as a fiction, became excited to see his literary fantasies fulfilled in reality, and supported those who tried to find Solyma in the south of Russia. Gradually he took a more balanced approach to mass migrations, precise calculations of the year of Christ's return and excessive religious enthusiasm in general. The search for a balance between trusting God and his prophecies on the one hand, and the necessity of avoiding excessive religious emotionalism and spontaneous action one the other hand was a major practical concern of Jung-Stilling towards the end of his life. Thus, Solyma serves for the late Jung-Stilling as an integral eschatological reference point. Solyma must become a reality prior to the beginning of millennium, but nobody can force it to become a reality, so Christians are reminded to watch and pray.

Jung-Stilling earned a wide popularity and recognition through a series of autobiographical books. Given the lack of any autobiographical works for the last thirteen years of Jung-Stilling's life, his correspondence serves as a crucial source of data for the understanding author's spiritual change and development in later life. I will be using a recently published edition of Jung-Stilling's selected German letters, edited by Gerhard Schwinge. Jung-Stilling authored somewhere between 20,000 to 25,000 letters in his lifetime, of which only about 1,200 pieces of correspondence survived. The edition I have used includes 372 letters. The editor's principle of selection of specific letters was based upon fair, even and representative coverage of Jung-Stilling's different life phases, periods of work on specific books, theological views, relationships to a wide circles of people and groups of people.[5] This paper will focus particularly on letters from 1806, when the idea of the last refuge in the east became a frequent topic in Jung-Stilling's correspondence, till the end of his life in 1817. The letters that have been used reflect the general importance of the idea of Solyma for Jung-Stilling during the later period of his life.

Land of Solyma as Ongoing Theme in Jung-Stilling's Later Period

Soon after its publication many of Jung-Stilling's readers began to perceive the insights expressed in his novel *Heimweh* as prophetic. In a letter to Markgraf Karl Friedrich von Baden as of December, 1796 Jung-Stilling acknowledged that "my *Heimweh* has become a great sensation, and wherever German is spoken, the book is widely read; it is also being translated into other languages."[6] The book was perceived as symbolic by its readers already at that time, and Jung-Stilling had to write a "*Schlüssel zum Heimweh*," a key to the book, where he explained "the use of the whole allegory of the conversion and salvation of a Christian."[7] One of the things he specifically wanted to point to through his allegories, was the imminence of "the last great battle between Light and Darkness."[8] At that time, neither the author nor his readers anticipated any material and tangible fulfillment of the insights expressed in the novel, and its description of Christian von Ostenheim's pursuit of the land Solyma somewhere in the symbolical east.

The French Revolution with its decidedly anti-Christian pathos, the rise of Napoleon, and spread of secularism created for Jung-Stilling an apocalyptic environment and convinced him that the end time was near and that true Christians would soon have to flee the power of Antichrist. In the eyes of Jung-Stilling, Napoleon was an apocalyptic figure who was preparing the way for the biblical "man of sin" (Thessalonians 2:3).[9] Napoleonic France, therefore, was the "military camp of the kingdom of darkness."[10] Jung-Stilling closely watched Napoleon's military efforts and interpreted them from his apocalyptic point of view. He wrote as early as 1799 about Napoleon's invasion of then Turkish Palestine: "this has something in common with the ascension of the beast from the bottomless pit, or with the man of sin, actual Antichrist."[11] This is the context for his idea of Solyma the place of refuge. The author located it far away from Europe, for the novel was written at the time when Napoleon was still expanding his power in Europe and beyond. Jung-Stilling's emphasis on the idea of a place of refuge in a far away land was a natural reaction to the spread of revolutionary ideas and ungodly influence. The literary image of the Christian land of peace was a mirror reflection of the harsh reality the author had to live.

Christian von Ostenheim, the protagonist of Stilling's *Heimweh* (1794-96), traveled to the East in search of the land of last refuge of true Christians before the coming tribulation. Jung-Stilling called that land

Solyma, a name apparently derived from "Jerusalem" and the Jewish word "shalom," that is, peace. As Jung-Stilling continuously noted, Solyma for the author at that time was merely fictitious. It was a symbolic reflection in a literary form of his belief in the place of the refuge that God would prepare for his faithful towards the end of times.

In his letter to Johann Jakob Hess of Zurich as of December, 1809 Jung-Stilling acknowledged that at the time when he was working on *Heimweh* in 1793 and 1794, he felt quite excited, calling it "the most pleasant time in my life."[12] He continued: "this all was a mere fiction, my heart did not think of any [literal] fulfillment, but I always suspected that the Lord would in due time bring his faithful to some safe place."[13] However, many of Jung-Stilling's readers desired more precision. Soon after the book was published "a gentleman of a high rank" wrote to the author asking him how he knew of a "gathering of some people on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem and on Egyptian pyramids" mentioned in the *Heimweh*.[14] Jung-Stilling answered that he did not know anything about them, and that they were only fictitious events. In a following letter the same correspondent assured Jung-Stilling that God must have revealed it to the author, because what he wrote was actually coming to pass. Soon after a man whose father was supposedly an emir from Syria, visited Jung-Stilling and told him that his father was a member of the society that gathered on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem.[15] These encounters prepared him to regard as prophetic what was initially written as a fiction, and made him more receptive to re-interpretations of his novel.

The first mention of Solyma appears in Jung-Stilling's letter to Markgraf Karl Friedrich von Baden as of May 1801 and is simply limited to his signature. He signs off as a "humble fellow traveler to Solyma," meaning a spiritual journey.[16] The next mention of Solyma occurs in Jung-Stilling's letters almost five years later, in February 1806, in a letter to the same correspondent. There Jung-Stilling was more specific, pointing to the Volga River and Crimea in Russia as the place of refuge (*Bergungsplatz*) "which is being prepared for the true worshippers of the Lord, where they will be able to flee in ten to twenty years."[17] Russia was an important destination of religious immigration from Germany from as early as 1763 when members of the Pietistic Moravian Brethren were allocated 6,500 hectares of land in the Lower Volga area and guaranteed complete religious freedom and administrative autonomy in their settlement. The famous colony and town of Sarepta was founded by those settlers, and by 1810 it had over 500 inhabitants. Jung-Stilling was aware of the Moravian

colonization and missionary efforts on the Volga as well as of the benevolent policies of Alexander I and his administration towards religious settlers.

Therefore, by 1806 Jung-Stilling had already linked the idea of Solyma initially born as an allegory, to a specific geographical location. This marks the second, "enthusiastic" phase of the development of Jung-Stilling's idea of Solyma. He now expected a mass migration to that tangible and material Solyma to begin around 1816 (as it in fact did!). The particularly notable fact about locating Solyma in Russia by 1806 is that from about 1804 the Russian theme powerfully enters Jung-Stilling's thinking. Already in August 1804 he wrote in a letter to a secretary of a Christian Society (*Christentumsgesellschaft*) Christian Gottlieb Blumhardt that "there is a powerful awakening in Saint-Petersburg, and two very noble Russian gentlemen are translating my religious writings into the local language."[18] Somewhat earlier, in May of the same year, Jung-Stilling mentioned that he was aware of the translation of his work into Russian. In the same letter the German thinker praised and invoked God's blessing on Tsar Alexander, who he heard was an excellent ruler.[19]

Letters written in 1809-1810 demonstrate how certain poetical and literary insights of Jung-Stilling evolved into a "fulfilled" prophecy. This sense of fulfillment, of an image and a symbol becoming reality in the perception of both the author and his readership, stirred up tremendous enthusiasm and had a lasting historical effect. Around 1809 Jung-Stilling accidentally learned of a colonization and missionary effort of a Christian community from Edinburgh in Scotland that established an intentional settlement on the Don River, in the southern part of European Russia. His letter to Johann Friedrich von Meyer of Frankfurt am Main testifies to the writer's amazement when he realized that his speculations about Solyma had been literally fulfilled. "The Missionary Society of Edinburgh in Scotland has sent to Petersburg seven missionaries, who did not know a word of my *Heimweh*, to obtain permission to establish there, in the Caucasus, a mission."[20] Initially preaching among indigenous non-Christian (mostly Muslim) ethnicities was the declared goal of Scottish missionaries. It should be noted that converting Orthodox people into any other faith was at that time a criminal offence. I do not know for sure to which church the Scottish group belonged, but one can assume that the group came to Russia under the same terms as the Moravian Brethren, and might have been associated with them. Jung-Stilling learned about the Scottish group through his contacts with Herrnhut who shared the first

letter from the Scots with the writer.[21] Jung-Stilling entered into a correspondence with the Scots (although it is not clear who initiated the letter exchange). It turned out that the Scots were happy in a new land, and asked their famous German correspondent to send other Christians over there.[22] They reported the climate in the new land was mild, the soil very fruitful, and that their community enjoyed autonomy and privileges from the Russian authorities.

Jung-Stilling interpreted the news in an apocalyptic manner, which was characteristic of his thinking in last decades of his life. He wrote, that "the place is being prepared for the wife clothed in the sun in Russian Asia."[23] Elsewhere in his letters Jung-Stilling said the land given to the Scottish missionaries was "a paradise."[24] Throughout his correspondence, Jung-Stilling invariably called the prospective land of refuge "Asia" although the North Caucasus (*Cirkessien*)[25] and Don River basin are still the southernmost part of European Russia, near the Caucasian mountain range which is the geographical line between Europe and Asia. According to the novel *Heimweh*, the literary Solyma was initially located by the author "in the East, near Samarkand," in former Russian Central Asia, presently Uzbekistan.[26] It is possible to assume that at the time of writing the novel, Jung-Stilling chose such an exotic location quite arbitrarily, due to its exoticism and the lack of factual knowledge about Samarkand among German readership.[27] However, the writer later corrected his idea of Solyma's physical location under the influence of circumstances, and moved it westwards to what is now southern Russia, because those areas were open for colonization and resettlement by the Russian imperial administration.

The feeling of a sincere and deep astonishment with the literal fulfilment of his fantasy about Solyma is re-iterated time and again in Jung-Stilling's letters written in 1809 and 1810, particularly to the Christian Society in Basel, Switzerland.[28] At the same time, members of the Society and enthusiastic believers in Switzerland and southern Germany, who included masses of impoverished by Napoleonic wars peasants and townspeople, grew impatient about prospects of finding earthly refuge in the East. Theologian Daniel Joahim Köppen (d.1808), parish priest in Zettemin, whom Jung-Stilling held in high esteem, had declared that both Johann Albrecht Bengel and Jung-Stilling in his *Siegsgeschichte der christlichen Religion* were erring. Köppen set the new date of the beginning of apocalyptic events for 1816, and not for 1836 as thought Bengel.[29] However, Jung-Stilling chose to take a more balanced

approach towards chronological calculations. He considered it necessary to constrain the excessive enthusiasm of those radical believers that were ready to abandon their homes and immediately leave for desired Solyma.

Hans Panthel analyzed the pieces of Jung-Stilling's correspondence where the writer explicitly pointed to a specific timeframe for the anticipated apocalyptic events.[30] In the earliest of those letters, sent to Johann Georg Siebel, then Bürgermeister of Freudenberg in Nassau-Siegen, in April 1807, Jung-Stilling pointed to 1818 as a possible date of the start of millennium.[31] However, already in 1810, having acknowledged his belief in the imminent beginning of apocalyptic events, Jung-Stilling underlined that he had always believed that 1836 was only an "exegetical hypothesis, although highly probable."[32] He continued that the same was his opinion of 1816 and another suggested date, 1819. This points to the concluding stage of Jung-Stilling's understanding of Solyma, characterized by a balanced and cautious approach. He emphatically put an end to chronological speculations saying: "enough, the Lord will come *unexpected*."[33] He touched upon the closely related topic of Solyma in the same letter, saying that it would have been unreasonable to talk openly right away about the start of the millennial kingdom of the Lord (*Zukunft des Herrn*) in 1816 or actual Solyma already existing in the Caucasus. He wrote: "however, the place is being prepared in the Caucasus, and those, whose situation is too difficult, can flee there."[34]

Thus, following the sensational popularity of the novel in Germany and beyond, Jung-Stilling faced the necessity to constrain the limitless enthusiasm of many, who were ready to set off immediately in pursuit of promised Solyma. Predictions of Bengel, coupled with the enthusiasm stirred up by Jung-Stilling's works and overall difficult material situation, prevailing in Germany following the Napoleonic wars, resulted in a massive flow of migration known as Swabian emigration to Russia (*Schwäbische Auswanderung nach Russland*).[35] Jung-Stilling more than once warned in his letters of the danger of excessive enthusiasm or emotionalism (*Schwärmerey*), pointing to enthusiasts' lack of solidity and tendency towards wishful thinking.[36] He warned already in April 1810: "No! My dear! The move to Solyma is not really that near, many things are yet to pass."[37] Nevertheless, the writer was not able to halt the movement that already gathered momentum, nor he was directly responsible for it. With some bitterness he wrote to his friends, pastor Gabriel Rudolf Dulliker and his wife Rosalie: "There will be yet enough of fanaticism (*Schwärmerey*); this cannot be otherwise in times like ours, this

moves us to watch and pray."[38] Nevertheless, the mass migration of Swabian Separatists to Solyma in southern Russia started around 1814 and continued well beyond Jung-Stilling's death.

Conclusion

Jung-Stilling's correspondence is an autobiographical source of utmost importance for the period when the writer authored no further autobiographical works. The Karlsruhe period of Jung-Stilling's life (1804-1817) was characterized by the author's increasing apocalypticism and emphasis on millenarian expectations as well as by the ongoing presence of the Russian theme in his thinking. The period coincides with the reign of Alexander I of Russia, a monarch whose personal quest of truth was not any less important for him as the most burning issues of the European politics. For Jung-Stilling Alexander I, the defeater of Napoleon, promoter of religious tolerance and sponsor of religiously motivated immigration into Russia, was a providential figure. In particular, the theme of the land of refuge being prepared for true Christians in southern Russia became a continuing topic in his late correspondence.

Jung-Stilling's opinion (based on Johann Albrecht Bengel's predictions) that true Christians will need to look for a place of refuge in the east towards the end of times, allegorically expressed in his novel *Heimweh*, contributed to a rise of eschatological expectations and mass migration of pietistic enthusiasts from Germany (*Schwärmer*) and elsewhere to the southern part of Russia. Successful colonization attempts undertaken by various religious groups led to the increasing popularity and authority of Jung-Stilling as a prophetic figure.

The allegory of Solyma, a far-away eastern land of peace, and a refuge for true Christians, became associated with southern provinces of Russia, particularly the Caucasus, open at that time for foreign settlement. Successful examples of Moravian, Mennonite and other religiously-motivated colonization in the south of Russia strengthened the prophetical enthusiasm of Jung-Stilling and his readers. The dynamics of this process are evident in Jung-Stilling's correspondence of the latter period of his life.

Jung-Stilling's correspondence reveals that the writer was not nearly as radical as the people who accepted his literary work as a guide to action. Jung-Stilling called for a more balanced and rations approach. Apparently, the writer realized his partial responsibility for the emerging *Auswande*

rung movement, and he urged enthusiasts not to make any hasty and spontaneous decisions. Yet, Jung-Stilling remained faithful to his belief in the future Solyma in Russia till the end of his life. In July 1814, at an audience with Alexander I in Brussels, the German thinker discussed with the Emperor "a place of refuge in his state, if the time of trial comes,"[39] and reminded the monarch of the Scottish mission in the Caucasus. Keeping a balance between the role of a prophet and that of a Christian author of fiction was a major preoccupation of Jung-Stilling in the latter period of his life.

Endnotes

1. For recent scholarship on the Molokan and Doukhobor migration see Nicholas Breyfogle, *Heretics and Colonizers: Forging Russia's Empire in the South Caucasus* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2005), 49-83.
2. H.W. Panthel, "Jung-Stillings Weltendzeit und Zar Alexander I von Rußland," *Germano-Slavica* I, no. 2 (Fall 1973): 61-66; and Andrei Zorin, "Star of the East": The Holy Alliance and European Mysticism," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 4, no. 2 (Spring 2003): 313-342.
3. Tatjana Högy, *Jung-Stilling und Russland: Untersuchungen über Jung-Stillings Verhältnis zu Russland und zum "Osten" in der Regierungszeit Kaiser Alexanders I.* (Siegen: Im Selbstverlag der J.G. Herder-Bibliothek Siegerland e.V., 1984).
4. Högy, *Jung-Stilling und Russland,* 53.
5. Gerhard Schwinge, "Introduction to Johann-Heinrich Jung-Stilling," in *Briefe*, ausgewählt und herausgegeben von Gerhard Schwinge (Giessen-Basel: Brunnen, 2002), 11.
6. *Briefe*, 193.
7. *Briefe*, 193.
8. *Briefe*, 193.
9. *Briefe*, 230.
10. *Briefe*, 230.
11. *Briefe*, 234.
12. *Briefe*, 437.

13. *Briefe*, 440.
14. *Briefe*, 437.
15. *Briefe*, 437.
16. *Briefe*, 278.
17. *Briefe*, 371.
18. *Briefe*, 348.
19. *Briefe*, 342.
20. *Briefe*, 431.
21. *Briefe*, 430.
22. *Briefe*, 432.
23. *Briefe*, 441.
24. *Briefe*, 461.
25. *Briefe*, 449.
26. Quoted in Högy, *Jung-Stilling und Russland*, 46.
27. It is worth mentioning that a group of Russian Mennonites from Lower Volga colonies, stirred up by millenarian expectations based upon Jung-Stilling's *Heimweh*, left for Central Asia as late as 1880 led by Klaas Epp, Jr. and founded a colony near Samarkand (see Franz Bartsch, *Our Trek to Central Asia* [Winnipeg: Manitoba Mennonite Historical Society, 1993]).
28. See, for instance, *Briefe*, 433, 440.
29. *Briefe*, 420, 429, 440.
30. Panthel, 61-65.
31. Panthel, 62.
32. *Briefe*, 452.
33. *Briefe*, 452.
34. *Briefe*, 452.
35. For more detail see Andreas Gestrich, "German Religious Emigration to Russia in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries," in *In Search of Peace and Prosperity: New German Settlements in Eighteenth-Century*

Europe and America, eds., Hartmut Lehmann, Hermann Wellenreuther, Renate Wilson (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), 77-98.

36. *Briefe*, 303.

37. *Briefe*, 453.

38. *Briefe*, 453-454.

39. *Briefe*, 550.

The Destruction of Robert Alder: An Example of Transatlantic Culture and Anarchy among the Methodists

TODD WEBB
Laurentian University

An argument could be made that the connection between the Methodist churches in Britain and British North America was more of a curse than a blessing during the mid-nineteenth century. Some British Wesleyan ministers certainly regarded their transatlantic brethren as a colossal pain in the neck. When a seven-year long union between the British Wesleyans and the Canadian Methodists collapsed in 1840, the president of the British Wesleyan connexion bemoaned "the wretched business of Canada" that had disrupted that year's Conference.[1] In 1846, as elements in both churches worked towards a reunion, some British Wesleyan ministers refused to have anything to do with the idea, arguing that "their connexion with the Canada Conference . . . had only been a source of trouble & injury to themselves & . . . they should keep aloof from all intercourse" with the Canadian Methodists.[2] A catastrophic schism in British Wesleyanism between 1849 and 1852 seemed to demonstrate that this pessimistic view of British-Canadian relations was warranted.

Though the agitation that began in 1849 was primarily the result of a number of factors indigenous to Britain, it was also connected to the existence of a subversive community of interests within North Atlantic Methodism.[3] Between 1847 and 1852, a small number of British Wesleyans and Canadian Methodists came together to battle what they saw as

rampant connexional corruption on either side of the ocean. Historians of British Wesleyanism and Canadian Methodism have overlooked this sudden confluence of forces, perhaps because this section of the Methodist community shared many of the characteristics of the various radical underworlds of the nineteenth century. Like the Spencean Philanthropists in England during the early 1800s or the Hunters' Lodges in Lower and Upper Canada in 1838, Methodism's transatlantic underworld was conspiratorial by its very nature and so left little behind that might be called hard evidence.[4] Also, most historians who have examined the interactions between British Wesleyanism and Canadian Methodism have been concerned with drawing out the conservative nature of that relationship.[5] This article aims to provide an initial sketch of the more anarchic side of transoceanic Methodism through an examination of the role played by one British Wesleyan minister, Robert Alder, in the schism of 1849-52. More specifically, it will focus on Alder's mission to Canada East and Canada West in 1847; the scandal that arose on both sides of the Atlantic after his return to Britain; the use that discontented elements in British Wesleyanism made of that scandal; and, finally, how some Methodists in the Canadas may have directly contributed to, and attempted to profit from, the destruction of Robert Alder's career.

It is important to realize, from the beginning, that Robert Alder was not the most popular man among either the British Wesleyans or the Canadian Methodists, despite his considerable skills as a minister and a missionary administrator.[6] By 1847 Alder had been one of the secretaries of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society (the WMMS) in Britain for fourteen years.[7] Having served in the maritime colonies and in Lower Canada during his active missionary days in the 1820s, Alder became the acknowledged British Wesleyan expert on all things North American.[8] He also had his flaws. Among his more petty opponents, his appearance was a matter of adverse comment. In 1841 he was described as having "[l]ight hair – [a] full face" and as wearing "[a] petticoat coat, with its body like the tight stays of a female, being any thing but Methodistical."[9] The Canadian Methodist minister John Carroll noted rather snidely that Alder "was said to have had royal blood in his veins, in a sinister way . . . his full face bore a very remarkable resemblance to that of King George IV."[10] On a more serious level, Alder's personality tended to rub people the wrong way. He was a vain man, forever flaunting an honorary Doctorate of Divinity from the Wesleyan University in Middleton, Connecticut.[11] He

also transcribed letters in praise of himself and sent them to his fellow ministers.[12] It was not a habit calculated to endear him to his less-accomplished colleagues.

Alder's politics could also be a source of trouble. A leading Canadian Methodist minister, Egerton Ryerson, blamed Alder for the dissolution of the British Wesleyan and Canadian Methodist union in 1840. Ryerson argued that Alder was an arch-reactionary, "more of a High Churchman than Wesleyan in Canadian affairs," whose conservatism had upset the fine balance that had been struck between the two connexions seven years earlier.[13] There was some substance to Ryerson's indictment. Robert Alder was one of the main supporters of the British Wesleyan leader, Jabez Bunting. Alder, like Bunting, believed that "nothing could be more fatal to real liberty, whether in church or state" than democracy.[14] Together, Bunting and Alder toiled mightily to drag Methodism away from its emotional, politically radical and populist roots towards a more dignified, politically conservative and thoroughly middle-class position in both British and colonial society.[15]

Despite these possible obstacles, Alder's 1847 mission to Canada East and Canada West appeared to be a complete success, initially at any rate. The WMMS dispatched him overseas "with the view of putting an end to the unhappy dissensions which [had] existed" between the Canadian Methodists and British Wesleyans since their union collapsed in 1840. In other words, he was sent to the Canadas to help organize a reunion. The WMMS had a great deal of confidence in their man, and they promised that they would "not forget the personal safety of Dr. Alder, and the success of his important embassy, in their united and earnest prayers . . ."[16]

Once in the Canadas, Alder faced the none-too-easy task of convincing both the Canadian Methodists and the British Wesleyan missionaries who were stationed in those colonies that a reunion was a good idea. The latter were particularly against any rapprochement with the Canadian Methodist Conference, having done their best to drive that organization into the ground since the disruption of the union in 1840.[17] Despite some stiff opposition from that quarter, Alder succeeded in his mission. He talked the British Wesleyan missionaries into accepting the viability and inevitability of a reunion.[18] One of those ministers, Matthew Richey, wrote to the WMMS in June 1847: "[t]he legitimate branches of our beloved Methodism," he exclaimed, "alienated for a time by causes which we could wish to obliterate forever from the tablet of memory, are

now happily and cordially *one* in the Lord . . . This is the Lord's doing and it is marvelous in our eyes." According to Richey, Alder was "entitled to the thanks not merely of our connexion, but of all who live in Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."[19] When Alder returned to Britain in August 1847, the president of the British Wesleyan Conference noted that "the brethren were very glad to see him, and were thankful for the care of God over him, for the success of his mission, and that he had been brought back in safety." The President "earnestly hoped that God would smile upon the plans adopted" in the Canadas.[20] The British Wesleyan Conference as a whole heard of the results of Alder's mission with "great satisfaction" and thanked God for his "safe return from his important Mission."[21]

It soon became clear, however, that Alder's success had been more apparent than real. He was in a poor way when he came before the British Wesleyan Conference in August 1847. He said that "three weeks ago, he had little expected to see the Conference. He was at that time so ill as to render it very doubtful whether, if his life were spared, he should be able to return to England for some time to come." Alder went on to give details of "some circumstances relating to his illness, and return home . . ."[22] This was bad news on a strictly personal level; within a year more ominous news began to arrive from the Canadas. The senior secretary of the Canadian Methodist missionary society, Samuel Rice, wrote to Jabez Bunting in July 1848: "[t]he effect of the reports relating to Dr. Alder's conduct after he left here and what they concur to be a Breach of promise on his part in relation to . . . the removal of British ministers from Canada West – which he assured them would not take place[,] has almost destroyed many of our people." The withdrawal of the British Wesleyan missionaries had led to a year of agitation in the colony. The effect on the reunion had been dire, Rice complained, and Alder was to blame.[23] This was damaging by itself, but what did Rice mean by "Dr. Alder's conduct after he left here"?

An alarming story began to cross the ocean even before Samuel Rice wrote his letter of complaint. In September 1847, in a letter marked "Private and Confidential," Matthew Richey told Jabez Bunting that "I am aware of your having received verbal – and it is not improbable that you may also have received written – communications from persons who reside on this side of the Atlantic seriously affecting the character of one for whom . . . I have ever cherished the highest regard." This story, Richey wrote, had acquired "a most painful notoriety" in the Canadas and

threatened the "interests of our Church." Richey warned that "unless something is done there may be an attempt to demand a formal investigation." He suggested, as a solution, that Alder should retreat from the public stage and accept "some less prominent position" in the missionary work.[24] Such was the nature of Alder's offense that the leading Methodist laity of Montreal questioned whether he was "likely to retain his office at the Mission House." "He conducted himself so badly in Montreal," one layman wrote, "that we were more than ashamed of him."[25]

The fact is that Robert Alder was publicly drunk on several occasions while he was travelling through the Canadas in 1847. Once back in Britain, the reverend doctor tried to make the case that his repeated incapacity had been the result of sickness. Writing from Canada East, the British Wesleyan missionary John Borland took Alder to task for such shabby untruths. Alder, Borland wrote, must stop shamming sickness and own up to his "long continued & immoderate use of ardent spirits . . ." "[I]nstead of a crisis in your Health being brought about by the heat of the Canadian summer etc.," he continued, "was it not by the fearfully immoderate use of Canadian brandy?" According to Borland, the story was well known throughout British North America and "[t]he leading men of the U[pper] C[anada] Conference have talked freely of it . . ." Some laymen, he added, still resented "the stigma which your unfortunate course in 1847 brought upon that Methodism which is as dear to them, as it can be to you . . ." The only wonder, Borland concluded, was that the anti-Methodist press in Britain had not used the story to effect the mutual ruin of Alder and Methodism in general.[26]

Unfortunately for Robert Alder and the British Wesleyan church, there was one man in Britain who was more than willing to take this story and run with it. Reverend James Everett was in many respects a thoroughly loathsome individual. Historians of British Methodism have called him an "apostle of discord," "the stuff of which Piltdown forgers are made," an "undistinguished" specimen "of the ministerial race," "that most abrasive of Methodists," and a "tangled nervous bookseller."[27] Everett's career as a Wesleyan preacher constituted one long campaign against Jabez Bunting and the denominational order that Bunting and his supporters were attempting to create.[28] Everett wanted Wesleyan Methodism to shake off the movement towards social respectability that it had undergone since 1791 and to return to the "pristine simplicity and power" that had characterized Methodism in the days of Wesley and the first circuit

riders.[29] Those apostolic men, he believed, had been replaced by men like Robert Alder – fat and complacent nonentities who were less concerned with the arduous work of saving souls than with filthy lucre or with gorging themselves on honorary doctorates from the Methodist universities and colleges of the United States.[30]

Thoroughly disgusted with the state of Methodism, Everett broke with Bunting in the early 1820s and embarked on a private war, often waged behind a cloak of anonymity.[31] In 1834 Everett met in secret with other ministerial malcontents in Leeds "to deliberate upon and mature a plan for the purpose of curtailing the power of the dominant party in Methodism whose arbitrary and crooked policy was becoming more and more apparent . . ."[32] Nothing much came of this meeting and, in 1841, Everett published a scurrilous (and anonymous) series of sketches of his fellow ministers – the *Wesleyan Takings*. He came down hard on Bunting, describing him as "great in influence – too great to be forgiven; if he were less so, it might be borne."[33] Over the next few years Everett became "increasingly contemptuous" of his enemy and his enemy's many supporters, who often made up a majority within the governing structures of the British Wesleyan connexion.[34] That contempt, long bottled up, began to generate "a personal venom peculiar to himself" which, between 1846 and 1848, Everett poured out on his fellow ministers in a series of vicious, anonymous pamphlets known as the *Fly Sheets*.[35]

The story of Robert Alder's misadventures in the Canadas was grist for Everett's mill. He attacked Alder in an effort to "show that Doctor Bunting's whole system of government has been opposed to the advise and practice of Mr. [John] Wesley; his system being one of EXCLUSIVE-NESS, FAVOURITISM, and SELFISHNESS, as exemplified in the formation and packings of his Committees, his opposition to open, free discussion, in the general assembly . . . and his invariable attempt to confine the knowledge, the power, the privileges of the body to his own chosen few . . ."[36] The first *Fly Sheet* labeled Alder "the dainty Doctor" and pointed out that he seemed partial to "Head Inns" which "are not sought for quiet, cold dinners, or light suppers . . ."[37] This was a reference to what Everett saw as Alder's free-spending ways while on the business of the WMMS. Everett was far more cutting in the fourth *Fly Sheet*, writing that, in 1847, Alder's "professed illness took him some months to another place for the good of his health. It is not for us to state what influence the GOVERNOR'S *table* at Canada had upon his constitution .

. .”[38] However, equally as bad as Alder’s bouts of public drunkenness was Bunting’s attempt to cover for his fellow WMMS bureaucrat. According to the second *Fly Sheet*, Bunting’s control over the various committees of the British Wesleyan Conference allowed his supporters to “defend and support each other on any remarks offered on their plans, propositions, and speeches.” Thus, Everett charged, Alder had repeatedly managed to avoid due censure from his fellow preachers.[39] Various corrupt committees had protected a corrupted and corrupting minister.

Everett used the same tactics of insinuation and outright abuse to attack the rest of Bunting’s supporters in the ministry.[40] Goaded almost beyond endurance for four years, Bunting and his followers proved unwilling to put up with Everett and his anonymous attacks indefinitely. In 1849 the British Wesleyan Conference was gripped by “an extraordinary mood of hysteria” as pro- and anti-Bunting ministers hurled accusations at one another and attempted, each in his own mind, to save British Wesleyanism from scandal and ruin. In the end, as so often before, the members of the pro-Bunting party formed a majority and, seizing their opportunity, they expelled Everett and two other particularly cantankerous preachers from the ministry.[41] That action, however, only made matters worse.

After the Conference of 1849, Everett and his supporters made full use of the charges already levelled against Robert Alder to gain lay support and to undermine the position of the Bunting-dominated Wesleyan connexion. The agitation that followed the expulsion of Everett was the worst in the history of British Wesleyanism. Bunting and his fellow ministers attempted to drive Everett’s supporters – known as the Wesleyan reformers – from church membership.[42] This led to mob violence in Newcastle, where the minister called in the police to have the reformers removed from the chapel.[43] That same Newcastle minister also required a police escort to visit the unsettled West Moor circuit.[44] In Leeds, the Wesleyan reformers “resisted the making of the Chapel Fund Collection, & the person who went round with the Box, was in danger of being murdered in the place. A blow was aimed at the Local Preacher in the Pulpit.”[45] The Leeds agitation was so bad that the minister declared that “the ruin of souls is fearful . . .”[46] At a missionary meeting in London, just as the agitation was gathering force, the Wesleyan reformers tried to pack the room and succeeded in heaping abuse on the connexional hierarchy. At one point, one of the agitators “blurted out some of the reports about Dr.

Alder."[47] At a public meeting in London, in October 1849, one of Everett's supporters asked rhetorically whether Alder remembered "any inquiry before the chairman of the New Brunswick District relative to the conduct of a passenger from Canada to Halifax, N.S.?" He also asked "[d]oes the Doctor recollect any remarkable occurrence as he travelled through Canada" and "[d]oes the Doctor know a gentleman who is in the habit of frequenting a tavern called the Queen's Head, Pitfield-street, Hoxton . . ."; that is, at a tavern very near the headquarters of the WMMS.[48]

All of this, combined with a variety of other tactics, was very successful from James Everett's point of view. The *Fly Sheets* agitation led, by 1852, to the loss of 22.6% of the membership of the British Wesleyan connexion.[49] In that year, too, the growing scandal around Alder's personal problems led to his resignation from the British Wesleyan ministry. A year earlier, despite the continued support of Jabez Bunting, Alder had been forced out of the WMMS.[50] Canada turned out to be a wretched business indeed for Robert Alder.

And various Methodists in Canada East and Canada West may have played a direct role in destroying Alder's career. Someone, or some group, seems to have been sending Everett and his fellow hell-raisers propaganda material from the Canadas. In making his case against Alder and the British Wesleyan Conference, Everett wrote about the "opinions and reports of the Canadians on the subject" of Alder's scandalous behaviour in 1847.[51] Everett also mentioned "evidence . . . direct from Canada" and claimed to have received letters from Montreal, Hamilton and Toronto.[52] This statement was calculated, of course, to suggest that there were those in the Canadas who supported the actions of the Wesleyan reformers in Britain. Undoubtedly, however, the vast majority of the Methodists in Canada East and Canada West stood solidly behind Bunting and his colleagues during the crisis of 1849-52. While the British Conference of 1849 was still in session Matthew Richey urged the Buntingites to clip the wings of the *Fly Sheets*, leaving them besmeared "with the serpent's food – fit retribution for doing the serpent's work."[53] As the agitation in Britain gathered steam, many British Wesleyan missionaries and laymen in Canada East also wrote home, sympathizing with "our Fathers & Brethren . . . at this particularly trying time" and praying that God might "support His dear servants and sanctify this painful matter to the good of [H]is Church and the glory of His holy name . . ."[54] At their conference in 1851, the Canadian Methodists in Canada West followed suit, expressing their

support for the Bunting and his allies, begging to assure them that the conflicts wracking the home connexion "only increase our approval of your principles and proceedings." "The constitution which was received from the Rev. John Wesley," the Canadian Methodist ministers added, "and faithfully transmitted to you and to us, is a sacred and an invaluable trust, which . . . will not be resigned at the bidding of any power, much less at the dictation of a mistaken, unscriptural, and violent confederation."[55]

Yet, despite such ringing messages of transatlantic solidarity, there were also indications of the existence of a subversive element within Methodism in Canada East and Canada West whose growth did parallel the development of Wesleyan reform in Britain, just as Everett suggested. From the official correspondence of the WMMS, it appears that Montreal was the epicentre of this colonial discontent. In 1850, a newspaper, significantly entitled the *Wesleyan Reformer*, was floated in the city. It aimed "to bring to light the abuses and to correct the evils of Methodism" and it was supposed to be a copy of the anti-Bunting and pro-Everett *Wesleyan Times* in Britain.[56] Two years later, again in Montreal, a British Wesleyan missionary wrote that "I regard it to be my duty to state . . . that there is a large amount of sympathy among the official members of this Circuit with the troublers of our Israel. In so far as my knowledge extends there is not one of our Leaders, but is somewhat tinctured with disaffection to the Conference; based as they say on the non-interference of Conference in respect to certain occurrences here" during Alder's time in Canada.[57] Agitation in the home country was linked to agitation in the colonies. The Montreal laity was every bit as angered as Everett by the support that Bunting and other members of the British Wesleyan Conference had given to Alder after his return from the Canadas in 1847.

The situation was no better in Canada West. There were also Methodists in that colony that shared the grievances of the Wesleyan reformers in Britain. As early as 1842, one Canadian Methodist minister, Matthew Holtby, wrote to Egerton Ryerson about his fear that "primitive, old-fashioned Methodism" was "on the decline in England." Using language that would have been familiar to James Everett, Holtby lamented that the zeal of the British Wesleyan preachers of old was being "murdered by *Degrees*," whether "A.M.D. or D.D. or even LL.D. with F.A.S. at the end of it . . ." He was afraid that "what *has taken* place in England *may take place* in Canada."[58] Holtby was not alone: when the *Fly Sheets* agitation broke out in Britain, some discounted elements in Canadian

Methodism attempted to make common cause with the troubles of the connexional waters in the Old Country. In November 1850, the superin tendant of the Methodist missions in Canada West, Enoch Wood, noted that that colony was "not altogether free from the company of sympathizers" with the agitators in Britain. The pro-Everett *Wesleyan Times* was regularly "sent among our people in different parts of this country . . ."[59] After visiting Hamilton in 1851, Wood reported that "[s]ome of us [in the ministry] came in for a good share of abuse by persons who sympathize with Everett & Co."[60] A month later, he noted that "a Canadian fly-sheet writer" had described the "sympathy said to exist here with the 'Reformers' . . ."[61] Wood vigorously denied that such sympathy existed, but his own letters suggested otherwise.

This point was driven home in the pages of the colonial press. Not surprisingly, George Sanderson, the editor of the *Christian Guardian*, the official organ of the Canadian Methodist church, came out swinging against Everett and the Wesleyan reformers. "Sympathy for the offenders," he declared in September 1849, "would prompt us to wish for clemency in their case," but an even greater sympathy for transatlantic Methodism compelled him "to demand the punishment of offenders against the peace, the spirit, the usage, and even the written law of Methodism."[62] Methodists in Britain and the Canadas, Sanderson argued a month later, did not need or want "successive changes in the system by which they have been so much blessed."[63] However, between 1849 and 1852, Sanderson felt the need to defend the Buntingites' actions against attacks launched by other newspapers in Canada West. Over and over again, he noted in April 1850, "[p]arties . . . hostile to the interests of the Wesleyan Church" had seized on the agitation in Britain in an effort "to awaken sympathy in behalf of the expelled."[64] The Hamilton *Provincialist*, for instance, made several attempts to "kindle the flame of Wesleyan revolution" in Canada West during early 1850. At one point, the *Provincialist* printed a letter from "An Old Wesleyan" denouncing the *Christian Guardian* as "a sickening specimen of cant and hypocrisy" for presuming to downplay the "the present religious commotion" within British Wesleyanism.[65] This effort, Sanderson admitted, may have elicited a response from some Methodists in the Canadas, but, he was careful to add, not to the "extent of croaking, much less of conspiring, but only to the degree of appearing suspicious and looking sour; a state of disease still quite curable by proper applications."[66]

The disease, however, remained stubbornly resistant to any cure

whatsoever. The slow and painful destruction of Robert Alder's career, and the Wesleyan reform agitation that accompanied it, was simply too handy a weapon in the hands of anyone who might have had a grudge against the leadership of either the British Wesleyan or the Canadian Methodist connexion. In October 1850, the Toronto *Examiner* – a newspaper with a history of attacking the Canadian Methodist church and its connection to British Wesleyanism – printed a scathing letter from "A Wesleyan Minister." The anonymous writer assailed the British Wesleyan church for its continued support of Robert Alder, a minister whose "fame as a lover of thick wine and thin brandy, is known over the whole world of Methodism." That Egerton Ryerson wrote to the British Wesleyan Conference declaring "that his heart was one with them," even though he knew about "the grave charges" against Alder, only served to demonstrate that Canadian Methodism had become as corrupt as the connexion in the home country. "Alas! Alas!" the 'Wesleyan Minister' wrote, "to what a depth of depravity and hypocrisy man can sink."[67] Eleven years later, even people friendly to the Canadian Methodists and British Wesleyans were of the same opinion. Henry Cox, a circuit rider in the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States, told a visiting British Wesleyan minister "his version of the charges against Dr. A[lder] from Canada etc. etc. and accused Dr. R[yerson] . . . and others of screening him to the great injury of our work and characters there."[68] As is often the case, it took an outside observer to point out what should have been obvious to everyone involved: the connection between the Methodist churches in Britain and British North America was, in fact, more of a curse than a blessing during the mid-nineteenth century.

In a 2002 article, Andrew Porter urged historians not to take the concept of the "Atlantic World" or "Atlantic System" for granted. This perspective, Porter wrote, must be examined and reexamined since "by the 1830s, transatlantic and European continental connections amongst those engaged in spreading Christianity overseas . . . proved themselves to be of considerable significance."[69] Having made that statement, Porter went on to argue that the Atlantic World (or System) was a great force for uniting all Protestant denominations in a common feeling of mission to redeem the world.[70] There is certainly a great deal to be said for this reading. However, as this article has attempted to demonstrate, the connections between centre and periphery could also lead to a great deal of disunity both at home and abroad for the nineteenth-century churches. This is not to say,

of course, that groups like the Wesleyan reformers in Britain and their sympathizers in British North America were ever more than a minority. Yet, the fact remains that they existed, they shared a common outlook on certain issues, they seem to have communicated with one another, and, for a brief time in the 1840s and early 1850s, they had a disruptive impact on the British Wesleyan and Canadian Methodist churches. Such discontented minority groups need to be investigated in greater detail in order to help us towards a more complex understanding of the transatlantic, evangelical culture that linked metropole and colony in the nineteenth century.

Endnotes

1. Letter, Joseph Taylor to Joseph Entwisle, 1 September 1840, MAM PLP 105.6.37, Joseph Taylor papers, Methodist Archives and Research Centre, John Rylands University Library of Manchester, Manchester (hereafter MARC).

2. Letter, John Ryerson to Egerton Ryerson, 1 August 1846, Box 3, File 74, Egerton Ryerson papers, United Church Archives, Toronto, ON (hereafter UCA).

3. Compare with Michael Watts, *The Dissenters: The Expansion of Evangelical Nonconformity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 614-22. Though Watts, like other historians of British Wesleyanism, discusses the role of the Irish-American revivalist James Caughey in the schism of 1849-52, he does not examine other transatlantic factors.

4. Iain McCalman, *Radical Underworld: Prophets, Revolutionaries, and Pornographers in London, 1795-1840* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 1-112; Allan Greer, *The Patriots and the People: The Rebellion of 1837 in Rural Lower Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 338-51.

5. Goldwin French, *Parsons and Politics: The role of the Wesleyan Methodists in Upper Canada and the Maritimes from 1780 to 1855* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1962), throughout; and Neil Semple, *The Lord's Dominion: The History of Canadian Methodism* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996), 71-99.

6. On Alder's involvement with Canada see Goldwin French, "Robert Alder," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967-), 10:3-5; and Semple, *Lord's Dominion*, 81-3, 93-7.

7. G.G. Findlay and W.W. Holdsworth, *The History of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society* (London: Epworth Press, 1921), 1:108.

8. French, "Robert Alder," 10:4.

9. James Everett, *Wesleyan Takings: or Centenary Sketches of Ministerial Character, as Exhibited in the Wesleyan Connexion, during the First Hundred Years of its Existence* (London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co., 1841), 309-10.

10. John Carroll, *Case and His Cotemporaries: or, the Canadian Itinerants' Memorial* (Toronto: Samuel Rose, 1867-77), 3:88.

11. Everett, *Wesleyan Takings*, 310.

12. See, for example, Letter, Robert Alder to Jabez Bunting, 9 September 1839, MAM PLP 1.36.8, Robert Alder papers, MARC; Letter, Robert Alder to an unknown correspondent, 5 June 1820, MAM PLP 1.36.24, Robert Alder papers, MARC.

13. Egerton Ryerson, *Canadian Methodism: Its Epochs and Characteristics* (Toronto: William Briggs,1882), 296, 303, 308.

14. Letter, Jabez Bunting to William Beal, 10 May 1821 in W.R. Ward, ed., *The Early Correspondence of Jabez Bunting, 1820-1829* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1972), 74. For Alder's political views see French, "Robert Alder," 10:4; and Semple, *Lord's Dominion*, 79; *Watchman*, 23 October 1839, 355.

15. Letter, Robert Alder to Jabez Bunting, 18 Novermber 1841, MAM PLP 1.36.10, Robert Alder papers, MARC; Letter, Robert Alder to Jabez Bunting, 29 August 1849, in W.R. Ward, ed., *Early Victorian Methodism: The Correspondence of Jabez Bunting, 1830-1858* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 380.

16. Minutes of the General Committee of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society (hereafter WMMS), 10 March 1847, Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society Correspondence (hereafter WMMS-C), UCA. See also French, *Parsons and Politics*, 251-4.

17. See, for example, Letter, Members of the London circuit to the Chairman and Ministers of Western Canada, Wesleyan Missionary District in special District Meeting assembled, 6 February 1847, Box 31, File 224, # 31, WMMS-C, UCA; Letter, William Martin Harvard to Robert Alder, 17 February 1847, Box 31, File 224, #34, WMMS-C, UCA; Letter, Matthew Richey to Robert Alder, 22 February 1847, Box 31, File 224, #4, WMMS-C, UCA; Letter,

Ephraim Evans to Robert Alder, 19 March 1847, Box 31, File 224, #36, WMMS-C, UCA.

18. Memorandum by Enoch Wood, 26 May 1847, Reel 5, District Minutes (Canada/Upper Canada), WMMS-C, UCA. For the reaction of the British Wesleyan missionaries in Canada East to Alder's mission see 8 May 1847, Reel 3, District Minutes (Canada/ Lower Canada), WMMS-C, UCA.

19. Letter, Matthew Richey to Dr. Bennett, 12 June 1847, MAM PLP 86.21.2, Matthew Richey papers, MARC. Emphasis in original.

20. *Watchman*, 18 August 1847, 393.

21. British Conference Journal, 1830, 830, NUG Shelf 364a, MARC.

22. *Watchman*, 18 August 1847, 393.

23. Letter, Samuel D. Rice to Jabez Bunting, 13 July 1848, MAW MS 45, John P. Lockwood collection, MARC.

24. Letter, Matthew Richey to Jabez Bunting, 13 September 1847, MAW MS 45, John P. Lockwood collection, MARC.

25. Letter, William Lunn to John Mathewson [?], 20 January 1848, Box 29, File 226, #3, WMMS-C, UCA.

26. Letter, John Borland to Robert Alder, 13 December 1850, MAM PLP 10.37.2, John Borland papers, MARC.

27. John Kent, "The Wesleyan Methodists to 1849," in *A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain*, ed. Rupert Davies et al. (London: Epworth Press, 1978), 2:223; John Kent, *Jabez Bunting, The Last Wesleyan: A study in the Methodist Ministry after the Death of John Wesley* (London: Epworth Press, 1955), 56; W.R. Ward, *Religion and Society in England, 1790-1850* (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd., 1972), 264; Richard Heitzenrater and W.R. Ward, eds., *The Works of John Wesley: Journal and Diaries* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1991), 20:309 n. 72; Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church, Part I*, 3rd. ed. (London: Adam and Charles Black Ltd., 1971), 380. Contemporaries could be equally unforgiving. One of them described Everett as "[t]he mole of Methodism working underground" (see 25 October 1863, Journal of George H. Harwood, Nottingham Record Office; quoted in Rowland C. Swift, *Lively People: Methodism in Nottingham, 1740-1979* [Nottingham: Department of Adult Education, University of Nottingham, 1982], 96).

28. Ward, *Religion and Society*, 264. See also Kent, "Wesleyan Methodists to 1849," 2:259 n. 74 on Everett's more personal grudge against Jabez Bunting.

29. Richard Chew, *James Everett: A Biography* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1875), 296.

30. Watts, *Dissenters*, 618-20. See also Letter, James Everett to Samuel Broadbent, 8 April 1840, MAM PLP 38.52.9, James Everett papers, MARC.

31. Letter, James Everett to Samuel Broadbent, 10 November 1841, MAM PLP 38.52.10, James Everett papers, MARC; Robert Currie, *Methodism Divided: A Study in the Sociology of Ecumenicalism* (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1968), 68; and Watts, *Dissenters*, 620.

32. 14 May 1834, Volume 3, MS Memorandum Book of James Everett, MARC; quoted in Ward, ed., *Early Victorian Methodism*, 102, n. 4; D.A. Gowland, *Methodist Secessions: The origins of Free Methodism in three Lancashire towns: Manchester, Rochdale, Liverpool* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1979), 38-9.

33. Everett, *Wesleyan Takings,* 6.

34. Currie, *Methodism Divided*, 65.

35. Ward, *Religion and Society*, 264. Everett's authorship of the *Fly Sheet*s has never been categorically proven, but their style and content point most directly to him. See Currie, *Methodism Divided*, 68-9; Kent, "Wesleyan Methodists to 1849," 2:234, n. 39; Watts, *Dissenters*, 618. Oliver Beckerlegge makes an entirely convincing argument for Everett's authorship in *The Three Expelled, James Everett, Samuel Dunn, William Griffith* (Peterborough: Foundery Press, 1996), 12.

36. [James Everett], *All the Numbers of the 'Fly Sheets' Now First Reprinted in One Pamphlet* (Birmingham: William Cornish, 1850), 1-2.

37. [Everett], *Fly Sheets*, 7-8.

38. James Everett, *'Methodism As It Is.' With some of its antecedents; including a diary of the campaign of 1849* (London: W. Reed, 1863-65), 1:341. Emphasis in original.

39. [Everett], *Fly Sheets*, 43. Everett elaborated on this charge, in regard to Alder's activities in Canada in 1847, in *'Methodism As It Is,'* 2:901-4, 905-6, 917. The third *Fly Sheet* specifically mentions Alder's "Canada case" – a reference to charges brought against the reverend doctor for supposedly misleading the British Wesleyan Conference about the success of his earlier mission to Canada in 1839 (see Ryerson, *Canadian Methodism*, 319-20).

40. See, for example, the excoriating comparison of Bunting's words and actions in [Everett], *Fly Sheets*, 1-3.

41. Benjamin Gregory, *Side Lights on the Conflicts of Methodism* (London: Cassell and Company Ltd., 1898), 444-60; John Kent, *Age of Disunity* (London: Epworth Press, 1966),119; and Watts, *Dissenters*, 620-2.

42. On the course of the agitation see Currie, *Methodism Divided*, 71-6; Ward, *Religion and Society*, 268-72; and Watts, *Dissenters*, 621-5.

43. Letter, William Burt to John Beecham, 25 September 1850, MAM PLP 21.13.5, William Burt papers, MARC.

44. Letter, William Burt to John Beecham, 11 December 1850, MAM PLP 21.13.7, William Burt papers, MARC.

45. Letter, William Lord to unknown correspondent, 18 February 1851, MAM PLP 70.33.5, William Lord papers, MARC.

46. Letter, William Lord to unknown correspondent, 9 April 1851, MAM PLP 70.33.6, William Lord Papers, MARC.

47. Letter, Elijah Hoole to Jabez Bunting, 13 October 1849, MAM PLP 55.32.54, Elijah Hoole papers, MARC.

48. Everett, *'Methodism As It Is,'* 2:236.

49. Watts, *Dissenters*, 621. Many of the laymen and women who left the British Wesleyan Church either abandoned Methodism altogether or eventually made their way into the United Methodist Free Church – the embodiment, more or less, of James Everett's reforming ideals.

50. Everett, *'Methodism As It Is,'* 2:905-6, 916; cf. French, "Robert Alder," 10:5.

51. Everett, '*Methodism As It Is*,' 1:341.

52. Everett, *'Methodism As It Is*,' 2:810-11.

53. Letter, Matthew Richey to Robert Alder, 12 July 1849, Box 33, File 242, #17, WMMS-C, UCA.

54. Letter, Matthew Lang to Elijah Hoole, 1 October 1849, Box 33, File 235, #15, WMMS-C, UCA. See also Letter, John Jenkins to Robert Alder, 21 December 1849, Box 33, File 235, #22, WMMS-C, UCA; Letter, James Ferrier to the General Secretaries of the WMMS, 8 February 1851, Box 35, File 252, #2, WMMS-C, UCA.

55. *Minutes of Twelve Annual Conferences of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada, from 846 to 1857 inclusive* (Toronto: Anson Green, 1863), 174.

56. Letter, John Jenkins to Robert Alder, 30 March 1850, Box 34, File 243, #6, WMMS-C, UCA.

57. Letter, William Squire to the General Secretaries of the WMMS, 2 January 1852, Box 36, File 260, #4, WMMS-C, UCA.

58. Letter, Matthew Holtby to Egerton Ryerson, 15 March 1842, Egerton Ryerson papers, Library and Archives of Canada (hereafter LAC). Emphasis in original.

59. Letter, Enoch Wood to Elijah Hoole, 14 November 1850, Box 34, File 250, #12, WMMS-C, UCA.

60. Letter, Enoch Wood to Elijah Hoole, 10 November 1851, Box 36, File 259, #9, WMMS-C, UCA.

61. Letter, Enoch Wood to Elijah Hoole, 10 December 1851, Box 36, File 259, #11, WMMS-C, UCA.

62. *Christian Guardian*, 12 September 1849, 186.

63. *Christian Guardian*, 31 October 1849, 214.

64. *Christian Guardian*, 17 April 1850, 304.

65. *Christian Guardian*, 3 April 1850, 296; 8 May 1850, 316.

66. *Christian Guardian*, 8 May 1850, 316.

67. *Examiner*, 28 October 1850. See also *Examiner*, 26 May 1847; 9 June, 1847; 28 July, 1847.

68. 9 August 1861, Journal, William Billington Boyce papers, LAC.

69. Andrew Porter, "Church History, History of Christianity, Religious History: Some Reflections on British Missionary Enterprise Since the Late Eighteenth Century," *Church History* 71, no. 3 (2002): 568-9.

70. Porter, "Church History," 574-5.

New Light on an Old Scandal?
Sex and Corporate Politics at the Norway House Methodist Mission of 1846

ARLETTE ZINCK
The King's University College

Did he do it? The question has hung like a dense fog over the history of the Methodist Mission at Rossville, near Norway House, Manitoba since the events of 1846. Reverend James Evans, the first superintendent of the western missions, the inventor of the Cree syllabic and the pioneer of the Rossville Press, was accused of sexual misconduct by three young Native women. Since then, several generations of church historians have come to varied conclusions about the truthfulness of these charges. A document recently recovered from files at the Pratt Library, Victoria University Archives, University of Toronto, mentioning a "deathbed confession" made by a Native woman to a subsequent Methodist minister posted at Norway House may shed new light on this cold case of sexual misconduct.

The Norway House Scandal

Rumours about Reverend Evans's "immorality" had circulated in the community for some time. When the allegations were formally presented in 1846, a local committee was struck, a trial was held, and a verdict was rendered: Evans was proclaimed to be "not guilty." Reverend William

Mason, Evans's assistant minister, sent the trial documents and related papers out from the territory to the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society (WMMS) secretary in London. Later this same year, once the trial documents had arrived, a hearing was held at the headquarters of the WMMS in London, England, and James Evans was able to attend. Months earlier, before the scandal broke, George Simpson, Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company, had made behind-the-scenes arrangements for Evans to be sent home. The HBC alleged that Evans had been interfering with trade, and convinced the Missionary Society to bring him back to England. The WMMS complied with the request, but decided to withhold the reasons for the visit. So it happened that James Evans was able to answer questions about the allegations of sexual misconduct to his London superiors.

A third and final assessment of the allegations was made at "a private investigation" held at Norway House on two separate occasions, and was hosted by HBC Governor Sir George Simpson. Evans had returned to London by this time, so the inquiry consisted of Simpson, his secretary Mr. Hopkins, Mr. C.F. Harriott (who acted as a translator) and a group of native women. After the first part of the investigation, a condensed statement of the testimonies provided by three of these young women was sent on to London.[1] In the second instalment of these investigations, another young woman was examined by Simpson in the presence of Major Crofton, Mr. Chief Factor Harriott and Simpson's secretary. An unabridged copy of notes from this meeting was also sent on to London, along with George Simpson's clear opinion on the matter: This evidence, said Simpson, bears "every mark of truth on the face of it" and it implicates "a minister of the Gospel in the highest crimes respectively known to divine and human laws."[2] In Simpson's estimation the verdict was clear: Evans was guilty.

Mail travelled slowly between the Hudson's Bay Company territories in Rupert's Land to London, England. The mail's progress on land, and then by sea often took several months and was delayed for long intervals by winter ice. When Simpson's letter of 13 August 1846 reached London, it was December, and much had transpired. James Evans had died, only weeks before, of a massive heart attack. He was 46 years old.

The Legacy: How Church Historians have Understood the Scandal

In the years since Evans's death the question of his guilt has been assessed by several generations of church historians. Two of his immediate successors in the mission field, Reverends John MacLean and Egerton Ryerson Young, both wrote near hagiographic accounts of Evans wherein they discounted what they deemed to be baseless accusations made against their former superintendent.[3] MacLean and Young followed in the sentiments expressed by the WMMS secretary Robert Alder to George Simpson when he wrote to announce Evans's death in December of 1846. Alder was pointed and sharp in his dismissal of Simpson's evidence (an earlier version of which had already been made available to him by the missionary trial). Alder argued that these testimonies had already been deemed self-contradictory, that Evans's long established reputation for upright behaviour in his earlier missionary assignments in Ontario also needed to be considered, and that both Alder and his associate had had the benefit of direct conversation with Evans about the charges made against him, and had been satisfied with the answers they had received. Alder politely acknowledged that Simpson had not had this same opportunity, and ventured that Simpson's views might have been altered if he had been privy to the conversations.[4] Amid the civilities of Alder's exchange, however, was an equally apparent tacit disapproval of Simpson's involvement and conclusions. When McLean and Young addressed the same topic 40 years later, they dispensed with the civilities: The HBC, and George Simpson in particular, was held accountable for what they deemed to have been a deliberate effort to discredit Evans.

This same line of argument is pursued again in 1966 in Nan Shipley's fictional account of the Norway House Scandal.[5] In her imaginative recreation of events, Shipley makes Evans's assistant minister, William Mason, the villain of the piece, and she too points a clear finger toward the HBC. Shipley also includes an episode wherein a later minister to the Norway House mission, one Reverend John Semmens, is called to the deathbed of a native woman to hear her confess that she had accused James Evans, but what she had said previously was not true. Shipley claims in the introduction to her work that the story she is about to tell is true. She does not, however, supply any scholarly documentation to support her claim.

Since the 1960s scholarly assessments have tried to redress some of

the overt bias apparent in Evans's nineteenth-century biographers, and to correct some of the misunderstandings about these events which were recorded in many of these earlier books. Attempts have also been made to recover materials alluded to in Shipley's book, and some successes have been made, most notably the rediscovery of copies of the original trial papers, which were found by Reverend Gerald Hutchinson in the London WMMS archives in 1973.[6] The original record of Reverend Semmens's deathbed confession, which he says he sent to the Wesleyan Conference in England by way of the Canadian church office has, however, eluded discovery in both England and Canada. Since Reverend Hutchinson recovered the trial documents, there have been several reappraisals of the scandal, and these have been less sanguine on the issue of Evans's guilt. Among the most recent investigators is Raymond Shirritt-Beaumont whose research begins with the intent to understand more about the women who made the allegations against Evans in 1846. After his careful and balanced assessment of the data, Shirritt-Beaumont concludes that "the circumstances of Evans's trial may never be fully understood, nor his guilt or innocence proven with any finality."[7]

The Pratt Files

Among files collected in the archives at the Pratt Library, University of Victoria College, University of Toronto, is a four page excerpt of a manuscript by Reverend John Semmens, the same Methodist minister who worked at the Norway House mission and who is mentioned by Nan Shipley. The excerpt is contained within a collection of documents in the library's James Evans Fonds. Semmens says the following:

> While I was a missionary at Oxford House (1884-1888) a message came to me in great haste from a dying Indian woman, urging me to come quickly. I went and the dying woman said, 'Oh Praying Master, I am so glad that you came. My heart is very heavy because of something I did many years ago and I must confess it before I go into the presence of God.' Then she told me she had been the woman who swore against James Evans in the trial at Norway House. She said, 'I was told to say that but it is not true.'[8]

Semmens goes on to provide a context for this confession. He avers that

James Evans had aroused the ire of the senior HBC officials shortly after he had arrived at Norway House and discovered that the HBC chief factors regularly accepted as concubines the native wives of the local chiefs, as a sort of seal to trade negotiations. Evans had protested against what he believed to have been a sexually immoral practice that was inconsistent with these HBC men's Christian beliefs. Semmens tells the tale this way:

> Mr. Evans's opposition was strenuously resisted and steps taken to get rid of him. On his return from a visit to a near band of Indians Mr. Evans was hailed before a Court of Justice, presided over by the Chief Factor as Justice of the Peace under authority of the British Government. He was charged with immoral conduct with Indian women. One young woman was brought in and swore that she was the one with whom Mr. Evans had transgressed.[9]

There are many obvious errors in Semmens's understanding of the context of the Norway House Scandal. Whether or not there were concubines is still an open question, but if there were, there is no known record of Evans ever having complained about this practice. Even if the concubine story is true, and Evans had complained when he first arrived, the direct line Semmens draws between Evans's complaint and the accusations made against him can not be substantiated: it was several years after he arrived at Norway House that the allegations of Evans's sexual indiscretions surfaced. Finally, as we have seen, extant documents prove that Evans was not hailed before a court of justice, presided over by the chief factor as justice of the peace under authority of the British Government. The trial before his peers at Rossville mission was overseen by Evans's assistant, Rev. William Mason. The "private investigation" held by HBC Governor George Simpson had absolutely no authority as a "court of justice" and Simpson himself makes no claims to be operating as a justice of the peace or any other agent of the British Crown.

While Semmens's explanations for the animosity that developed between Rev. James Evans and the HBC men are inadequate, there is no doubt that animosity did exist despite the fact that things had begun well. Evans made the move to Rupert's Land from Ontario, where he had been ordained in his early twenties, shortly after he had arrived in Canada from England. When he travelled out west in 1840 to take up ministry in Norway House, he was already a missionary of some experience and note

among the Ojibway. Evans was encouraged to take the post by HBC Governor Sir George Simpson who felt a little Protestant competition in the ecclesial marketplace might be good for business.[10] In a letter from the Governor and Committee of the HBC giving orders for free transportation and lodging to be provided for the Methodist missionaries, the Methodists are praised for their "zeal in the causes of morality and religion." The governor and the committee also suggest that the churchmen may be able to help rehabilitate the company's reputation in the wake of unspecified complaints by "contradict[ing] many of the statements, that have gone forth to the public, highly injurious to the character of the service."[11] Accordingly, Evans was welcomed at Norway House by both Simpson and his chief factor at that location, Mr. Donald Ross, but it was not long before tensions between the Methodist Mission and the HBC became apparent.

Evans was first and foremost a minister to the local Cree. While Evans acknowledged the company's right to set the terms of employment and trade, and expressed gratitude for the support that the company provided to his missionary projects, he was also anxious to help the local people establish basic independence by growing their own food and attaining the basics of a white man's education. Soon after he arrived at Norway House he set about devising a ready means by which the natives could read scripture, and in the process he developed the first Cree syllabic characters which permitted the hither-to exclusively oral language to be rendered in print. He and his assistants began teaching and translating the Bible, hymns and other devotional works to supplement their ministry. Before long, there was a thriving church community anxious to learn and live by the Methodist doctrines. Key among these Methodist doctrines was the sanctity of the sabbath–a Sunday of rest for all workers.

It is hard to say which of many issues first served as a wedge between Evans and the HBC, but certainly the falling out over Sunday travel appears to have had decisive effects on Evans's future. Three years into the relationship Chief Factor Donald Ross was writing disparaging comments about Evans and his family to George Simpson.[12] Evans was moved out of the HBC fort into the native village, which they named Rossville. As Evans commented to Simpson, he certainly had no objections to the move: he had desired to live among the Natives from the outset. But he smarted against the public perception that he had been moved because of a falling out with Ross and the HBC personnel at the

Fort.[13] Despite Simpson's assurance that ill feelings toward Evans were not the reason for the move, letters exchanged over the period indicate Ross's developing frustrations with Evans, and his personal dislike of the man were indeed at the root of this change in accommodation. Gossip indicated that Mrs. Evans did not get along well with Mrs. Ross.[14] Mr. Ross grew increasingly intolerant of Evans's demands on the company purse.

Most problematic for Ross was Evans's intervention on behalf of the local natives. Ross took Evans's interventions as a personal insult, a challenge to the primacy he had enjoyed in the Natives' affections and the control that he was able to exert for the purposes of trade. The Natives' desire to rest on Sundays while the boats were travelling across Lake Winnipeg and among the complex river systems that connected the various fur-trading centers was not in itself an insurmountable problem. At the outset their appeared to have been a measure of good will between Evans and Ross to make things work, but when a direct challenge was placed to Ross's plans to travel to Red River in May 1845, Ross balked. This offence was soon compounded by Evans's suggestion that the natives be able to make gifts of one or two of the furs they had trapped, rather than turning them all over to the company. Evans, in a letter to Simpson, first used the word "immoral" in a direct request he made to Simpson to have Simpson spell out the legalities implied in the practice of Natives giving furs they have trapped as gifts, rather than presenting them for sale to the HBC. Evans begged Simpson to "afford [him] the information" he would need in order to guide the "missionaries when called upon to correct immoralities."[15] Simpson was polite in his official return correspondence with Evans, stating that "in this higher department of moral duty we confidently rely on your cordial cooperation," but he stated unequivocally that "considering how deeply the inhabitants of Rossville are indebted to us both on spiritual & on temporal grounds, they ought to feel an obligation superior to any standing rule having the authority of human law against squandering their furs among themselves or transferring them to others."[16] It is clear from the private correspondence exchanged between Simpson and Ross at this time that they had very little confidence in Evans's moral compass when it came to matters of trade. In the context of trade disruptions in Oregon and the tensions that were rising among the Red River free traders, Evans's interference with trade was a threat that the HBC would not forbear. Within a matter of months Ross and George Simpson managed to arrange with the WMMS in London to have Evans

removed. Ross was apprised of this good news in December of that same year, but he was cautioned not to share the information with Evans who would hear of his removal directly from his missionary superiors when the letters from London, England would arrive on the spring ships.

So, with or without concubines, there is plenty of evidence to suggest that Evans did run afoul of the HBC, and that this transgression was framed by Evans and Simpson in terms that included the word "immorality." It is also clear that these disagreements were sufficient to motivate Simpson to secure Evans's removal from the territory. These facts seemingly scuttle both the occasion and the motivation for Semmens's implication that the HBC men maligned Evans's character by "arranging" for the young women to come forward with their allegations of sexual abuse. Why would Simpson and Ross need to connive against Evans when his departure was already secured? Why would Simpson and Ross go out of their way to fabricate an unrelated account of sexual transgression when they had already succeeded in having Evans removed by arguing that he was impeding trade?

Although they have nothing to do with concubines, there may have been both motive and a reasonable occasion for both of these moves. Robert Alder, Secretary of the Wesleyan Missionary society, made it clear that "our committee will deem it necessary to keep up the present number of missionaries, & to send a very efficient one to Norway House."[17] Neither Ross nor Simpson had any intention of allowing this to happen. In a letter dated 26 December 1845 Simpson responded to Alder, arguing that "I do not at all consider a resident Superintendent necessary."[18] He hoped to convince the London office that the territory could be left under the distant supervision of the Methodist official in Ontario. By late December it may have occurred to both men that their arrangements for Evans's removal might have been inadequate: Evans might be replaced with someone as troublesome; worse yet, Evans himself might very well return after a stay overseas.

If between December 1845, when they got word of Evans's removal, and February 1846 when the scandal broke, Ross and Simpson had decided to make their case for the permanent removal of a local superintendent more compelling, they would have been hard pressed to find an official channel in which to do so. Their complaint about Evans's interference with trade had already been taken to the highest authority within the HBC, and the WMMS had already compiled with the com-

pany's request to send Evans to London where the issue would be discussed in full. On the other hand, the rumour of "immorality" appears to have been ready made for exploitation. The use of this word which we have already traced through several key pieces of correspondence between Evans and Simpson, takes an important shift when it is used by a well-placed member of the extended HBC community. The letter containing the volatile word "immoralities" is first sent to Simpson by Evans in June 1845, a full three months before Letitia Hargrave, the wife of James Hargrave, chief factor at York Factory, uses the same word in an entirely different context. Letitia Hargrave's newsy letters to her family provide a back-stage look at events recorded in official company letters. HBC personnel travelled regularly between Norway House and York Factory, bringing with them sought after accounts of the social events as well as business news. In September,1885, Mrs. Hargrave expressed concern over Rev. Evans's conduct in a gossip-filled letter to her mother. Mrs. Hargrave noted that the Norway House people called Reverend Evans "immoral." The passage is worth quoting at length:

> Mr. Evans is in bad health, a chronic affection of the kidneys. I see now change in him but Hargrave [her husband] says he seems quite broken down – the Norway House people are aspersing his character & say since that accident he has become deranged & that his conduct is immoral &c. I am sure it is not true & so is Hargrave.

The accident to which Letitia Hargrave refers is the accidental death of Thomas Hassell, Evans's interpreter, which occurred when the gun Evans was holding misfired and hit Hassell. The tragic event, acknowledged by all to have been an accident, grieved Evans greatly.
Later in the same letter, Letitia Hargrave returns to her earlier subject and repeats herself:

> People, that is the Norway House people say that Evans has gone daft – we saw no symptoms of it. What is worse they asperse his character & say that his conduct is immoral. I am sure it is not true. The man's mind may have got a shake by that fearful accident, but he appears perfectly collected – I may just as well say that it is asserted that the whole village of Rossville had been converted into a seraglio by him.[19]

Although Mrs. Hargrave passed along the gossip to her mother, it is clear by the context in which it is presented that the news is perplexing and not quite believable, either for Mrs. Hargrave or for her husband. She repeated herself, as though she was attempting to make sense in writing of a situation that made little sense otherwise.

From this distance, there is no way to know if there is any connection between these two contexts for the word "immoral" as it was used by Evans and Simpson, and later by Letitia Hargrave. If, however, we take seriously the possibility that the allegations against Evans were fabricated rather than real, it may not be too large a stretch to imagine that the all important word "immoral" might have been initially used in connection with Evans to describe his interference with trade, and that, as it passed around in an HBC version of the game "telephone," it picked up an entirely different interpretation. Were Simpson and Ross unscrupulous enough to exploit this situation? Further research will be required before a judgement can be rendered, but the raw hostility toward Evans apparent in both Ross and Simpson's private correspondence makes the idea plausible. For example, in a letter dated 7 July 1846, a week after Evans left for England, George Simpson writes to Donald Ross to request an official investigation into the death of Thomas Hassell. Simpson states that "various circumstances have come to my knowledge, which seem [sic] to demand a thorough investigation with respect to the death, supposed at the time to have been accidental, of the late Thomas Hassell."[20] He then devises a list of ten questions that Donald Ross is charged to investigate. In a private correspondence to Donald Ross written that very same day, Simpson is more overt about why he is raising doubts about Hassell's death so shortly after Evans has left the territory for England. Simpson's professional demeanour, so apparent in the first letter, is now exchanged for complete candour:

> With reference to another letter under this date respecting Mr. Evans, you must all have been very much delighted when that worthy took his departure; but in case he may keep his promise of visiting you at the expiration of two years, I think it is well we should be prepared to speak to him seriously on the subject of Hassell's death.[21]

Simpson mentioned a rumour he once heard to suggest that Hassell's death was a deliberate murder, not an accident. At the time, Simpson says he

dismissed it as "some idle Indian rumour," but now he intends to take the idea seriously. In the official letter Simpson is careful to instruct Ross to be "careful to put as few leading questions as possible" into his investigations, but in the private correspondence he is less scrupulous: he told Ross that "it is very desirable we should know whether any intimacy existed between Evans & Hassell's wife," and he asked Ross to dig for whatever details he was able to uncover. At the conclusion of the letter Simpson is clear about his intentions for the mission at Norway House:

> Now that Evans is off, we must not allow his successor, whoever he may be, to play the Bishop at Norway House, where you alone must be prophet, priest & king –Mason merely acting under your advice. By having him in your hands, he may be useful to the trade & may, unquestionably, better carry out the views of the Society than by acting on his own judgement and discretion, in which I have little confidence.[22]

Issues for Future Research

Semmens's understanding of the background events surrounding the Evans case are incorrect. How ought we to judge the authority of what he purports to have heard directly, the dying Native woman's "confession"? As I have mused about the significance of this new evidence two issues have come to mind: the first is Semmens's credibility, and the second is the motivation of the penitent woman.

Semmens states that he sent copies of this confession to "the Wesleyan Conference in England through the Canadian Methodist Church"[23] but the original copies Semmens sent have not been found either in Canada or in London. This does not necessarily mean that they were never sent or received. It appears that much of the information surrounding this trial was buried after Evans's sudden death, and only parts of it have been recovered. The documents in the Pratt Library file suggest, however, that Semmens's report continued to circulate and was eventually evaluated in 1956 by at least one Canadian church official. In the file with Sem mens's excerpt is a letter by J.A. Lousley, formerly a missionary at Norway House and a principal of the Residential Indian School (circa 1902-36). A note appended to the bottom of this letter explains that rumours circulated within the Methodist community that Mr. Lousley had "definite evidence

that exonerated James Evans." The author of this note, identified only by the initials G.B.K., goes on to say that Mr. Lousley was "in Ontario, in retirement." G.B.K. requested that President W.T. Brown of Victoria University visit Mr. Lousley to collect the story. Apparently the president complied with this request and the story of Semmens's encounter is retold in Lousley's words in a letter contained in the same file as own Semmens's account.

The church appears to have declined to make public the evidence presented by Lousley. In a letter to one Dr. Arnup, a former moderator of the United Church, Mr. Lousley avers that "Rev. Mr.Evans's reputation is, I think, on the ascendant and needs no defence at present."[24] Lousley does, however, request that Arnup keep the evidence close at hand since "a time might come when this deathbed confession of the Indian woman might be needed." These records suggest that Semmens, at least, believed what he had heard and made every possible attempt to have this event recorded for posterity. Evidently Semmens also managed to convince Lousley that what he had heard from the Native woman was true, and Lousley was then similarly anxious to have the information on file for future reference.

The major point that counts against Semmens's reliability is his allegation about the concubines and about the specific timing and details concerning how the scandal had been addressed. If Semmens is unreliable in these details, how much weight can be assigned to his statements about the deathbed confession? He was dependant upon local gossip and his memory of it when he inferred the motivation for the testimony against Evans, and Semmens exhibits an unattractive habit of quoting hearsay as fact on other occasions in his other writings.[25] When it came to the woman's testimony, however, he was directly reporting a conversation in which he had been a participant. The fact that this testimony seemed to arise out of the clear blue, decades after the original events, also adds credibility to this account.

If we assume that Semmens can be believed, the next question concerns the woman herself. What might have motivated this testimony, so many years later? Immediately following the local trial, there is evidence to suggest that one or more of the young women either threatened to recant, or actually did recant, but no printed record exists to substantiate the claim.[26] The archives do record, however, a fragment of a letter written from H.B. Steinhauer, the man who interpreted at the Rossville trial, to William Mason, Evans's assistant. The letter was written shortly after news of Evans's death had reached the Norway House community. In this letter

Steinhauer asks Mason why he was not called to interpret "the wretched women's confessions" when he had interpreted everything else. The letter implies that Steinhauer had been made aware that the confessions had taken place.

In the aftermath of the trial and of Evans's untimely death, one might suspect community pressure to play an important role in influencing public professions about Evans. Almost forty years later, however, it is reasonable to assume that public pressure would have abated and been supplanted by other motivations. In the case of Semmens's parishioner, the desire to clear her conscience appears to be her primary concern. Accordingly, this confession ought, I believe, to be judged worthy of interpretative weight.

But who might this woman have been? Once again, further research will be required before an answer will be available. In his assessment of the Norway House scandal, Raymond Shirritt-Beaumont considered the possibility that the deathbed confession reported by Nan Shipley might have occurred and made preliminary assessments about who the penitent might have been. Shirritt-Beaumont's research in the Oxford House post journals suggests that there is no readily identifiable candidate.[27]

And so, this new evidence in the cold case of Evans's sexual immorality adds yet another layer to an already complex and contradictory set of facts. The Native woman's testimony, as it is recorded by Semmens, comes with as many questions as it purports to answer. The testimony is most suggestive because it states overtly what has long been alleged but never proven: that the accusations against Evans had been encouraged by the HBC who hoped to benefit from the damage they would cause.

Let's hope that this small discovery will spur a new round of searches for primary evidence. Apparently, there is still more out there to be found. In the meantime it will be the task of both present and future church historians to decide if Semmens's story sheds new light on an old scandal.

Endnotes

1. The term "private investigation" is used by George Simpson to describe the proceedings to the WMMS secretary, Robert Alder. See George Simpson to Robert Alder, York Factory 13 August 1846, HBCA/AM D.4/68, Hudson Bay Company Archives, Winnipeg, MB (HBCA).

2. See George Simpson to Robert Alder, Red River Settlement 14 September 1846 HBCA/AM D.4/68, Hudson Bay Company Archives, Winnipeg.

3. See John McLean, *James Evans, Inventor of the Syllabic System of the Cree Language* (Toronto: W. Briggs, 1890) and Egerton, Ryerson Young, *The Apostle of the North, Rev. James Evans* (Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1899).

4. See Alder to Simpson, London 1 December 1846 HBCA/AM D.5/18, HBCA, Winnipeg.

5. See Nan Shipley, *The James Evans Story* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1966).

6. I would like to thank Reverend Hutchinson for several conversations we have shared while I worked on this story. He has been generous in sharing his scholarly instincts and his time.

7. Raymond Shirritt-Beaumont, "The Rossville Scandal, 1846: James Evans, the Cree, and a Mission on Trial," M.A. Thesis (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 2001), student abstract. I am grateful to Mr. Shirritt-Beaumont for his help in thinking though various aspects of this project, for sharing his research notes with me, and for reading a final draft of this paper.

8. John Semmens, 'Manuscript account of the mission at Norway House,' James Evans Fonds, Box 6, file 1, United Church of Canada/ Victoria University Archives, Toronto, ON [hereafterUCC/UVA]. A duplicate copy of these same pages is also included in the John Semmens Fonds (see John Semmens Fonds, 3204, box 1, file 4, UCC/UVA). I would like to thank to Gabbi Zaldin, Reader Services Librarian, Victoria University Library, for her help and hospitality during my several visits to the UVC Archives and for making documents and good advice available to me from afar. I am also grateful to Robert C. Brandeis, Chief Librarian, for his help in sorting through various questions I posed about the collection.

9. James Evans Fonds, Box 6, file1, UCC/UVA.

10. Apparently Simpson felt that the existent Roman Catholic clergy were in a position to "gain an ascendancy" throughout the fur-trading country and exercise an unfavourable influence over the indigenous labourers upon whom the HBC depended for trade. See Donald Ross Private Papers, PACB AE R73 La5; quoted in Paul Hengstler, "A Winter's Research and Invention: Reverend James Evans's Exploration of Indigenous Language and the Development of Syllabics, 1838-1839," M.A. Thesis (University of Alberta, 2003), 63.

11. Governor and Committee of the Hudson's Bay Company to Duncan Findlayson. London, 4 March 1840 HBCA B.235, James Evans Fonds, Box 3 file 34a, UCC/UVA.

12. Donald Ross to Sir George Simpson. Norway House, 17 August 1843. HBCA D.5/8,James Evans Fonds, Box 3, file 34a, UCC/UVA.

13. See James Evans to Sir George Simpson, 28 July 1843. HBCA D.5/8,James Evans Fonds, Box 3, file 34a, UCC/UVA.

14. See Letitia Hargrave,*The Letters of Letitia Hargrave,* ed. Margaret McLeod (Toronto: Champlain Society, 1947).

15. James Evans to George Simpson 10 June 1845 HBCA/ AM.D.5/14, Hudson Bay Company Archives, Winnipeg.

16. George Simpson to James Evans 11 June 1845 HBCA/AM. D.4/32, Hudson Bay Company Archives, Winnipeg.

17. Robert Alder to George Simpson, London 3 December 1845 HBCA D.5/15,James Evans Fonds, Box 3 file 34a, UCC/UVA.

18. George Simpson to Robert Alder, Lachine, 26 December 1845 HBCA D.4/67,James Evans Fonds, Box 3 file 34a, UCC/UVA, Toronto.

19. See Hargrave, *Letters of Letitia Hargrave*, 208.

20. See George Simpson to Donald Ross. Red River Settlement, 7 July 1846 HBCA D.4/68,James Evans Fonds, Box 3 file 34a, UCC/UVA, Toronto.

21. George Simpson to Donald Ross, Private 7 July 1846 HBCA D.4/68,James Evans Fonds, Box 3 file 34a, UCC/UVA, Toronto.

22. George Simpson to Donald Ross, Private 7 July 1846.

23. Semmens, Manuscript account of the mission at Norway House.

24. JA Lousley, a minister who followed Semmens into the Norway House territory (Semmens had by this time left the church and was working for the Dominion Government as an Indian agent) tells the story to Dr. Arnup in 1956. The story also exists in John Semmens's private memoirs and personal papers. Arnup in James Evans Fonds, Box 6, file 1, UCC/UVA, Toronto. Semmens private papers in John Semmens Fonds 3204, box 1, file 4, UCC/UVA, Toronto.

25. One such occasion occurs in Semmens's account of John C. Sinclair, a translator who worked with James Evans at Norway House. In his earlier work describing life on the western missions field, Semmens reports that John C. Sinclair is "indolent and morally lax" (see *The Field and the Work: Sketches of Missionary life In the Far North* [Toronto: Methodist Mission Rooms, 1884], 104). When Semmens writes his own account of the Norway House Mission, he has since had the opportunity to work with John C. Sinclair, and he now has nothing but glowing words for him (see Semmens, "Manuscript Account of the Mission at Norway House"). One way to account for this discrepancy is to conclude that Semmens was reporting gossip in the first instance, but recording his own experience in the second.

26. See H.B. Steinhauer to William Mason. Rossville 10th or 15th of December 1846 (arrived June 1847), WMMS outgoing mail MG 597 Reel 28, The Rooms, St. John's, NF. The primary WMMS archives are held at The School of Oriental and African Studies Library at the University of London, England. Once again I would like to thank librarian Lance Martin for his untiring help in securing documents both during my visit to the library and since then by mail.

27. This assessment is recorded in Raymond Shirritt-Beaumont's unpublished research notes, and his conclusions were shared with me in various email correspondences.

The Canadian Battle for Christmas

GERRY BOWLER
University of Manitoba

The celebration of the birth of Jesus Christ is the second highest feast in the Christian year and the occasion for the most popular festival on the planet. No other day is as widely celebrated or freighted with such a variety of important cultural messages as Christmas. But for almost 1800 years, struggles have been waged for the soul of this holiday: legions of individuals and organizations, inside and outside of Christianity, have fought to define, control, reform, enhance, castigate, abolish or spread the celebration. From the fulminations of early Church Fathers to demonstrations in shopping malls, from Puritan decrees to Supreme Court rulings, from medieval councils to internet screeds, the meaning of Christmas has been the source of ceaseless debate. This paper will examine a few of the ways this struggle has been waged in Canada since 1945.

World War II spread the North American version of Christmas around the world and following the war voices were raised globally in protest against perceived changes in its practice. Bishops in Franco's Spain railed against Christmas cards as Protestant novelties; French clergy burnt Santa Claus in effigy; eastern Europeans resisted the imposition by Soviet occupying forces of the new seasonal gift-bringer Grandfather Frost; and American Catholic journals decried the displacement of the crèche as the central Christmas symbol.[1] None of these yuletide phenomena, however, attracted as much attention in the post-war years as the antics of Canada's deputy minister of health, known universally as the Man Who Killed Santa Claus.[2]

General Brock Chisholm was one of those relentless do-gooders that

Canada produces in such numbers. War hero, Unitarian, founding director of the World Health Organization, proponent of masturbation, eugenics and planetary federalism, Chisholm first aroused hostile attention in 1944 by attacking motherhood[3] and conventional morality as enemies of mental health. "We have swallowed all manner of poisonous certainties," he said, "fed us by our parents, our Sunday- and day-school teachers, our politicians, our priests, our newspapers and others with a vested interest in controlling us."[4] Having survived the firestorm of criticism and dodged calls for his resignation from government service, Chisholm turned his attention on Santa Claus in a series of speeches in 1945. To the parents of St George's School in Montreal he stated that "[t]he preservation of peace for all time and the orderly progress of the world to a state of adequate living for everyone may require for future generations the sacrifice of Santa Claus." For Chisholm, Santa stood for all that was superstitious and irrational in human discourse and social relations. To make a child believe "against the evidence of his own senses" stories and lies like Santa Claus was "to subjugate his capacity to think and to make him easy meat for demagogues and mob orators."[5] Later that year, in a talk to one-hundred and fifty mothers and fathers at Rockcliffe School in Ottawa, he averred that instilling the belief in a mythical gift-bringer would make a child "the kind of man who will develop a sore back when there is a tough job to do and refuse to think realistically when war threatens."[6] A businessman with an ulcer and nervous problems could rightly blame his middle-aged ailments on the foolishness he was taught as a child.

Chisholm found that he was supported by his co-workers in the psychiatric industry and Prime Minister Mackenzie King who sheltered him from dismissal, but everywhere else his views were met with outrage and scorn. Among his critics was the editor of the Peterborough *Examiner*, Robertson Davies, who rebuked Chisholm's approach to the immaterial, claiming that "myths are at their best poetry, and if General Chisholm wants to root the poetry out of life we must oppose him."[7] Undaunted, Chisholm clung to his Santa-bashing even after his resignation from the Canadian civil service and his appointment in 1946 to the directorship of the World Health Organization, which he would use tirelessly as a bully pulpit on topics of mental hygiene. In 1951 he threatened to bring the case of Santa Claus before the United Nations and to denounce the old man along with other harmful fictions which sapped the youth of the world of that spirit which was necessary to solve the problems of the day.[8] Five years later he was still at it, writing about the neurosis one of his child

patients had suffered in the 1930s, becoming fearful and withdrawn from dread of the nocturnal attack of an imaginary bear. It was no use reassuring the child that the bear did not exist:

> The boy went into a panic. Suddenly he leaped at me and beat me on the chest with his fists as high as he could reach on my body and said, 'Can Santa Claus come down the chimney? You have got to tell me. You have got to tell me. You have got to tell me.'
>
> If Santa Claus can come down the chimney, what is the good of telling him that a black bear can't get into his bedroom. None, because he was an intelligent child. If reindeer can fly through the air, and a great fat Santa Claus can come down a chimney with all sorts of things on his back and Santa Claus can call on all the houses in the world in one night and note all about the behavior of all children, then what is the good of thinking about these things because it only leads you to the conclusion that your parents are liars and you can't believe them at all. This is the only intelligent conclusion an intelligent child can reach. As this is so painful and difficult for a child, he controls his thinking. He says I must not think these dreadful things, thus he learns to dissociate. He thus learns to divorce cause from fact and not think through in terms of cause and effect even in terms of his own behavior. We produce or do everything we can to produce a totally irresponsible citizen who cannot be expected to think sensibly and reasonably about things throughout his lifetime, or at least produce a person who find great difficulty in doing so. We have taught him under colossal emotional pressure to do just that – not to think.[9]

If Chisholm was opposed to belief in Santa Claus, there were other Canadians who were opposed to the whole notion of Christmas. These were the ultra-Calvinist descendants of generations of Puritans for whom the prime directive was the "regulative principle"– the belief that nothing was permissible in worship which had not been directly sanctioned by scripture. Where these Calvinists had come to power in early-modern Europe or its colonies – as in Scotland, the Netherlands, New England or, for a time in the 1640s and 1650s, the English republic – Christmas had been abolished along with mince pie, greenery and the singing of carols.[10] In contemporary North America where they live as a gathered remnant of holiness amidst a sea of godlessness these folks continue their war on Christmas. For them "Christ-mass" (the very name betrays its popish

origins) is an instrument of the Evil One to beguile and entice men away from the true worship. Thus they make much of the similarity between "Satan" and "Santa," trace the holiday's pagan roots back to Nimrod and the Babylonian Marduk cult, condemn Christmas cards (even with lines of Scripture on them) as "an abomination in the sight of God" and write parodies of traditional songs of the season such as:

"No Christmas" (sung to the tune of "White Christmas")

> I'm dreaming there'll be no Christmas
> Just like those Scottish days of yore
> When the people listened
> Reformed truth glistened
> And they laid low the Romish whore.
>
> I'm dreaming there'll be no Christmas
> And that the truth will be revived
> May God's people follow His light
> And put out this superstitious rite.

And to the tune of Mel Tormé's "Christmas Song"

> Servetus roasting in an open fire;
> John Knox preaching where he can;
> Calvin teaching against every sin;
> The folk all look so Puritan.
> Everybody knows idolatry is wickedness
> For papist, Protestant or Jew.
> Though some people say,
> They got carried away
> Banish Christmas here, too![11]

These ditties can be found on the website of Still Water Revival Books, a mission of the Reformed Puritan Church of Edmonton. This church has an interesting theological background, with roots in Scottish Covenanter traditions of the seventeenth century, the Reconstructionist movement, the Christian Heritage Party and the Reformed Presbytery of North America. Still Water Revival Books has a presence in the world of internet religion greatly disproportionate to the small size of its Edmonton congregation and distributes some of the more thoughtful neo-Calvinist

attacks on Christmas, both on its website and in hard copy.[12]

At the other end of the theological spectrum, but no less puritanical in its impulses, is the Buy Nothing Christmas Movement. This phenomenon is the offspring of young counter-cultural Mennonites in Winnipeg who were inspired by *Adbuster* magazine's Buy Nothing Day, the Centre for a New American Dream and Bill McKibben's ideas of a low-cost festive season.[13] Claiming not to wish to abolish Christmas, these folk desire to see it become much less of a festival of consumption, and, in their own words, to "offer a prophetic 'no' to the patterns of over-consumption of middle-class North Americans." To this end it uses religious tropes – a Byzantine icon of Christ with the slogan "Where did I say that you should buy so much stuff to celebrate my birthday?"; a reference to "Mary, the unwed mother of Jesus [who] went against the grain"; a play based on the Biblical characters of Mary and Martha; and a "Buy Nothing Christmas" liturgy. These activists have produced a musical play by Scott and Andrew Douglas, entitled *A Christmas Karl* (pun intended), "a tender tale of commercialism, compassion and fruitcake," but are best known on the news media for their street theatre and provocative invasions of shopping precincts during the Christmas season. You might have seen them at a mall near you singing "Consumer Wonderland," just before being ejected by store security:

> The TV's on, are you watching?
> Another product that they're hawking
> one more thing that you need, to make life complete
> Welcome to Consumer Wonderland.
>
> In the stores, you will hear it
> "Pricey gifts, show holiday spirit"
> That's what they call it, to get to your wallet,
> Welcome to Consumer Wonderland.
>
> At the mall, we can go out shopping
> and buy lots of stuff we can't afford
> we'll have lots of fun with our new toys
> until we realize that we're still bored.[14]

Unlike earlier Protestant movements which sought to purge Christmas celebrations of excess, the Buy Nothing Christmas movement is avowedly anti-capitalist. Our present economic system, they say,

"favours the rich, abandons the poor, is heartless, and is based upon the assumption that people buy things out of self-interest." By attacking Christmas spending they hope to bring capitalism to its knees. In reply to the question "If we all buy nothing this Christmas, won't a lot of people lose their jobs?" their web site says:

> Yes, and now we're getting close to the core reasons for why Buy Nothing Christmas is necessary in the first place: our economy is based on a consumer driven capitalism. And because it's the only economy we have right now, if we stop shopping we stop the economy… But the pitfalls of our current economic system (we work too hard to save money to buy things we don't really need, and we endorse a standard of living that reinforces the gap between the rich and poor and ruins the earth) are simply untenable. Once we finally see the retail sector shrivel . . . we can redirect our efforts to cleaning up our mess and developing more sustainable activities (how we build our homes, transport ourselves, manufacture clothes, and spend our leisure time).[15]

In November 2000 a number of businesses in the Westmount district of Montreal found themselves trashed by splashes of paint, oil and eggs. Their sin was to have brought out their commercial Christmas decorations too soon, according to their attackers, members of a group styling themselves "L'Anti Noël Avant L'Temps" or "No Christmas Before Its Time." In what was surely the most poetic of all Canadian terrorist manifestoes, the vandals proclaimed:

> Halloween has ended. Before Halloween it was autumn, and after Halloween autumn continues. Do you agree?
>
> The leaves lie scattered on the soil, the atmosphere is calm and romantic; it is the dead season and many are rejoicing. Right? It is part of a whole season, a beautiful season, and one that does not officially end until the twenty-first of December. Are you listening?
>
> Winter is far off, and Christmas does not exist outside of winter. Christmas = winter. Autumn = tranquility, peace of mind. You see what we want to say, no?
>
> We are L'A.N.A.L.T. (L'Anti Noël Avant L'Temps)

> We are a group of people who are saddened and frustrated by your ill breeding. We refuse to let you destroy autumn for a reason as pernicious and disgusting as making a little bit of money. Everybody knows that Christmas is coming. You're going to make the same kind of cash! So, if you please, everything has its time.
>
> We demand that you take down all of your Christmas decorations without delay, and not put them back up until the first of December. If not, we are going to strike again.
>
> N.B. Do not take this lightly. We are SERIOUS.[16]

Sadly, these seasonal aesthetes were never heard of again and retailers in Canada continue to stretch the Christmas season back into October.

In December 2002, drivers on the Pat Bay Highway near Victoria, British Columbia, were treated to the following greeting; in huge black letters on red, a billboard spelled out the message: "Gluttony. Envy. Insincerity. Greed. Enjoy Your Christmas."[17] This was the festive wish of Valerie Williams, a 32-year old student of women's studies at the local university, and her partner Trevor, an aeronautical engineer, both long-time anti-Christmas activists. Fed up with what they perceived to be the annual hell of a "white, middle-class, heterosexual, patriarchal, Christian Christmas," they spent $1200 to alert their neighbours and rank strangers to their pent-up rage and followed it with a bulk e-mailing of their manifesto:

> In response to the growing onslaught of manufactured consumeristic Christmas cheer, we have decided to actively reject the capitalist ideology of Christmas. We refuse to spend one cent on buying into the consumer machine this year – no tinsel, no tree, no shiny balls, no Christmas cards, no presents, no wrapping paper, no turkey, no cranberry sauce, no candy canes, and no icicle lights . . . Christmas will not be coming to this house . . . Join us in our Christmas rebellion!

As for Santa Claus, Ms. Williams had no doubt: "He is the mall's puppet . . . Children are taught to worship this white, heterosexual man who overeats. I mean, it's wrong."[18] Though the Williams family claimed to have received verbal support for their crusade, public reaction was more hostile and their billboard greeting has not been repeated or imitated.

A paper on the Canadian struggle for Christmas would not be complete without examining the so-called "multicultural" or "politically correct" controversies which arise every year, though they seem to have reached a particularly virulent peak in 2001-2002. There is not space here to examine the countless disagreements that have occurred over the proper use of Christmas symbols or greetings in public spaces, but I want to use one recent case to generalize on the Canadian experience of this phenomenon.

In December 2006 Judge Marion Cohen of Toronto ordered the removal of a small Christmas tree that had customarily been placed in the hallway of the Ontario Court of Justice. She explained her actions by saying that she didn't think it was appropriate that when people entered the courthouse, the "first thing they see is a Christian symbol." The tree's presence, she said, suggests to non-Christians that they are "not part of this institution."[19] Reaction was swift and predictable: her decision was roundly condemned by her employees, editorialists, the Ontario Bar Association, religious and ethnic groups and, as far as can be determined by call-in shows or reader feedback, the general public. From this and other instances an observer might draw the following conclusions.

First, Canadians take their Christmas symbols very seriously and are pained when long-standing traditions are attacked. Despite annual grumbling about the season's stresses and inconveniences Canadians are firmly in the Christmas camp. Second, these outbreaks of ill-will tend not to be provoked by religious or ethnic groups who have been offended by the overt display of Christian symbols or discourse but from others who choose to be offended on their behalf, chiefly employees in the "umbrage industry," that GULAG of equity officers, diversity coordinators, human rights police and hyper-sensitive public officials.[20] Third, these cases betray a misunderstanding about the entangled religious and social meanings of Christmas. At what point, for example, does a poinsettia or an evergreen become a Christian symbol? Fourth, these cases betray anxiety over the nature of multiculturalism and the lack of meaningful public debate on the issue. It is unclear how an attack on the majority culture advances the celebration of the multicultural nature of Canadian society. Last, these cases tended to be solved with more good humour in Canada than in the United States where identity politics, love of litigation and a reflexive appeal to certain constitutional norms inevitably prolong and exacerbate the issues.[21] In Winnipeg and Toronto, anger over the renaming of public Christmas trees as a "multicultural tree" or a "holiday

tree" was easily defused by Premier Doer and Mayor Lastman who received public acclaim for stating the obvious, that these conifers in the legislative building and Nathan Philips Square were, in fact, Christmas trees.[22]

Will there ever be an end to the struggle over the soul of Christmas? No. Christmas is simply too much part of our lives to be without controversy. North Americans spend at least a month out of every year under the holiday's sway; it is central to the global economy; its religious claims are too profound and challenging and its secular meanings are too valuable ever to be taken lightly. Just as Christmas is likely to endure so will its critics.

Endnotes

1. "Santa, Yule Cards Criticized in Spain," *New York Times,* 15 December 1952, 15; Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Le Père Noël Supplicié* (Paris: Sables, 1952); "Santa's Sub," *Washington Post*, 18 December 1949, B4; "East Bloc's Santa Exiled by Russian," *New York Times,* 25 December 1952, 20; "Santa Now a 'Sugar Daddy', Not Saint, Catholic Editor Says," *Washington Post*, 16 December 1949, 1.

2. A good introduction to this colourful character is Allen Irving, *Brock Chisholm: Doctor to the World* (Markham, ON: Fitzhenry and Whiteside,1998). Ian Dowbiggin examines him in the context of his more radical ideas ("'A Rational Coalition': Euthanasia, Eugenics, and Birth Control in America, 1940-1970," *Journal of Policy History* 14, no.3 [2002]: 223-60).

3. *Globe and Mail,* 10 February 1944, 13.

4. His remarks and the ensuing controversy can be followed in the *Globe and Mail,* 15 November 1945, 6; 1 December 1945, 5; and 15 December 1945, 6.

5. Irving, *Brock Chisholm,* 62.

6. James H. Barnett, *The American Christmas: A Study in National Culture* (New York: Macmillan, 1954), 41.

7. Irving, *Brock Chisholm*, 63.

8. Catherine Lepagnol*, Les Biographies du Père Noël* (Paris: Hachette, 1979), 124.

9. Brock Chisholm, "The Family: Basic Unit of Social Learning," *The Coordinator* 4, no.4 (June 1956): 10.

10. Gerry Bowler, "Opposition to Christmas," *The World Encyclopedia of Christmas* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 2000), 167-68.

11. Written by James Dodson who also penned "God Keep All of You Protestants," "That Little Town the Vatican," and "Enslave the World," http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualNLs/HoHoSong.htm

12. See David W. Cason, *Christmas-Keeping and the Reformed Faith* (Dallas, TX: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1995); Michael Schneider and Kevin Reed, *Christmas: A Biblical Critique* (Dallas: Presbyterian Heritage Publications, 1993); A.W. Pink, "Xmas (Christmas)" http://www.swrb.com/newslett/actualNLs/CHRISTMAS-AWPINK.htm; and David Schwertley, "Is Christmas Christian?" http://www.sermonaudio.com/sermoninfo.asp?sermonid=92703223958

13. Bill McKibben, *Hundred Dollar Holiday: The Case for A More Joyful Christmas* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1998).

14. Lyrics by Erica Avery, "Buy Nothing Christmas 2005" song sheet, http://www.buynothingchristmas.org/resources/carols.html.

15. http://www.buynothingchristmas.org/about/index.html#7

16. "You Better Watch Out," *Harper's,* December 2001, 16.

17. *National Post,* 13 December 2002, A6.

18. Gerry Bowler, *Santa Claus: A Biography* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 2005), 231-32.

19. http://www.cbc.ca/canada/toronto/story/2006/12/14/christmas-tree.html

20. See, for example, the Vancouver declaration by 40 representatives of different minority faith communities avowing their support for public Christmas celebrations and statements by Jewish and Muslim leaders in the wake of Judge Cohen's decision. http://islamicaweb.com/forums/culture-society/7447-case-merry-christmas.html; "A Muslim Defence of the Christmas Tree," *National Post*, 14 December 2006; http://www.bnaibrith.ca/prdisplay.php?id=1138. One of the few messages for support for the removal of the Christmas tree came from the Toronto Secular Alliance: http://secularalliance.ca/2006/12/29/the-tsa-defends-justice-cohen/

21. "*The War on Christmas* in Canada: No War But Some Irritation," BDO Dunwoody Weekly CEO/Business Poll by COMPAS in the *Financial Post*, 26 December 2005.

22. ”Doer gets it right,” *Winnipeg Sun*, 13 December 2001, 3; http://www.canada.com/national/features/holidayguide2002/news/story.html?id=672101b9-6dcb-4cd4-8970-933c0746d156

"We Wish to Inform You": Canadian Religious Reporting of the Rwandan Genocide

KATE BOWLER
Duke University

This article was accidently shortened during the publishing process of *Historical Papers 2007*. It was, therefore, republished in *Historical Papers 2008* in its entirety, and is available in that online edition.

The Place of Church History in the Rise of Evangelicalism

DARREN W. SCHMIDT
University of St Andrews

This article was accidently shortened during the publishing process of *Historical Papers 2007*. It was, therefore, republished in *Historical Papers 2008* in its entirety, and is available in that online edition.

The Many Faces of Providence in the New England Captivity Narratives of Nehemiah How and the Reverend John Norton, 1748

COLLEEN GRAY
Queen's University

> This morning we set out and traveled about eleven miles. We had something rough Traveling to-day. We quickly left the small Stream we lodged by at our right hand to the East of us, and, traveling in a few Miles over some small Hills and Ledges, came to a Stream running from East to West, about two or three Rods in Width, and about two Feet deep. We crossed it, our general course being North. We traveled about two or three Miles farther and came to a Stream running from South-West to North-East, about six Rods in Width, which we crossed. And this Stream (which we supposed to be Wood Creek), according to the best of my Remembrance, and according to the short Minute that I made of this day's Travel, we left at our right Hand to the East of us; but Sergeant Hawks thinks I am mistaken, and that we crossed it again, and left it at the left hand, West of us. I won't be certain, but I cannot persuade myself that I am mistaken.[1]

It is, I believe, obvious from the excerpt above, that an initial reading of a published New England captivity narrative by those uninitiated to the literary norms of the eighteenth century may prove to be an arduous task indeed – the spelling is archaic and unstandardized, the language turgid and often awkward. The narratives are not, as they have been described, "exciting adventure stories."[2] Instead, the descriptions seem unexciting, tiresome and lacking in drama.

The challenge of these documents then initially becomes: how do we

understand these narratives which obviously reflect a mentality far different from our own? The starting point, I believe, is precisely those features that appear so tiresome and even unfathomable to the twentieth-century reader: these are the "jumping off points" into the eighteenth century, for it is the exact qualities that are so incomprehensible that actually reflect a distant mentality.[3]

One way of approaching these narratives is to imagine how these documents were read by people in the mid-eighteenth century. The act of reading in eighteenth-century colonial America was not similar to that of the twenty-first century. Reading was an "intensive" activity and the printed text, because it was scarce, was venerated. Texts were read and reread over and over again, slowly, each word carefully pronounced and listened to, each word possessing a life and meaning of its own.[4] When we begin to comprehend the intensive nature of this type of reading, we can begin to understand the world of those who wrote and consumed captivity narratives. The turgid prose and the undramatic nature of the narratives reflected not only the slower manner of speech, but also the slower manner of reading and listening. Viewed within this context, the published captivity narratives come alive, mirroring not only the writers, but also the readers – they become a window onto the mentality of the eighteenth-century New Englanders who wrote, read and listened to them.[5]

The above discussion of mentality becomes pertinent as this discussion turns to the exploration of New England religious mentality. Any examination of mentality in the eighteenth century cannot overlook the importance of religion, for religion formed the very core of many peoples' existence; it shaped their thoughts, their dialogue, and their interpretation of the reality surrounding and confronting them. Colonial New England was no exception to this. Religious dissent had been responsible for the establishment of the original Puritan colony in the New World in the seventeenth century and, throughout that century, it shaped many controversies.[6] As the colony grew in the eighteenth century, religion played no less an important role. According to Harry Stout, if one judges seventeenth- and eighteenth-century New England in terms of regular church life, there was not a decline in religion as the colony grew in numbers. Rather, his study of unpublished sermons underlines the importance of religion in general, and specifically sermons, in shaping "cultural values, meanings and a sense of corporate purpose."[7]

A significant and fascinating segment of colonial American historiography has expressed an interest in this issue of religion and has,

in particular, focused upon the phenomenon of millenarianism in early New England thought. Briefly, millenarianism has been defined as a viewpoint that believed that human history was divinely ordained and would culminate in a period of heavenly perfection.[8] This concern has produced a prolific debate, and the many historians engaged in it have added enormously to our knowledge of the eschatological implications of eighteenth-century New England mentality.[9] This historiography, however, has generally been interested in millenarianism in terms of its influence upon the development of American revolutionary thought.[10] This discussion does not attempt to engage in this controversy, as the topic of the American Revolution is beyond its scope. Nevertheless, it does recognize the importance of what will be termed a "Providential"[11] tradition in colonial New England that has two dimensions. The first, the millennial or total Providential view, explained events within the Biblical tradition of covenant, sin, punishment and redemption. Often included within this belief was the perception of the chronic warfare that marked the seventeenth- and eighteenth-centuries between the British colonies and their French Catholic enemy as a millennial struggle against the Papal anti-Christ.[12] The second dimension involved a more simple faith in God's underlying and often benevolent influence in individual human lives.

The following essay will examine the published captivity narratives[13] of two individuals, Nehemiah How and the Reverend Mr. John Norton. Both narratives were written in the 1740s during the War of the Austrian Succession between the British and the French, a war which would culminate ultimately in the defeat of the French in 1763 and the concomitant establishment of British hegemony in North America. The discussion will focus first upon the commercial aspects of the total Providential view within these documents and then move to an analysis of the individual religious mentality of these captives.[14]

Total Providentialism

It is perhaps easy for the reader of captivity narratives to become mesmerized by the narratives as individual testimonials or adventure tales[15] or, as in this case, rich historical primary sources.[16] Yet, one should also not lose sight of the physical existence of these stories, for they were concrete realities within the colonial American publishing industry. These accounts were chosen for publication by printers working within an industry notoriously strapped for cash, who must have been aware of their

A

NARRATIVE
Of the Captivity
OF

Nehemiah How,

Who was taken by the Indians at the *Great-Meadow-Fort* above *Fort-Dummer*, where he was an Inhabitant, *October 11th* 1745.

Giving an Account of what he met with in his travelling to *Canada*, and while he was in Priſon there.

Together with an Account of Mr. *HOW*'s Death at *Canada*.

Pſal. cxxxvii. 1,2,3,4. *By the Rivers of Babylon, there we ſat down --We hanged our Harps upon the Willows, in the midſt thereof. For there they that carried us away captive, required of us a Song; and they that waſted us, required of us Mirth, ſaying, Sing us one of the Songs of Zion. How ſhall we ſing the Lord's Song in a ſtrange Land.*

BOSTON: N. E.
Printed and Sold oppoſite to the Priſon in Queen-Street, 1748.

Figure 1: Title page from *Narrative of Nehemiah How* (Boston: Printed and sold opposite to the prison in Queen St., 1748)

audience and therefore must have chosen and structured the material they published with its market value in mind.[17]

One aspect of the narratives that the printers undoubtedly shaped for their readers was the format and content of the title pages,[18] which, at least throughout the 1740s and 1750s, bore a resemblance to one another (see Figures 1 and 2). This page generally included a title, a brief description of the contents of the narrative itself, place of publication, printer, location of the printer and date. In addition, the most interesting feature of these title pages from the point of view of this discussion are the Biblical quotes which normally appeared on the title pages of most narratives published throughout this period. Placed about three-quarters down the page, they were set off from the rest of the title page by rules above and below the quotes. It is, I believe, by examining these Biblical quotes that we can clearly grasp the printers' concept of what appealed to the readers of these narratives.

On the title pages of the narratives of Nehemiah How and the Reverend Mr. John Norton, the Biblical quotes are laments from the Old Testament: the title page of How's narrative included, in part, a passage from Psalm 137:1 which read, "by the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down . . . ," while the Norton title page contained a passage from Jeremiah 50:33, "The children of Israel and the children of Judah were oppressed together and all that took them captives held them fast, they refused to let them go." These passages allude, in particular, to the Babylonian captivity (587 B.C.) and the exile of the Israelites from Jerusalem. The Babylonian captivity, perceived as a punishment meted out by God for the sin of breaking the covenant, is viewed by the Jewish people as one of the most important events in their history, second only to their captivity in Egypt. The Biblical quotes on these particular title pages do not refer specifically to the themes of covenant or sin, punishment or redemption, integral aspects of this particular viewpoint. In How's case, his captivity was an occasion of great sorrow: "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land?" (Psalm 137: 4), while in the instance of Norton, it was "because of affliction" (Lamentations 1:3). However, the context of these quotes would not be lost to readers of the day who undoubtedly knew from their historical tradition and Biblical training, as well as the many sermons they listened to, that just as God had punished the Israelites for their sins, He would redeem the children of His covenant in a better world.[19]

Imbedded on the title page, either directly or indirectly, was the complete Providential framework for viewing not only the captivities but

The Redeemed Captive.

Being a

NARRATIVE

Of the taken and carrying into Captivity

The REVEREND

Mr. *John Norton*,

When *Fort-Maſſachuſetts* Surrendered to a large Body of French and Indians, *Auguſt* 20th 1746,

With a particular Account of the Defence made before the Surrender of that Fort, with the Articles of Capitulation &c.

Together with an Account, both entertaining and affecting, of what Mr. *NORTON* met with, and took Notice of, in his travelling to, and while in Captivity at *Canada*, and 'till his Arrival at *Boſton*, on *Auguſt* 16. 1747.

Written by Himſelf.

Jer. 21. 4. *Thus ſaith the Lord,--Behold, I will turn back the Weapons of War that are in your Hand, wherewith ye fight againſt the King of Babylon, and againſt the Chaldeans, which beſiege you without the Walls, & I will aſſemble them into the City.*

Chap 50. 33.--- *The Children of Iſrael, and the Children of Judah were oppreſſed together, and all that took them Captives held them faſt, they refuſed to let them go.*

Lam. 1. 3. *Judah is gone into Captivity, becauſe of Affliction.*

Neh. 7. 6. *Theſe are the Children of the Province, that went up out of the Captivity, of thoſe that had been carried away.*

BOSTON: Printed & Sold oppoſite the Priſon. 1748.

also the war itself – covenant, sin, punishment and redemption – fashioned by printers for an audience they must have been sure would have understood. This Providential context must have been, in the printers' eyes, one of the selling features of the narratives, and by placing the Biblical quotes on this title page, they not only set them in the context and language their audience would have understood, but also created a structure for reading these tales. However, central question remains: How far did the individual captives like How and Norton view their experiences of the war within the total Providential context alluded to so prominently on the title pages of their respective narratives?

The Narrative of Nehemiah How

Nehemiah How's captivity narrative was written after he was taken captive by the Abenakis, native allies of the French, on 11 October 1745 when "he went out from the fort about 50 rods to cut wood." It describes his journey as an Abenakis prisoner from Great Meadow Fort (Fort Massachusetts) to Fort St. Frédéric, down Lake Champlain to Fort Chambly and then to Québec. How also describes the time he spent in the Québec prison where he succumbed to a virulent epidemic and died on 25 May 1747 at the age of fifty-five. Although the narrative is primary descriptive, it contains enough references to devotional matters to develop a sense of this man's religious mentality.[20]

Nehemiah How was, undeniably, a deeply religious man, a "good pious gentleman," another captive said of him, and "a Christian from his youth." How was also a man of prayer. This is evident from the outset of his captivity, when he was being chased by "12 or 13 Indians with red painted heads," he "cry'd out to God for help and ran and hollow'd" as he ran; he then committed his case to God when the Abenakis "led me into a swamp and pinion'd me."[21]

How's religiosity was expressed outwardly through prayer. At times, as the above examples illustrate, his prayer was unreflective and immediate, a lifeline to hold onto, a resource to aid him in moments of distress. Yet, he was not simply a man who only petitioned God in times of dire need. Prayer was also an integral part of his life, and while he did not practice it regularly on route to Québec, it became something he performed both daily and devoutly within the confines of the Quebec prison. Here, other prisoners, perhaps recognizing the pious nature of this man, "desir'd me to lead them in carrying on morning and evening

devotion." It became custom, he wrote rather proudly that "our constant practice was to read a chapter in the Bible and sing part of a Psalm, and to pray, night and morning."[22]

But then again, How's prayer was also more than a mere daily formality – it was also a source of profound solace and a reflection of his deep spirituality. In prison, for example, he learned that the French had taken one hundred prisoners in the area of Great Meadow Fort, where his family and friends lived. This news was an occasion of great sorrow for this captive. The news "put me upon earnest prayer to God," not to save the fort, his family and friends, but for the greater gift, to enable him "to submit his will," that is, God's design. This particular prayer had a healing effect upon him; after reciting it, he wrote that he was "easy" in his mind, presumably free from the anxiety and sorrow that the news had evoked.[23]

Obviously How was a deeply religious individual, a man for whom prayer was an integral facet of his life. But who was this God to whom How prayed so dutifully and fervently? Was this the God described in the title page of his narrative, the God of Providence who had a covenant with his people, punished them for their sins and ultimately redeemed them to a promised land? And was this war within which he was embroiled as a captive a millennial struggle against a French papal anti-Christ, destined to culminate in a new promised age?

How's God was, in part, the Providential God who intervenes in human affairs. He was a God whose will it was "to deliver me into the hands of these cruel men" (the Abenakis), and who turned these enemies into friends: his God saw to it that he "found favour in the their [the Abenakis] eyes," for they were generally "kind to me while I was with 'em." His God rescued his friends, Jonathan Thayer, Samuel Nutting and his own son, Caleb How, from pursuing Indians; granted him strength to climb mountains on the way from Great Meadow Fort to Fort St. Frédéric; turned his weakness into strength for a time in prison; preserved his family from French attacks; and was responsible for the gentlemen and ladies who visited him in prison who "shew'd us great kindness in giving us money and other things."[24]

How rarely hesitates to shower praise upon this beneficent God who was responsible for the many favours both he and other captives either asked for or received: "Blessed be God therefore," he wrote in prison, "for I desire to ascribe all the favours I have been the partaker of ever since my captivity, to the abundant grace and goodness of a bountiful God, as the first cause."[25] Yet, for him, was this beneficent God also accountable for

the many misfortunes that occurred throughout his captivity?

At the beginning of his narrative, How admits that his captivity is God's will: "I then committed my case to God," he wrote when he was captured, "and pray'd that since it was His will to deliver me into the hands of these cruel men, I might find favour in their eyes." Nevertheless, he never alludes to the disturbing possibility that the Lord may be punishing him or others for their sins. In fact, he never reflects upon the many misfortunes he recorded. God's "gracious goodness" eased his sufferings, protected his friends and his family, and turned enemies into friends. And yet he leaves blatant tragedies totally unexplained. For example, David Rugg, a man from How's fort, was immediately killed by the natives. Rugg was scalped, and his scalp was painted red, with the "likeness of eyes and mouth on it." The natives then stuck the painted scalp on a pole on their canoe and traveled to Fort St Frédéric. Here, the natives left How "in a storm without shelter or a blanket." Again at Fort Chambly, natives struck him on the cheek with stones, and this "made the blood run plentifully," after which they forced him to dance and to sing. Moreover, his prison experience describes a litany of captives streaming in with news of successive French victories and English defeats, and numerous accounts of "deaths among us daily" from the plague. Had God visited these misfortunes upon his children as a punishment for their sins – How himself, David Rugg, the inmates of the prison, his fellow countrymen – as the context of Psalm 137 on the title page of the narrative would have led the reader to expect? If How believed for even one moment that these adversities were a punishment from God visited upon a sinful people, he remains totally silent in this regard.[26]

And what about redemption to the promised land, also an integral facet of the Providential message? Indeed, How never questions the larger meaning of his captivity or the war itself. He neither mentions the greater upheaval as a millennial struggle against the papal anti-Christ, nor does he blame the French for his misfortunes. How celebrates God's goodness as an unquestioned source of comfort, a real presence working within his life. But he remains curiously silent about the punishing and redemptive dimensions of the Creator.

It is left to the author of the epitaph, the "unknown hand" at the end of the narrative to endow How's tale with the redemptive meaning, so glaringly absent in the narrative itself:

> His death is a great loss to his friends, but I believe a gain to himself;

> and that he is gone from a captivity of sorrow on earth to join in songs of everlasting joy among the ransom'd of the Lord in the heavenly Zion.[27]

The Narrative of the Reverend John Norton

The narrative of the Reverend John Norton reflects a similar pattern. Written by Norton, who was thirty years old at the time of his captivity, the document is primarily descriptive. It discusses the defense, military struggle and surrender of Fort Massachusetts (1746), Norton's captivity in the hands of the French, and his long and often arduous journey from Fort Massachusetts to Québec where he was released on 25 July 1747 from prison. Yet, like How's tale, the document also contains enough devotional references to illuminate the nature of his religious point of view.[28]

Although a man of the cloth, the reverend was also a man of this world. He was, first of all, a candid man, as well as a man of action: he freely spoke his mind after the surrender of Fort Massachusetts and opposed the transfer of French prisoners to the natives; he attempted to negotiate with the French for the release of English captives from the hands of the Indians; and he comforted other captives on their march from Fort Massachusetts to Fort St. Frédéric, reminding them along the way that "God would strengthen them." Norton was also in close touch with the secular world of events, and he displayed a great interest in them – he recorded in detail the latest news of the war and political developments the French passed on to him. And he rarely let an opportunity slip by without this debating this information. On at least two occasions, he engaged in heated political debates with Lt. de Muy, the French officer who was in charge of him. The reverend also enjoyed the physical comforts of this world, and he filled his journal with descriptions of the "kind" treatment that the French bestowed upon him, including evenings of drinking fine wines and eating sumptuous meals.[29]

Norton was also a devout man, a man who executed his religious duties sincerely and promptly. Before the surrender of Fort Massachusetts, for example, presumably in front of the defeated who were assembled together, Norton prayed "unto God for wisdom and direction"; he performed religious services at Fort St. Frédéric where "they had the liberty of worshipping God together in a room"; and according to How, on at least one occasion in prison "preach'd two discourses from Psalm 60:11 Give us help from trouble for vain is the help of man." Moreover, Norton's

prayer was more than a mere formality. Rather, it could be, as it was in the prison, "where we had the free liberty of the exercise of our religion," a "matter of comfort to us in our affliction.[30]

Despite his secular proclivities, Norton firmly believed, like How, in a God of Providence who works directly and benevolently in human affairs. Thus, while Norton relied on his own actions to alleviate human suffering, to improve terms of surrender, or upon the course of political and military events to determine the outcome of the war, a beneficent God that underlay human reality. The "good God of Providence" ensured that they "we were all in the fort" when "there appeared an army of French and the Indians" who attacked them. The providential God also continued to help the captives on their long journey northward from Fort Massachusetts to Fort St. Frédéric and "wonderfully strengthened many who were weak," "ensured that our men that had been sick grew better and recovered strength," and that Mrs Smeed, who had just three days earlier delivered her baby named "Captivity," was not harmed by the "heavy shower of rain, which wet us through all our clothes." Moreover, his belief in God's Providence was also profound and could become a source of comfort in moments of distress. This is evident on the march from Fort Massachusetts to Fort St. Frédéric where his "heart was filled with sorrow, expecting that many of our weak and feeble people would fall by the merciless hands of the enemy." The subsequent "shouting and yelling" of the "savages" made him tremble and conclude that they had "murdered some of our people." In spite of these fears, Norton did not fall into despair, but was comforted by the thought that "they [the natives] could do nothing against us, but what God in his holy Providence permitted them." [31]

Yet, did he ever place this be Norton, like How, obviously believed in the goodness of God. neficent Providential God within the total Providential framework appearing so prominently on the cover of his tale? Not within this narrative. Like How, Norton never mentioned the possibility of redemption to a promised land, although he did attribute his final release by cartel to "the many great and repeated mercies of God towards me." He also never situated the larger events of the war – the loss of Fort Massachusetts to the French, the news of English reverses and French victories he constantly received, not only on route to the Québec prison, but also within the prison itself – within the wider context of a millennial struggle against the French Catholic enemy or the Papal anti-Christ. Nor, like How, does he ever attribute his personal captivity to a God who may be punishing him for his sins.[32]

This is not to argue that the Reverend did not reflect upon the larger issue of punishment. In one particular situation, when faced with the overwhelming reality of the death of a number of individuals in the Quebec prison, Norton does ruminate upon the theme of punishment, and these brief reflections offer an important insight into this man's religious mentality. "Those who brought it (the plague) into the prison," wrote Norton as many of the inmates began to fall ill and die, "mostly recovered and so there were many others that had it and recovered; but the recovery of some was but for a time – and many of them relapsed and died." These deaths moved Norton to reflect upon the more elaborate significance of the events surrounding him: "I will therefore put you in remembrance," he wrote, "tho ye once knew this, how that the Lord having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterwards destroyed them that believe not." But the conviction, however, that his fellow prisoners were dying as punishment for their sins did not provide Norton with a satisfactory answer: Could all of these dying people possibly be sinners? Instead, Norton immediately dared to question the doctrine of punishment itself: "Not that I have reason," he wrote, "to think ill of those upon whom the sickness fell and who died with it. Many of them, I hope were truly pious and godly persons." However, just as readily, Norton interpolates this brief moment of skepticism with another Biblical quote that clearly re-establishes the sovereign judgment of God: "The Lord is righteous," he wrote, "for I have rebelled against his commandment. Here I pray you, all people, and behold my sorrow. My virgins and my young men are gone into captivity."[33]

Undeniably, Norton adhered to the doctrine of punishment deeply embedded within the Christian tradition, and which he, as a reverend, represented. Yet his temporary doubts indicate that his belief in certain aspects of the total Providential framework was, at the very least, deeply divided.[34]

Conclusion

This examination of the title pages and the contents of these two captivity narratives reveal contrasts not only between the religious mentality of these two individuals, but also between these particular narratives and the printers' perception of the collective mentality of their colonial American audience.[35] These differences are perhaps indicative of the possibility of many diverse shades in the religious attitudes in colonial America during the War of the Austrian Succession, and, concomitantly,

various opinions about captivity and the war itself.[36]

Perhaps some individuals did place the war within the total Providential framework that appeared on the title pages of the narratives – or, at least, they would immediately have understood it within these terms. The printers of these narratives must have believed they did or they would not have bothered to have given the Biblical quotes such a central position within these documents. After all, it was in their interest to understand their audience and sell the material they published, for books were their livelihood. And perhaps many others thought of the war as a millennial struggle against the papal anti-Christ and the French Catholic enemy.

However, neither How nor Norton entirely placed their experiences within this framework of total Providentialism or a millennial struggle, at least not within these particular narratives. Both men rested firmly within the Providential tradition that believed in God's underlying and benevolent influence in human affairs. Neither man discussed either the papal anti-Christ or the French Catholic enemy, any more than they mentioned the covenant or redemption. Moreover, How never reflected upon the idea of punishment and, when Norton did meditate upon this theme, his ruminations reveal a man deeply divided in his religious attitudes.

It is easy, however, to become lost in pointing out differences in attitudes and beliefs within these narratives and in doing so to lose sight of the fact that while the printers and individuals may have expressed divergent points of view, they all conveyed, deeply religious perceptions, not only of the war, but also of the circumstances around them. Whether they perceived either the war or captivity specifically in terms of a clearly defined Providential tradition, as the title pages would suggest, or expressed their views within a simpler, more flexible Providential framework, is perhaps a matter of splitting hairs. The war to the colonial readers and the individuals who experienced it was obviously a deeply religious matter, and, in the end, these documents remain as specific reflections of the religious temper of the time within which they were written and published.

Endnotes

1. The Reverend John Norton, *The Redeemed Captive* (Boston: Printed and sold opposite to the prison in Queen St., 1748), 16-17.

2. R.W.G. Vail, *The Voice of the Old Frontier* (New York: Thomas Yoseloff Inc., 1949). Vail contends that a modern reader would admire the authors of the captivity narratives for "their swift-moving and exciting plots and their sense of suspense and sustained horror" (Vail, *Voice of the Old* Frontier, 27).

3. Robert Darnton, "Workers Revolt: The Great Cat Massacre of the Rue Saint-Severin," in *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1985), 77, 78. According to Darnton, anthropologists have found that the best points of entry into another culture are those that appear most incomprehensible.

4. David Hall, "The Uses of Literacy," in *Printing and Society in Early America*, ed. William L. Joyce, *et al* (Worcester, MA: American Antiquarian Society, 1983), 22, 23, 32.

5. I have borrowed the expression of a "window" from Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney, "The Historicization of Anthropology," in *Culture Through Time: Anthropological Approaches*, ed. Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990), 23.

6. Edmund S. Morgan, *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop* (Boston: Little Brown and Co.), ix, x, 3-53. For an excellent description of the role of religion in seventeenth-century New England, see David D. Hall, *Worlds of Wonder, Days of Judgment* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989).

7. All colonies in America experienced the impact of the first Great Awakening throughout the 1740s. Ruth Bloch, *Visionary Republic: Millennial Themes in American Thought, 1756-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 15; Harry Stout, *The New England Soul* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 202-4. Bloch, *Visionary Republic*, 234, n. 9, also maintains that religiosity, in general, was more prominent within colonial America as a whole. Further, see Patricia U. Bonomi and Peter Eisenstadt, "Church Adherence in the Eighteenth-Century British American Colonies," *William and Mary Quarterly* 3d ser., 39 (1982): 245-86.

8. Bloch, *Visionary Republic*, xi.

9. Kerry Trask, *In Pursuit of Shadows: Massachusetts, Millennialism and the Seven Years' War* (New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1989), 7.

10. According to Bloch, the two most significant works emphasizing the importance of millennial thought upon the American Revolution are Alan Heimert, *Religion and the American Mind* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966) and Ernest Lee Tuveson, *Redeemer Nation: the Idea of America's Millennial Role* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968).

11. For an excellent discussion of Providence see Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Belief in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Wiedenfeld and Nicolson, 1971), 78-112.

12. See especially, Thomas More Brown, "The Image of the Beast: Anti-Papal Rhetoric in Colonial America," in *Conspiracy: The Fear of Subversion in American History*, ed. Richard O. Curry and Thomas More Brown (New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1972), 1-20. According to Trask the Seven Years' War was seen by Protestant colonists as a "mythical" struggle of the forces of good and evil and a crusade for utopia (*In Pursuit of the Shadows*, 13).

13. Captivity narratives have held the attention of scholars for decades. Most recent treatments of captivity narratives include Sarah Carter, *Capturing Women: The Manipulation of Cultural Imagery in Canada's Prairie West* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997); James D. Hartman, *Providence Tales and the Birth of American Literature* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999); Pauline Turner-Strong, *Captive Selves, Captivating Others: The Politics and Poetics of Colonial American Captivity Narratives* (Bolder, CO: Westview Press, 1999); and Joe Snader, *Caught Between Worlds: British Captivity Narratives in Fact and Fiction* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2000).

14. Nehemiah How, *The Narrative of Nehemiah How* (Boston: Printed and sold opposite to the prison in Queen St., 1748); and Norton, *The Redeemed Captive*.

15. Vail, *Voice of the Old Frontier*, 27.

16. For other uses of the captivity narrative in this respect see James Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures Within Colonial America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); John Demos, *Unredeemed Captive: A Family from Early America* (New York: Knopf, 1994); and Kevin Sweeney, *Captors and Captives*: *The 1704 French and Indian Raid on Deerfield* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003).

17. David Hall, "The Uses of Literacy," 22, 23, 32. See also Lucien Febvre, *The Coming of the Book: The Impact of Printing, 1450-1800*, trans. David Gerard, ed. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith and David Wootton (London: N.L.B. 1976). Febvre claims that the book was a piece of merchandise that men produced above all in order to earn a living (109). I have used the term "printers" to describe these men. According to Febvre, however, these men could more correctly be termed "printers-journalists-postmasters." They were also often booksellers. For a good description of a New England bookseller see Elizabeth Carroll Reilly, "The Wages of Piety," in *Printing and Society in*

Early America.

18. The printers also shaped other aspects of the captivity narratives with economic considerations in mind. These pamphlets were far from luxury items in this book trade. Rather, the two narratives under discussion (How and Norton) were small pamphlets of twenty-three and forty pages respectively, 15.8 cm x 11.4 cm and 16.7 cm. x 10.2 cm, unadorned with woodcuts (see Vail, *Voice of the Old Frontier*, 240, 241.) Merely holding a captivity narrative conveys a sense of their simplicity: a small document with a cardboard cover, easily held in two hands, it could be transported cheaply and readily passed on to other individuals.

19. J.D. Douglas, ed., "Jerusalem," *The New Bible Dictionary* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1962), 614; G.W. Anderson, "The Psalms," in *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. H.H. Rowley (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1962), 442; and John Paterson, "Jeremiah," in *Peake's Commentary*, 550, 562; and Stout, *New England Soul*, 6.

20. How, *Narrative*, 3. How's diary must have been smuggled out of the prison after his death and taken to Boston, where it was published by the same publisher as the Norton narrative. One can assume that the original manuscript has been lost.

21. How, *Narrative*, 22, 2.

22. How, *Narrative*, 3, 13.

23. How, *Narrative*, 14. Many of the raids that How describes were a part of the French counter-offensive carried out against New York and the New England frontier between 1746 and 1748 due to the exposed position of Quebec after the fall of Louisbourg in 1745. For more on this period see George F.G. Stanley, *New France: The Last Phase, 1744-1760* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1968), 25-28; For a good discussion of the different types of prayer, as well as the individual and social function of prayer, see Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, chapter 5, esp. 113-24.

24. How, *Narrative*, 2, 4, 5, 12, 14.

25. How, *Narrative*, 12.

26. How, *Narrative*, 12, 2, 6, 9, 10, 14-22.

27. How, *Narrative*, 22. It is, of course, impossible to determine whether the printer or the person who found How's diary after his death in prison added this epitaph. Given the title page, however, more than likely the printer was the "unknown hand."

28. Norton, *Redeemed Captive*. According to Clifford K. Shipton and James E. Mooney, eds., *National Index of American Imprints Through 1800*, vol. 2 (Worcester, MA: American Antiquarian Society and Barre Publishers, 1969), Norton was born in 1716 and died in 1778.

29. Norton, *Redeemed Captive*, 11, 12; 20-2; 19, 25, 26, 28.

30. Norton, *Redeemed Captive*, 8, 18, 28; How, *Narrative*, 20.

31. Norton, *Redeemed Captive*, 4, 14, 16, 12, 13.

32. Norton, *Redeemed Captive*, 40.

33. Norton, *Redeemed Captive*, 31.

34. red Anderson, *A People's Army: Massachusetts, Soldiers and Society in the Seven Years' War* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1984) also notes that the belief in Providence that he found prevalent among provincial soldiers during the Seven Years' War was, by the mid-eighteenth century, already rather old-fashioned. Norton's reflections, particularly his doubts on the subject of punishment, immediately take him out of the category of a "New Light" preacher. Perhaps he belonged to or at least had sympathies with the section of ministers who, as early as the 1720s, maintained that religion was more a matter of "reason" than inward spiritual experience. David Hall, *Worlds of Wonder*, 244.

35. In this case, at least, these "printers" were not the purveyors of "rationalization and progressive thinking that we call *modernity*," Michael Warner, *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century America* (London and Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), ix. Rather, ultimately these individuals used their technology to reinforce traditional ways of thinking, clearly because it was profitable to do so.

36. The existence of these contrasts also points out to the historian the necessity of studying the individual in history in order to penetrate finer shades of historical meaning; that perhaps a collectivist approach, which would, for example, have taken the Biblical quotes on the title pages as reflective of colonial American mentality, masks a more complex multi-dimensional reality.

    The predominance of the individual Providential view is probably not indicative of a general trend away from belief in the total Providential world view during this period. David Hall, *Worlds of Wonder*, also notes the diversity of religious experience in seventeenth-century New England. More specifically, Hall notes that Henry Dunster, a minister and president of Harvard College, expressed a definite affirmation of the total Providential viewpoint. However, other individuals he studies expressed doubts about

God's Providence – that the operations of the divine economy were often inconsistent, and it was troubling to some people that God should appear so indifferent to prayer ("The World of Print and Collective Mentality in Seventeenth-Century New England," *William and Mary Quarterly* 41[1984]: 54).

"Barred from heaven and cursed forever": Old Colony Mennonites and the 1908 Commission of Inquiry Regarding Public Education

ALAN M. GUENTHER
Briercrest College

The title is taken from the newspaper headline of the Regina paper, *The Morning Leader,* on 5 January 5 1909 regarding a Royal Commission that had taken place in the town of Warman north of Saskatoon a week earlier. Warman came to the attention of nation more recently in 1980 when a public inquiry was held regarding the proposal to establish a uranium refinery there.[1] While the 1908 Commission of Inquiry had a much more limited scope, it did catch the attention of the newspapers in Saskatoon and Regina. The full headline of the Regina paper read:

> Progressive Mennonites "Barred from Heaven and Cursed Forever" by Bishop of the Sect in Saskatchewan. Commission of Enquiry into Practices of Old Colonier Sect of Mennonites near Warman leads to some Strange Revelations – Settlers who send their Children to the Public Schools banned by the Church – Excommunicants Shunned by their Co-Religionists and Blood Relations – Low Standard of Education Prevalent in Mennonite Private Schools – Canadian Branch of the Church Sterner than Parent Church – The Bible taken as Sole Basis of Authority and Conflict with Civil Authorities Result.[2]

What follows is the reporter's detailed account of the examination of witnesses who appeared before the commission to testify of their experi-

ence of excommunication as a result of their wanting to send their children to a public school, rather than the private school established by the Old Colony Mennonite Church. Fortunately we don't have to rely on a journalist's summary and interpretation of the two day hearing. The commissioners submitted a one-hundred-page transcript of the questions and answers given by all the participants, a copy of which now resides in the Saskatchewan Archives.[3]

In order to understand the bases of authority accepted by the Old Colony Mennonites and by those who had been excommunicated, some background on the Reinländer Mennonites or "Old Colony" Mennonites in Saskatchewan will be useful. Starting in 1874, 17,000 German-speaking Mennonites emigrated from the Ukraine to North America, 7,000 of which settled in Manitoba. The ones who came to be known as the Old Colony Mennonites settled on west side of the Red River in townships reserved by the Canadian government for exclusive Mennonite settlement. Twenty years later when available farm land became more scarce, families began moving to the Hague-Osler region north of Saskatoon, where once again the government set aside large blocks of land for homesteading Mennonites. However, unlike regular homesteaders, the Mennonites did not have to reside on their individual homesteads, but were permitted to form their traditional villages enabling them to maintain their communal and religious traditions.[4]

The right to educate their children in their own schools had been a major factor in the Mennonite immigration to Canada in 1875, and in their new villages in Saskatchewan Mennonites quickly set up their schools where children were taught the basics of reading, writing and arithmetic. The texts used were a primer, the catechism, and the Old and New Testaments. As Bishop Jacob Wiens testified before the commission, all boys ages six to thirteen and girls ages six to twelve were expected to attend during the winter months from the middle of October until seeding time in the spring.[5] The teachers had received no training beyond their own years in such schools. At the time of the Commission of Inquiry, the Old Colony Church was conducting seventeen such schools in villages between Rosthern and Warman. Instruction was in the German language in contrast to the public schools under the supervision of the province.[6] And that is where the problems became manifest.

"Progressive" Mennonites

Other Mennonites who moved into the Rosthern valley area, while also wanting to preserve their traditions and German language, were much more willing to participate in establishing public schools where the language of instruction was English and the teachers were trained beyond a basic level. The word that they frequently used to describe themselves was "progressive." Reverend David Toews, who was their pastor and eventually was ordained as their bishop, had been invited to appear at the commission because his church had taken in the dissidents who had been excommunicated from the Old Colony Church. He declared, "Our Church believes in public schools and *progress* all along." In contrasting his church with the Old Colony, he said further, "We are favoring public schools, *progressive* schools, and they don't believe in them. We believe in voting, and they forbid it."[7]

The media as well as other non-Mennonite observers picked up on that language and those Mennonites desiring an English education (and excommunicated by the Old Colony Church) became known as "progressive Mennonites." J.E. Knipfel, a non-Mennonite who practiced medicine in Warman, testified briefly at the commission and subsequently wrote a letter to the government full of assimilationist language in regard to the Mennonites in Saskatchewan: "I have most confident reason to believe that the half and by far the most intelligent and *progressive* half of the number of these people will thank the government to the bottom of their heart, if they will be assisted in tearing themselves loose from this educational, civil, and also religious bondage."[8] An editorial in the Saskatoon paper, *The Daily Phoenix*, proclaimed, "In a country which is endeavouring to assimilate so many different types of people such difficulties are to be looked for occasionally where old time prejudices and convictions based on conscience come in sharp conflict with enlightened ideas."[9] The Old Colony Mennonites who did not favour assimilation were then left with the stigma of being prejudiced, bigoted, and whatever else was the opposite of "progressive."[10] This how they were labelled by outsiders, but how did Bishop Jacob Wiens identify himself and his church?[11]

A number of men in the colony near Warman had been excommunicated by the Old Colony Mennonite Church, ostensibly for sending their children to a public school rather than one of the schools established and run by the church. They had gone ahead and joined other churches, but

continued to suffer from the excommunication in that their businesses were being shunned by the Old Colony Mennonites who made up a considerable majority of the community. Several of them had written to the provincial government to request its assistance, enlisting the help of Gerhard Ens, the Mennonite member of the Legislative Assembly. Ens forwarded a list of twenty-two men who had been excommunicated by the Old Colony Church, chief among them being Isaak P. Miller of Warman, Isaak P. Friesen of Rosthern, and Jacob J.S. Friesen also of Rosthern.[12] As a consequence, the lieutenant governor had established a Royal Commission to look into the matter and, on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Education, J.A. Calder, had appointed Deputy Attorney General Frank Ford and Deputy Commissioner of Education Duncan P. McColl as commissioners.[13] The hearings were held in the schoolhouse in Warman beginning on 28 December 1908, and everyone interested was invited to attend and to speak. Questions and testimony continued for two days while the commissioners probed the accuracy of the allegations and sought to understand the position of the Old Colony leaders on the education of children and their practice with regard to excommunication.

Other analyses that have touched on the 1908 commission of inquiry have looked at the sociological dynamics of excommunication from the point of view of the victims, or at what it revealed about the state of education in the Mennonite communities in Saskatchewan.[14] While the transcript of the commission of inquiry is certainly a valuable source for such investigations, the language also reveals how the Old Colony leaders constructed the authority that gave shape and continuity to their community. Although the inquiry was established to focus on the question of access to education, issues of power and authority dominated the discussion during the two days of hearings as well as the correspondence surrounding the event. That authority grouped around the five centres of ordination, congregation, tradition, Scripture and secular government.

Ordination

The complainants who had initiated the hearings had blamed Bishop Wiens and the other ministers of the Old Colony congregation for their difficulties.[15] The commissioners, who would have been familiar with the more hierarchical church structures of the dominant Protestant denomination, accordingly probed the authority structures of the Old Colony

Church. How long had Wiens been the Bishop of the Church? Who had appointed him? What was he before he became Bishop?[16] The answers briefly given were that Wiens had been elected as a minister by the congregation in Manitoba in 1888, then had also been elected to serve as bishop, and had been ordained by Bishop Johann Wiebe who had been ordained by Gerhard Dyck in Russia and had led his people to Canada.[17]

Whenever he was challenged by the commissioners to speak authoritatively on behalf of the church regarding its beliefs or practice, Bishop Wiens would consistently defer to the authority of the congregation from whom he derived his authority by virtue of his election by its members. Likewise the five ministers that worked alongside him had not been chosen by the bishop, nor had they received any special training for ministry. Rather, they had been lay people elected by the congregation whom they would serve. Therefore, with regard to the exercise of church discipline, neither the bishop nor the ministers had any power to excommunicate a member; only the congregation could do that. Bishop Wiens frequently reiterated that he could make no decision to overturn an excommunication alone without consulting the community.

From the start, the complainants had seen the church leadership as the key authority, and decided to force them to relax the rules of the church by threatening to undermine their authority. In their discussions and correspondence with Premier Walter Scott and with the minister of education, J.A. Calder, they had suggested that a means the government could use would be to deprive the bishop and the ministers of the legal right to solemnize marriages. In a memo to Calder, Premier Scott advises:

> At Rosthern I saw Miller, of Warman, with Mr. Friesen in like position, together with Mr. Ens. Mr. Ens advises that the time has come to act if we can act at all. Two suggestions were made (1) to inform the Mennonite heads that unless they leave free those of their people who wished to use the public school we will compel the formation of Public School Districts where ever there are enough children of school age and will force the payment of taxes; and (2) to inform them also that we will deprive them of the legal right to solemnize marriages.[18]

This suggestion was picked up by the commissioners and repeated at intervals throughout the proceedings. “Which would you rather do: give

up your rights to solemnize marriage or let your people send their children to the public school?"[19] At a subsequent meeting with some of the leaders of the Old Colony Mennonites, Deputy Attorney General Ford admitted that the legal right to marry people was unrelated to the school question, and was simply a means the government might consider using to force the church leaders to follow its dictates.[20] This threat did not address the issue of education, but was a direct attack upon one of the rights conferred upon those Old Colony leaders who had been ordained by their congregations.

When pushed to answer why he restricted the freedom of the church members, Bishop Wiens at one point responded with a parable that perhaps most clearly expressed how he saw the authority of his ordination:

> If there were a shepherd who was watching a flock of sheep, whom the Master had placed in the shepherd's care, would not the Master demand an account of him, whether he had left each sheep to go as it wanted to go, or whether he had tried to enforce the rules as given him?[21]

In like manner, Bishop Wiens felt responsible for those who had joined the congregation of their own free will to insist that they remain true to their vows. The Old Colony leaders made it clear that their disciplinary actions applied only to those who voluntarily joined the congregation as adults; if children who had grown up in the community chose not to join the church through baptism, they did not suffer the same discipline of "shunning."[22]

Congregation

Although exercising considerable authority as a Bishop in reality, Wiens continually described that authority as secondary to that of the congregation. In his words, there was one "congregation" or "*Gemeinde*" consisting of 950 members, meeting weekly in three church buildings or monthly in schools buildings in other villages.[23] Male members joined the congregation voluntarily as adults by accepting baptism between the ages of nineteen and twenty-five, while female members might join a year or two earlier.[24] This act of bending the knee to God at baptism (which was by pouring) and promising to remain faithful to God until death was the irrevocable decision that authorized the community to excommunicate those who did not remain true to their vows. One of the leading elders of

the church attempted to explain the strength of this commitment by comparing it to a sworn oath, something Mennonites refused to do. (Of the eighteen Mennonite witnesses that appeared before the commission, only one – Jacob A. Friesen – was sworn while all the others were simply "affirmed.") "We don't force anybody into our community, but when he is once in our community you know, he makes such a promise, - it is as strong as if you would swear anything."[25] One was not, therefore, born into the congregation, but joined as a result of his or her own decision taken as an adult and expressed in the rite of baptism and verbal promises at that time.

While the congregation ideally consisted of all members, only male members were invited to participate in electing ministers and bishops. Men were also the only ones permitted to participate in the decision of excommunicating a member. Through an interpreter, the commissioners elicited the following answers from Bishop Wiens to their questions:

> Q.Who has the power to excommunicate?
> A.The whole community. The whole congregation has that power. He [Wiens] says it is first presented to the congregation.
> Q. "The congregation." Is that the whole community now?
> A.That means the place where they have service.
> Q.Well, are they all asked to come?
> A.They are not specially invited for that special purpose: only those that come there. Then they pass a resolution that a certain member be excommunicated.
> Q.Would the member himself know anything about it before the meeting?
> A.Yes, he is invited to come and attend and speak for himself.
> Q.Can the Bishop excommunicated?
> A.Not alone.
> Q.Can a minister?
> A.No.
> Q.How many people must meet together to excommunicate?
> A. He doesn't know exactly, but he says whatever number of male members are in Church are asked to remain after the service and then the resolution is passed.[26]

Although Wiens begins by including the whole congregation, further clarification reveals that the process in fact involves only the men of a

particular gathering who are asked to stay after a regular service to administer discipline to a recalcitrant member.

The role of the congregation in the process of excommunicating a rebellious member was also not as authoritative as the rhetoric of Bishop Wiens suggests. Yes, the member under discipline was invited to appear before the congregation, but the process was far from a free exchange of ideas and a democratic decision by all. The onus was on the member to demonstrate to the congregation and its leaders, from Scripture, that their teaching or practice was wrong. If he was unable to do so, he had to acknowledge that he was wrong or face excommunication.[27]

Another role in which the congregation exercised its authority was in the delivery of the final notice of excommunication. Generally, it was not the bishop or a minister who delivered this notice, but two, sometimes only one, respected elders of the congregation. The commissioners took pains to inquire after the names of each of those who had delivered letters to the various excommunicants. This action effectively placed the responsibility of enforcing the ban on the whole congregation rather than just its leaders. A point repeated by two of the witnesses was that, at the congregation level, excommunication was understood to have eternal consequences – in effect it barred the excommunicant from heaven.[28] One of those witnesses, I.P. Friesen, later testified upon further questioning that he no longer believed that the community had the power to send him to hell for what he had done.[29]

Tradition

Aside from the quoting the biblical command of 1 Thessalonians 3:6, "Keep away from every brother who leads an unruly life and not according to the tradition which you have received from us," Bishop Wiens did not explicitly appeal to "tradition" as a separate authority. But it deserves mention because what Wiens referred to as the authority of the Word of God was in reality the particular interpretation he and the ministers had placed on Scripture. Rev. John Wall, one of the ministers who accompanied the bishop, referred more explicitly to the "rules" to which baptized members of the congregation were required to adhere, though here too he refers to Scripture as the foundation of those rules. When asked whether a member would be excommunicated if he persisted in sending his children to a public school, Wall replied, "If they don't want

[to] remain with us in the same rules and want to have another rule, when he wants to go outside the pale of the rules which we have according to God's Word, then we believe we must do so. For the sake of our and their soul's salvation."[30] Incidentally, this is as close as the leaders of the Old Colony Church came to addressing the issue of whether they believed they had the authority to bar someone from heaven by means of excommunication.

As the deft probing of the commissioners revealed, tradition was the default position that the erring member had to refute (using Scripture) if he was to retain his membership. When repeatedly challenged by the commissioners to explain why people were being excommunicated when they merely wanted to send their children to the public school, the bishop consistently responded that he always invited such a member to come to him or to the congregation and demonstrate that the practice in question was in accordance with the teaching of Scripture. The commissioners pointed out to Bishop Wiens that it would be nearly impossible for any member to convince the church leaders that they were wrong and he or she was right and to overthrow the weight of the accepted interpretation of Scripture. The translated exchange reads in part:

> Q. Suppose I belonged to your Church and sent my children to the public schools: would I be excommunicated?
> A. . . . He [Wiens] says if you were not able to convince him that you were right then you would be excommunicated.
> Q. Would I be able to convince you that I was right?
> A. He says God's Word is right.
> Q. And God's Word says what about this?
> A. He says God's Word says that if we know it from our youth up it can lead us in the paths of righteousness; or something like that.
> Q. Has anybody been able to convince you that sending children to the public school is not against God's law?
> A. He does not know of anybody ever trying. He says no one came to the church to –
> Q. Ask him again how many persons have been excommunicated because of sending their children to the public schools.
> A. He can't say. He says they were then asked to come to the church and they would not appear.[31]

Repeatedly, this is the stalemate at which the commissioners arrive.

The members who were threatened with discipline had been invited to appear to defend their position before the congregation, but none had done so. In the bishop's view, then, no one had been excommunicated for sending their children to the public school, but rather for failing to defend their rebellious action before the congregation. When one of the excom municants, I.P. Friesen, pressed the commissioners make it possible for him to be freed from the ban, Bishop Wiens once again commented that Friesen had often been invited to convince him by way of God's word that he (Wiens) was wrong. Friesen then expressed his frustration with Wiens' interpretation of Scripture: "He takes a verse that didn't relate to that at all. How can a person convince him?"[32]

Scripture

That brings us to the discussion of the authority of Scripture in the self-understanding of the Old Colony Mennonites. Occurring even more frequently than his appeals to the authority of the congregation, are the bishop's appeals to the authority of Scripture as the basis for all his decisions and the decisions of the church. It seems at times the commissioners became weary with his constant reference to the Word of God.

> Q. Tell us what is the effect on a man's business when he is excommunicated?
> A. He [Wiens] says he can't say. He says, We tell our brothers to do nothing else than God's Word teaches.
> Q. What do you do that God's Word teaches?
> A. On account of disobedience, even the smallest disobedience is enough: or something like that.
> Q. Would you shake hands with a man who is excommunicated?
> A. He says if God's Word says you should not then he has to obey God more than man.
> Q. Well, does God's Word say so?
> A. He says it says, If somebody comes who does not bring this teaching then do you not take him up in his house.
> Q. Would you eat with a man who is excommunicated?
> A. [before translator has time to translate Wiens' answer, the commissioner speaks again]
> Q. Never mind God's Word; would you or not?
> A. No.[33]

It would be easy to conclude that Bishop Wiens was being evasive by his constant appeal to the authority of Scripture, but it would be more accurate to see in it a reflection of his deep-seated belief that God's Word was indeed the only ground for any belief or practice of the church not only for disciplinary action.

To some extent, the authority of Scripture can also be seen to lie at the heart of the desire of the Old Colony Church to maintain their own schools. Through Bishop Wiens' testimony it becomes clear that the church did not wish to oppose public schools as much as it wished to promote its own. And the justification for this stance is the injunction that is frequently repeated to the effect that a person must be taught the Scriptures from his childhood. Since the church schools use only texts which point the way to salvation (and public schools do not), sending ones children to the church school is a matter of obedience. In the bishop's letter of excommunication to Jakob Friesen, a translation of which is also included in the government's file of correspondence, the apostle Paul's exhortation on the training of children in 2 Timothy 3:15, and Moses' command in Deuteronomy 6:6-7 are quoted, followed by the question, "Is it not then our duty to teach our children God's word in the school, where in every book the way to salvation is taught?"[34] Most of the rest of the letter of excommunication is likewise filled with scriptural references and quotations.

However, once again this rhetorical invocation of the ideal was not as straightforward and simple as Bishop Wiens and the other ministers expressed it. The commissioners rightly pointed out that the role of interpretation is actually more determinative than that of the Scripture alone. This was something that the ministers apparently found difficult to comprehend. At a subsequent meeting between Ford and three of the church leaders the following discussion ensued:

> Ford: You believe a certain thing; and no amount of argument would convince you that you were wrong.
> Mr. Klassen: Our Testament and yours is exactly the same. I am pretty sure of that. I have one that is in your language, and ours, and it is exactly the same. Well, as long as it is the same it should be understood the same. It cannot be misunderstood: it is so plain.[35]

The hermeneutic employed by the Old Colony leaders effectively prohibited any alternative interpretation of the biblical text. In their view, there could only be one interpretation, that of the plain, obvious meaning of the text. That meaning was the one taught by the bishop and other ministers, and logically there could be no other understanding of Scripture.

The influence of interpretation is compounded by the selective use of Scripture. This is seen most clearly in the congregational meeting of more than 300 members in response to a directive from the commissioners. The bishop was asked to seek the opinion of his congregation on the matter of excommunicating those who went against the church's teaching regarding the education of children. The bishop accordingly sent out a letter calling the members to a meeting within a month after the end of the commission of inquiry. The brotherhood was invited to gather to consider God's Word, and then the following verses were given as the ones that were to be considered:

- Matthew 18:15-18 – if a brother sins, go to him in private, then take a witness or two, then tell it to the church, then let him be as a Gentile or tax collector.
- Mark 7:21-24 – for from within out of the heart of men, proceed the evil thoughts, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, deeds of coveting and wickedness, as well as deceit, sensuality, envy, slander, pride, and foolishness.
- Romans 16:17-18 – keep your eye on those who cause dissensions and hindrances contrary to the teaching which you have learned, and turn away from them…such men are slaves of their own appetites and by their smooth and flattering speech they deceive the hears of the unsuspecting
- Thessalonians 3:6, 14 – keep away from every brother who leads an unruly life and not according to the tradition which you have received from us…If anyone does not obey our instruction in this letter, take special note of that person and do not associate with him so that he will be put to shame.
- 2 John 9, 10 – anyone who goes too far and does not abide in the teaching of Christ, does not have God . . . if anyone comes to you and does not bring this teaching do not receive him into your house, and do not give him a greeting.
- 2 Timothy 3:1-6 – in the last days difficult times will come. For men will be lovers of self, lovers of money, boastful, arrogant, revilers,

> disobedient to parents, ungrateful, unholy, unloving, irreconcilable, malicious gossips, without self-control, brutal, haters of good, treacherous, reckless, conceited, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God, holding to a form of godliness, although they have denied its power. Avoid such men as these.
> - 2 Timothy 3:15 – from childhood you have known the sacred scriptures.[36]

All of these verses except the last one deal with the issue of church discipline and excommunication. This was not to be a meeting where the members could freely explore the Scriptures relating to the subject of educating children in government-run schools. Rather, the leaders perceived the issue to be primarily one of disciplining those members who did not submit to the decisions of the congregation. Nevertheless, this appeal to scriptural authority must be seen as key to Old Colony Mennonite self-understanding.

Secular Government Authority

Finally, it is important to understand the authority of the secular government, and its relation to the church. Throughout the hearings, Bishop Wiens stated his respect for the government's authority, while clearly subordinating its role to that of Scripture and the church as far as the education of children was concerned. When he did adamantly appeal to the authority of secular powers, it was in connection with the guarantee that the federal government of Canada had given to the Mennonite emigrants before they had left Russia that they would have religious freedom in all areas including the education of their children. Bishop Wiens and the ministers had brought a copy of this document with them to the hearings and were eager to get it into the hands of the commissioners.[37] The document, included in the record of proceedings as an appendix, stated in clause ten:

> The fullest privilege of exercising their religious principles is by law afforded to the Mennonites without any kind of molestation and restriction whatever, and the same privilege extends to the education of their children in schools.[38]

What Wiens and the other church leaders failed to realize was that the

Canadian government had amended this original agreement by adding the clause "as provided by law" effectively nullifying any guarantee granted by the *federal* government with regards to education which, by law, was a *provincial* matter.[39] Although the commissioners did not build their case on this discrepancy, they did focus on the tenth clause, suggesting that the Old Colony leadership was itself in violation of the principle when "preventing others exercising their privilege of doing as they like as to sending children to school."[40]

The language of "privilege" rather than "right" pervades the ministers' discourse. When church members who were sending their children to public schools were called before the congregation, they were asked why they did not want to avail themselves of the "privilege" the government was affording them, meaning sending their children to schools where they could be taught the Scripture.[41] Perhaps in their invocation of "privilege," they were recalling the *Privilegium* promised to them by Catherine the Great in 1789, prompting the mass migration of Mennonites from Prussia to the steppes of the Ukraine. The eventual withdrawal of the exemption from military service guaranteed in that *Privilegium*, which had been renewed in writing by two subsequent Russian emperors, was the catalyst that had led to the mass migration of Mennonites to North America starting in 1874. Now, once again, they felt the promises made to them by government were being eroded one by one.[42] Interestingly, those who were rebelling against Church authority likewise adopted the language of "privilege" and gave as their reason for leaving the church the fact that they wanted the privilege of sending their children to a school where they would receive a good education.[43] The Old Colony Mennonite leaders desired that the government leave them alone to live peacefully, as "the silent in the land," except for keeping its commitment to permit them to run their private schools.[44]

This quietist approach towards secular government was in stark contrast to those excommunicated members whose lobbying had precipitated the Royal Commission.[45] The letters Miller and Friesen sent prior to the hearings demonstrate their willingness to use the levers of political power to achieve their goals. With both provincial and federal elections occurring that year, they did not hesitate to remind the politicians of their faithful support to the Liberal party and its policies in the past, and their willingness to lend all possible aid in the upcoming election, with the expectation that the government would address their grievances. In early

October, Jacob J. Friesen had written:

> Now, that the Dominion Election is nearing again I don't know what to do. I have allways [sic] been a supporter of liberalism but judging the present Government by its action towards our condition I can't help but loosing [sic] faith in it. I always had much confidence in Hon. Scott and his Cabinet but I fear that he will disappoint us in our believes [sic]. As far as I can learn, is the Hon. Mr. Scott afraid of the opposition to do anything in our matter. If this is really the case then I have allways had a wrong opinion about the Premier's character.[46]

Earlier, prior to the provincial election, I.P. Friesen had likewise connected government action on this matter with electoral support, when he wrote, "We may add that should you decide to take energic [sic] steps in this matter shortly, we feel assured that you would make a lot of friends in this District for the forthcoming election."[47]

The representatives of secular government – the two commissioners appointed to hear the grievances – saw their role as limited to listening and then passing on their recommendations to the government. Despite their evident frustration at times in trying to solicit clear responses from the bishop, they approached their work with fairness, asking incisive questions to discover that in almost all the cases presented, a member had been excommunicated for some other reason than for sending his child to a public school alone. The points of law that they felt the Old Colony leaders may have violated were in advocating a boycott, which was criminal offence, and in restricting religious liberty. But they repeatedly emphasized that it was not their intention to interfere with the Mennonites' practice of religion or to bring in harsh measures.[48] The commissioners submitted their report, in the form of a transcript with accompanying documents, but as it appears in the archives, there were no concrete recommendations.

Three hundred members of the Old Colony congregation gathered on 19 January 1909 for the meeting called by Bishop Wiens. In the letter the bishop subsequently wrote to the Saskatchewan government, he expressed the congregation's gratitude for the fact that "our belief, according to God's word, has been left undisturbed and that we have enjoyed our freedom of knowledge undisturbed by the honourable Government," and requested that that freedom might continue.[49] At the same time, Wiens also declared that the brotherhood had unanimously

voted to reject the claims of those who had rebelled against the community.

I.P. Friesen, one of those who had hoped to be released from the ban, also wrote to Premier Scott, expressing his profound disappointment that the church had decided to be stricter rather than showing any leniency whatsoever.[50] He blamed Bishop Wiens for not taking a fair vote on the issue and for not framing the question in a way that would have elicited frank discussion. Friesen stated that members had not spoken out because of their fear of being banned and boycotted themselves. Premier Scott responded to Friesen's letter with surprisingly strong language, "This species of tyranny cannot possibly be permitted to continue if the Government can find available means to stop it."[51] He had written in similar language to J.E. Knipfel who had followed up his oral testimony with several written submissions urging the government to act. Scott wrote, "No class of people can be permitted by a form of tyranny to discourage others from taking advantage of a public institution so essential as is our public school system."[52]

In spite of the strong rhetoric, there seems to have been no action taken by the Legislature in response to the reports, disappointing those excommunicated Mennonites who had hoped to force the Old Colony to limit their use of the ban in disciplining the community. However, the issue of private versus public schools did not go away. It resurfaced less than ten years later after the First World War when the new premier of Saskatchewan, W.M. Martin, determined to close the German schools and force all children by law to attend the provincial schools. Because of the unwillingness to compromise on both sides, large numbers of Old Colony Mennonites moved away to Mexico where they were once again promised freedom to teach their children as they wished.[53]

Conclusion

While from the outside, the authority in the Old Colony Church appears to be centered in the figures of the bishop and his fellow ministers, or in the church's strong tradition handed down from generation to generation, it is clear from the testimony of Bishop Wiens that he saw the locus of authority in the congregation and in the Word of God. For the Old Colony ministers decisions were not taken by the leadership unilaterally, but by the gathered brotherhood. Also, they did not see their interpretation of Scripture as determined or even coloured by tradition, but saw it as the plain sense of Scripture, conclusions that anyone who read the Bible in

humility would also reach. From their understanding of Scripture, the education of children must be done in an environment where all knowledge was based on and derived from the Holy Bible, found not in the public schools but only in the ones the church had established. Also from their understanding of Scripture, anyone who resisted this plain teaching regarding the education of children was liable to the discipline of the community, specifically excommunication and shunning. The leaders did not arbitrarily enact this discipline on their own, but only as agreed upon by the gathered congregation.

The bishop and ministers of the Old Colony Church saw their own authority as contingent upon these two other bases of authority – the Bible and the congregation. Consequently, the commissioners as well as the excommunicated members encountered insurmountable obstacles to extracting commitments from the leaders to change their practice of disciplining those members who chose to send their children to schools other than those established by the church. The leaders declared themselves to be without the authority to change the current practice, first because of the clear teaching of Scripture, and second because such decisions would need to be taken by the congregation as a whole. The strategy of the excommunicated members had been to attempt to force change by dragging the church leadership before government powers. Because they had failed to take into account the leaders' self-perception that their authority was not inherent in themselves, the disaffected members were thwarted in their attempt.

Endnotes

1. Leo Driedger, "Community Conflict: The Eldorado Invasion of Warman," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 23 (1986): 247-269.

2. *The Morning Leader*, 5 January 1909.

3. "Inquiry re Practices of Old Colonier Mennonite Church: Minutes of Evidence," Proceedings of Commission of Inquiry at Warman, Dec. 28 & 29, 1908, File Ed. 12 d., Saskatchewan Archives Board, Saskatoon, SK (hereafter SAB; subsequent references to the transcript of these Proceedings will be cited as "Inquiry at Warman").

4. Leonard Doell, "Mennonite Homesteading in Saskatchewan," in *Mennonite Homesteaders on the Hague-Osler Reserve* (Saskatoon, SK: Mennonite Historical Society of Saskatchewan, 1999), 13-22; and Leonard Doell, "The Hague-Osler Reserve," *Hague-Osler Mennonite Reserve, 1895-1995* (Saskatoon, SK: Hague-Osler Reserve Book Committee, 1995), 26-38.

5. "Inquiry at Warman," 62.

6. A list of the villages in which the schools were located, along with the names of the teachers, was delivered to the commissioners in Regina two weeks later by a deputation of leaders from the Old Colony Church (see File Ed. 12 d., SAB).

7. "Inquiry at Warman," 41, 43.

8. Undated letter by J.E. Knipfel, File Ed. 12 d., SAB.

9. Editorial, *The Daily Phoenix*, 5 Jan. 1909.

10. This discourse of "progress" also is reflected in the discussion of the inquiry in Frank H. Epp, *Education with a Plus: The Story of Rosthern Junior College* (Waterloo, ON: Conrad Press, 1975), 34-39.

11. On Bishop Wiens and other leaders of the Old Colony Church in Saskatchewan, see: Leonard Doell, "Hague Osler Old Colony Mennonite Church in the Old West Saskatchewan," in *Old Colony Mennonites in Canada 1875 to 2000*, ed. by Delbert F. Plett (Steinbach, MB: Crossway Publications, 2001), 142-146; and Leonard Doell, "The Old Colony Mennonite Church," in *Hague-Osler Mennonite Reserve*, 579-583.

12. I.P. Miller, Warman, to Gerhard Ens, M.L.A., n.d., File Ed. 12 d., SAB.

13. J.A. Calder, Regina, SK, to His Honour The Lieutenant Governor in Council, 15 Dec. 1908, File Ed. 12 d., Saskatchewan Archives Board, Saskatoon.

14. Leo Driedger, "Individual Freedom vs. Community Control: An Adaptation of Erickson's Ontogeny of Ritualization," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 21, no. 3 (1982): 226-242; Leonard Doell, "Education," in *Hague-Osler Mennonite Reserve*, 635-667; and William Janzen, *Limits on Liberty: The Experience of Mennonite, Hutterite, and Doukhobor Communities in Canada* (Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 100-103.

15. Jacob J. Friesen, Rosthern, to J.A. Calder, Regina, 1 Oct. 1908, File Ed. 12 d., SAB.

16. "Inquiry at Warman," 62, 72-73.

17. On Bishop Johann Wiebe and his leading role in the immigration of Old Colony Church to Canada, see Plett, ed. *Old Colony Mennonites in Canada*, 45-72.

18. [Walter Scott], Memorandum for Mr. Calder, marked "Confidential," 2 Sept. 1908, File Ed. 12 d., SAB.

19. "Inquiry at Warman," 74-75.

20. "Inquiry at Warman," 93, 95.

21. "Inquiry at Warman," 75.

22. "Inquiry at Warman," 95-96.

23. "Inquiry at Warman," 62-63.

24. "Inquiry at Warman," 96.

25. "Inquiry at Warman,"96.

26. "Inquiry at Warman," 64-65.

27. "Inquiry at Warman," 67.

28. "Inquiry at Warman," 10, 29, 31.

29. "Inquiry at Warman," 87.

30. "Inquiry at Warman," 76.

31. "Inquiry at Warman," 67.

32. "Inquiry at Warman," 88.

33. "Inquiry at Warman," 68-69.

34. Jacob Wiens, Neuanlage, to Jakob Friesen, 20 Jan. 1908, File Ed. 12 d., SAB. The letters of excommunication for Isaac Mueller and I.P. Friesen are also included, the latter with the original letter in German script.

35. "Inquiry at Warman," 95.

36. Jakob Wiens, Neuanlage, Announcement of meeting, File Ed. 12 d., SAB. The summary given of the Scripture passages is mine.

37. "Inquiry at Warman," 71-72.

38. "Inquiry at Warman," 89-90.

39. Frank Epp, *Mennonites in Canada, 1786-1920: The History of a Separate People*, vol. 1 (Toronto: Macmillan, 1974; reprinted by Mennonite Historical Society of Canada, 1993), 338-339.

40. "Inquiry at Warman," 72.

41. "Inquiry at Warman," 65, 71.

42. Abraham Friesen, *In Defense of Privilege: Russian Mennonites and the State before and during World War I* (Winnipeg: Kindred Productions, 2006), 4-10.

43. "Inquiry at Warman," 20, 31.

44. "Inquiry at Warman," 75.

45. On the Mennonite involvement in political and legislative institutions in the early twentieth century in Canada, see James Urry, *Mennonites, Politics, and Peoplehood: Europe – Russia – Canada, 1525-1980* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2006), 161-183.

46. Jacob J. Friesen, Rosthern, to J. A. Calder, Regina, 1 Oct. 1908, File Ed. 12 d., SAB.

47. I.P. Friesen, Rosthern, to J. A. Calder, Regina, 27 July 1908, File Ed. 12 d., SAB.

48. "Inquiry at Warman," 86, 97.

49. Jacob Wiens, Neuanlage, to the Provincial Government of Saskatchewan, Regina, 21 January 1909, File Ed. 12 d., SAB.

50. I.P. Friesen, Rosthern, to Hon. Walter Scott, Regina, 20 Jan. 1909, File M1, IV, 57. Education: Foreign Schools, 1906-1916, Scott Papers, SAB.

51. [Walter Scott, Regina], to I.P. Friesen, Rosthern, 27 Jan. 1909, File M1, IV, 57. Education: Foreign Schools, 1906-1916, Scott Papers, SAB.

52. [Walter Scott, Regina], to J.E. Knipfel, Warman, 18 Jan. 1909, File M1, IV, 57. Education: Foreign Schools, 1906-1916, Scott Papers, SAB.

53. Janzen, *Limits on Liberty*, 103-112.

Commemorating the Contribution of John Webster Grant to Canadian Religious Historiography: Four Views

A session sponsored jointly by the Canadian Society of Church History and the Canadian Catholic Historical Association

---

John Webster Grant's Contributions to Aboriginal Historiography

SUSAN NEYLAN
Wilfrid Laurier University

Unlike perhaps some of you in this room, I never knew John Webster Grant; nor did have a good sense of the breadth of his work in terms of scholarship or his life of service in the United Church before coming across several of his works on field lists during my comprehensive exams in the mid-1990s. *Moon of Wintertime: Missionaries and the Indians of Canada in Encounter since 1534* was the first John Webster Grant book I read.[1] I recall the impression it made on me quite vividly, having read it so vigorously that the binding of the paperback edition I had borrowed from my supervisor actually fell apart, much to my chagrin. *Moon of Wintertime* appeared in 1984, the year he retired from being Professor of Church History at Emmanuel College at Victoria University in the University of Toronto, and while other scholarly publications followed, we can locate his interpretations of Aboriginal peoples and Christianity in encounter at the end of his very long career. It was an ambitious undertaking, one that only a mature scholar, well immersed in the scope of archival

sources and extremely knowledgeable on the range of literature on missionaries, churches, and Christianity in general, could even attempt. This paper situates Grant's work as a contribution to Aboriginal historiography in Canada, and traces a few paths that other scholars after him have picked up on and further developed. My discussion will focus on Grant with respect to two topics – Native agency in mission work and residential schools. On the former approach, Grant's work is a foundational study that echoed the broader trends in Canadian historical writing on First Nations. In terms of the latter topic of residential schools, Grant's research was published prior to the widespread public awareness of their negative legacy, and his reflections on the position of the churches and Aboriginals in Canada seems overly optimistic given the revelations that would soon follow.

For those of you unfamiliar with Grant's work on Aboriginal peoples and missionaries – *Moon of Wintertime*, a few additional articles on certain aspects of missions and prophet movements, and also his coverage of First Nations in his history of religion in nineteenth-century Ontario, *A Profusion of Spires*, which came out in 1988 and built further on the groundwork laid out in *Moon of Wintertime* – here is a summary of Grant's interpretations.[2] *Moon of Wintertime* is an overview of nearly 450 years of Christianizing Canada's First Nations, including nearly every denomination, missionary agency, or individual missionaries he could think of, covering First Nations from coast to coast. He had originally intended the work as a textbook of sorts, based mostly on secondary sources, but soon discovered that he was required "to do much of the spadework" himself.[3] As one reviewer remarked, "the breadth of the book is both its greatest strength and its greatest weakness." He covers a lot, avoiding "the pitfalls of narrow specialization at the expense of scholarly depth" – a survey and overview rather than an analysis in case studies, in other words.[4] He chose to exclude Métis and Inuit in his coverage, and most unfortunate, his book does not have a bibliography. However, we should not diminish the magnitude of his effort. While the literature existed in studies of individual missions, missionaries, religious orders, very few attempted such broad strokes as Grant. As a general history and reference book it is still remarkably useful, and it is worth saying there has been nothing comparable to *Moon of Wintertime* in the decades since, although there has been much scholarly interest in the topic of Native peoples and missions.

The central thesis of John Webster Grant's *Moon of Wintertime* and,

more or less, the chapter on indigenous religions in *A Profusion of Spires,* is that Aboriginal peoples accepted Christianity at a time when their own "traditional" beliefs were being challenged and fading away in the face of the influence of Euro-Canadian culture. "'Twas in the moon of winter time,/ when all the birds had fled / that mighty Gitchi Manitou/ sent angel choirs instead . . ." from J.E. Middleton's translation of Brebeuf's *A Huron Carol* encapsulates the notion held by other scholars of missions that there must be some level of cultural disruption or outright crisis before missions can be successful; new spiritual alternatives are only considered when the old ways are deemed to be no longer effective. On this point, I actually disagree with Grant – cultures can turn inwards at the sign of crisis, just as often as they can look outward for new powers – but I do appreciate that Grant is essentially pointing to colonialism (although he never uses that phrase) and the weight of its impact. Furthermore, his work is by no means uncritical and he does not shy away from phrases like "cultural genocide" in his assessment.[5] The missionaries arrived into this environment of flux intending to consciously and deliberately transform Native cultures, and thereby threw Native religion into crisis – so taking advantage of the opportunities afforded by the colonialist impact but also part of the process of colonialism itself. Another key and admirable aspect of Grant's interpretation is his insistence that First Nations were not helpless in this encounter, because that is precisely what is was – an encounter, maybe unexpected, but a meeting and exchange nonetheless between two parties (and frankly, missionaries often had a very uphill battle when they tried to merely impose their will on Native peoples).

Moon of Wintertime covers the missionary experience in beginning in New France, paying attention to the missions of the Récollets and the Jesuits among Native peoples of eastern Canada, and emphasizing that none operated separately from the influence of state and commercial interests of France. Among those groups targeted by the missionaries, "the presence of Europeans had long ceased to be a novelty when Christian missionaries made contact with them," and trade, depletion of game, and disease aggravated the "severe psychic shock" that Grant believed allowed for Christianity's reception.[6] Grant next moves through the colonial into the national periods, the dominance of overseas of missionary societies, and the development of a "civilizing and Christianizing" mission that despite differences between denominations, bore striking similarities in its approach to Native people by the 1800s. "By the late nineteenth-century evangelism and pastoral oversight were supplemented and sometimes

overshadowed by a network of auxiliary institutions that ultimately included schools, hospitals, and various agencies for social welfare."[7] This institutionalizing element received some earlier attention by Grant in shorter articles that examined the contributions made by a single denomination like the Methodists, or particular church organizations, such as the Women's Foreign Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church.[8]

By the twentieth century, in Grant's estimation, most missions entered a "holding pattern" stage and the roles Aboriginal Christians had taken in founding, fostering, directing, and supporting church institutions characteristic of earlier periods (especially the early nineteenth century) were long gone.[9] One of the book's weaknesses is perhaps, therefore, the short-shrift given to the twentieth century, and here Grant missed the opportunity to more deeply engage with themes such as gender, social Christian expressions, and ecumenicalism, although in this book he does give at least an outline of some of these topics. This reflects his obvious interest in the "heydays" of mission work – those periods of dynamic activity fostering Aboriginal commitments and striking leadership that Grant strongly located within a central Canadian context and as having occurred in the early nineteenth century.[10] Grant argues that despite new methods for mission work in the twentieth century (e.g. through the use radio or by employing airplane travel) and the involvement of new missionary groups (Pentecostals, Mennonites, Seventh Day Adventists, and Mormons), work with Native people declined until the post-World War II period ushered in new perspectives on Native rights (including an ecumenical movement more open to other spiritualities and the immediate need to address the very vocal Aboriginal criticism). By the 1960s, partnership, service, and integration rather than assimilation, marked the attempts to address what Grant still saw as the failing relationship with Native peoples.

The most provocative chapters, even from the standpoint of nearly a quarter century after he wrote *Moon of Wintertime*, are those that encapsulate Grant's genuine reflections and critical rethinking about the place of missions and mission work for Canada's First Nations. Optimistically Grant pronounces that Native rejection has not been directed to Christianity itself, but rather towards the threats it posed to Aboriginal culture.[11] Grant's final chapter boldly states: "Christianity is not a recent arrival but has been a factor in Indian life for almost four hundred years…Christianity has penetrated the Indian consciousness so deeply that in the long run it may prove as difficult to eradicate as the indigenous

traditions that have so often prematurely been pronounced moribund."[12] "Justice of native peoples," he concludes in *A Profusion of Spires,* "demands acknowledgement not only to the long reign of spirits of the land but of the traumatic effects of their displacement by Christian missionaries who in their zeal were frequently insensitive to the cultural wounds they were inflicting. By the late twentieth century too, it has become evident that despite their eclipse the spirits have not been totally dislodged."[13] Perhaps then, the older belief systems were not in their wintertime when those "choirs of angels" arrived to do mission work.

Where do we place Grant's interpretation of Native missions within the wider scholarship on Aboriginal history? For a long time, studies of missions among First Nations in North America were predicated on the assumption that Christianity and Aboriginal spiritualities were mutually exclusive, closed and self-contained religious expressions, almost always in opposition to one another. A classic work in this vein is Robert Berkhofer's *Salvation and the Savage* (1965) whereby Christianity is privileged as being superior, catching Native cultures at point of severe disruption or crisis, and its triumph over pre-existing Aboriginal belief systems regarded as inevitable.[14] As the missionization of Native peoples was often accompanied by European and Western associations, and frequently direct imperialism and colonization, another perspective says that indigenous societies by definition are those that exclude Christianity.[15] Indeed, Grant himself identified the "European associations of Christianity" as being both "the chief attraction" and "the most formidable obstacle to its acceptance. In many cases those who opted for it were, by the very act of conversion, consciously opting also for the adoption of a European mode of life."[16] Moreover, Grant meant European rather than Canadian lifestyles, as he argues in a 1978 article entitled, "Indian Missions as European Enclaves." Until the mid-nineteenth century Aboriginal missions were almost exclusively directed from overseas and only slowly was Christian outreach to First Nations made more of an internal operation in Canada, though never entirely.[17] By the 1980s, when *Moon of Wintertime* was published and gaining speed over decades since, scholars had increasingly challenged this notion of mutually exclusive separation (i.e., dichotomies) by considering the dialogic nature of the Native-Christian encounter.[18] This is not unique to examinations of the North American context and has elsewhere (e.g., for the African or South Pacific mission contexts) been touted as the "translatability school."[19] That is to say, a belief that Christianity can be translated, incorporated, and become an

integral part of an authentic indigenous identity, without wholly having to replace what came before.

Grant's work falls somewhere between these two poles. In what he calls the "pioneer stages" of missions to First Nations, there were points of meeting and even Native direction, but as he explains, by the late nineteenth century, a fairly fixed "classical pattern" of mission procedures (and assumptions about indigenous peoples) came to dominate.[20] Amidst this missionary paternalism and regulation, and aided by Canadian Indian policy (treaties, reserves, Indian Act) that similarly constrained and confined Aboriginal peoples, Native Christians had little input beyond the most local of contexts. The mutual exchange aspect of the encounter, according to Grant, was gone by the early twentieth century, and Grant considers this characteristic of mission work as the one most responsible for Aboriginal alienation from the churches, criticism, and a good deal of Native anger that permeated their response in the later half of the twentieth century.[21] "Indians," he writes, "have experienced the church as an institution constantly denigrating their culture and seeking to displace its values. It is not surprising, therefore, that recent expressions of Indian discontent have borne with special severity upon the churches."[22]

However, Grant's emphasis on Native agency brings him in line with wider developments occurring in Native historiography in general in the 1970s and 80s. Take fur trade historiography: Research in the 1970s and 80s on the native role in the fur trade altered the image of Aboriginal people from one in which they were presented as passive and historically unimportant participants in processes they could neither understand nor control, to an image of Natives as willing, shrewd, sophisticated, and historically decisive partners in commercial and social relationships over which they exerted considerable influence. Studies of mission history came to similar conclusions.[23] Scholars such as Cornelius Jaenen, James Axtell, and Bruce Trigger were leaders in the development of ethnohistory and frequently applied it to their study of missionization of Native peoples.[24] Ethnohistory is an approach to the study of Natives and newcomers in contact that considers textual, oral, and material sources in its analysis. James Axtell's "Some Thoughts on the Ethnohistory of Missions" (1982) called for an assessment of Native responses to Christian missions in as much detail as historians had hitherto invested in the examination of missionary goals and criteria.[25] Above all, the ethnohistory of missions should reveal that Christianity was an important part of that post-contact Native past, whether through resistance against, conversion

to, or the various reactions that fell between. Axtell writes:

> It would be easy – and foolish – to lament this particular revitalizing break with their pre-Columbian past as a tragic loss of innocence for the Indians. It was indeed a loss for them, but not necessarily a tragic one. Only if we continue to see the pre-contact Indian as the only real Indian, as the "noble savage" in other words, can we mourn his [or her] loss of innocence. Only if we persist in equating courage with mortal resistance to the forces of change can we condemn the praying Indians as cultural cop-outs or moral cowards.[26]

Moon of Wintertime came to a similar conclusion; Christianity is part of Aboriginal history and culture. Grant's work is an otherwise traditional, descriptive, documentary-based history, and therefore more reliant on Euro-Canadian evidence over Aboriginal sources, privileging male Euro-Canadian perspectives on religion.[27] That said, Grant also recognized that the next logic step was to consider "what conversion meant to the Indians who embraced Christianity."[28] "A realistic evaluation of Indian Christianity," he writes in his conclusion, "must take into account not only what the Indian made of Christianity but of what it did for them."[29] And indeed, I think other scholars have taken him up on this.

Endnotes

1. John Webster Grant, *Moon of Wintertime: Missionaries and the Indians of Canada in Encounter since 1534* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984).

2. John Webster Grant, "Indian Missions as European Enclaves," *Studies in Religion* 7, no. 3 (Summer 1978): 263-75; John Webster Grant, "Rendezvous at Manitowaning: The Scramble for Indian Souls," *Bulletin of the Committee on Archives and History of the United Church of Canada* 28 (1979): 22-34; John Webster Grant, "Missionaries and Messiahs in the Northwest," *Studies in Religion* 9, no. 2 (Spring 1980): 125-36; Grant, *Moon of Wintertime*; and John Webster Grant, *A Profusion of Spires: Religion in Nineteenth-Century Ontario,* Ontario Historical Studies Series for the Government of Ontario (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988).

3. Grant, *Moon of Wintertime*, vii.

4. Douglas Leighton, Review of John Webster Grant's *Moon of Wintertime*, in *Histoire Sociale/Social History* 18 (November 1985): 460.

5. Grant, *Moon of Wintertime*, 263.

6. Grant, *Moon of Wintertime,* 21.

7. Grant, *Moon of Wintertime,* 175.

8. John Webster Grant, "The Hunters Hunted: Methodists of Three Countries in Pursuit of the Indians of Canada;" and John Webster Grant, "Presbyterian Women and the Indians" typescript, John Webster Grant Fonds, #F14, Box 7, File 27 and File 28, Victoria University Library Special Collections, Toronto, ON. The latter appeared in the *Bulletin of the Committee on Archives and History of the United Church of Canada* (n.d.).

9. Grant, *Moon of Wintertime,* 197, 182.

10. This was particularly true of Upper Canada/Canada West/Ontario in the nineteenth century, where he claimed "Even in the process by which the bulk of the native inhabitants of the province came to accept Christianity the most dramatic events occurred early in the century, with the result that there is little of comparative interest to record about its later stages" (Grant, *A Profusion of Spires*, 221).

11. Grant, *Moon of Wintertime,* 263.

12. Grant, *Moon of Wintertime,* 264-5

13. Grant, *A Profusion of Spires*, 221.

14. Although none of these works argues the extreme position and certainly acknowledge an active role for Native peoples during the process of missionization, they tend to regard a strict separation between belief systems and points of opposition rather than points of meeting: Robert Berkhofer, Jr., *Salvation and the Savage: An Analysis of Protestant Missions and American Indian Responses, 1787-1862* (Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 1965); Elizabeth Graham, *Medicine Man to Missionary: Missionaries as Agents of Cultural Change Among the Indians of Southern Ontario, 1784-1867* (Toronto: Peter Martin Assoc., 1975); Cornelius Jaenen, *Friend and Foe: Aspects of French-American Cultural Contact in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976), although rejecting the poles of civilization/savagery in favour of acculturation; Robin Fisher, *Contact and Conflict: Indian-European Relations in British Columbia, 1774-1890* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1977); and Karen Anderson, *Chain Her By One Foot: The Subjugation of Women in Seventeenth Century New France* (London and New York: Routledge. 1995).

15. Terence Ranger criticizes the kind of circular logic that serves to distance parties rather than emphasize points of meeting in such definitions of indigenous societies (Ranger himself falling into the translatability school) in his "Christianity and Indigenous Peoples: A Personal Overview," *Journal of Religious History* 27, no. 3 (October 2003): 259-60; and Terence Ranger, "Christianity and the First Peoples: Some Second Thoughts," in Peggy Brock, ed. *Indigenous Peoples and Religious Change* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005), 21.

16. Grant, *Moon of Wintertime*, 244.

17. Grant, "Indian Missions as European Enclaves," 270.

18. For example, James Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Context of Cultures in Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); Grant, *The Moon of Wintertime*; Jean-Guy Goulet, "Religious Dualism Among Athapaskan Catholics," *Canadian Journal of Anthropology* 3, no.1 (Fall 1982): 1-18; Donald B. Smith, *Sacred Feathers: the Reverend Peter Jones (Kahkewaquonaby) & the Mississauga Indians* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987); Clarence Bolt, *Thomas Crosby and the Tsimshian: Small Shoes for Feet Too Large* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 1992); Kerry Abel, *Drum Songs: Glimpses of Dene History* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993); Martha McCarthy, *From the Great River to the Ends of the Earth: Oblate Missions to the Dene, 1847-1921* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press and Western Canadian Publishers, 1995); James Treat, ed., *Native and Christian: Indigenous Voices on Religious Identity in the United States and Canada* (New York and London: Routledge, 1996); Raymond Huel, *Proclaiming the Gospel to the Indians and the Metis* (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1996); Brett Christophers, *Positioning the Missionary: John Booth Good and the Confluence of Cultures in Nineteenth Century British Columbia* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1998); Sergei Kan, *Memory Eternal: Tlingit Culture and Russian Orthodox Christianity through Two Centuries* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1999); Lee Irwin, ed., *Native American Spirituality: A Critical Reader* (Lincoln, NE: Nebraska University Press, 2000); Susan Neylan, *The Heavens are Changing: Nineteenth-Century Protestant Missions and Tsimshian Christianity* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003); and Clara Sue Kidwell, Homer Noley, and George E. Tinker, *A Native American Theology* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2005).

19. Ranger, "Christianity and Indigenous Peoples," 259; See also Jean and John Comaroff, *Of Revelation and Revolution: Christianity Colonialism and Consciousness in South Africa Vol. I* and *The Dialectics of Modernity on a South African Frontier Vol II* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991 &

1997); and Robert W. Hefner, ed., *Conversion to Christianity: Historical and Anthropological Perspectives on the Great Transformation* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993).

20. Grant, *Moon of Wintertime*, 170. Grant also paradoxically concludes: "Despite the existence of many common elements of program the Christian mission to the Indians was far from monolithic. Each agency had an ethos that was not quite identical with that of any other. Each individual brought a set of convictions, talents, and sometimes idiosyncrasies that make generalization difficult and dangerous" (226).

21. Grant, *Moon of Wintertime,* 264-6.

22. Grant, *Moon of Wintertime,* 258.

23. Kerry Abel identified Ray along with the likes of Robin Fisher and Sylvia Van Kirk as authors of path-breaking books of the first wave of Native historiography in Canada. Kerry Abel, "Tangled, Lost, and Bitter? Current Directions in the Writing of Native History in Canada," *Acadiensis* 26 (Autumn 1996): 92. But the scholarly list of such "path-breakers" goes much further: Arthur J. Ray, *Indians in the Fur Trade: Their Role as Hunters, Trappers and Middlemen in the Lands Southwest of Hudson Bay 1660-1870* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1974); John S. Milloy, *The Plains Cree: Trade, Diplomacy and War 1790 to 1870* (Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press 1988), which was derived from a MA thesis completed at Carleton University in 1972; John E. Foster, "The Country-Born in the Red River Settlement: 1820-1850" (Ph.D. diss., University of Alberta, 1973); Sylvia Van Kirk, *'Many Tender Ties': Women in Fur-Trade Society in Western Canada, 1670-1870* (Winnipeg: Watson & Dwyer 1980) based on her PhD dissertation completed at the University of London in 1975; and Jennifer S.H. Brown, *Strangers in Blood: Fur Trade Company Families in Indian Country* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia 1980), likewise derived from her PhD dissertation completed at the University of Chicago in 1976.

24. Berkhofer, *Salvation and the Savage*; Cornelius J. Jaenen, *Friend and Foe: Aspects of French-Amerindian Cultural Contact in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976); James P. Ronda, "'We Are Well As We Are': An Indian Critique of Seventeenth Century Christian Missions," *William and Mary Quarterly,* 3d ser., 34 (Jan 1977): 66-82; James Axtell, *The Invasion Within*; and Bruce G. Trigger, *Natives and Newcomers: Canada's "Heroic Age" Reconsidered* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1985).

25. James Axtell, "Some Thoughts on the Ethnohistory of Missions," *Ethno History* 29, no. 1 (1982): 35-41. He later expanded upon similar themes throughout Axtell, *The Invasion Within.*

26. Axtell, "Ethnohistory of Missions," 37. The issue of representation (self-representation, mis-representation), particularly concerning Native spiritualities, is a hotly debated, highly politicized one among academics and Native writers and activists (see the Special Issue of the *American Indian Quarterly* devoted to this and related themes, which includes Lee Irwin, ed., "The Hear the Eagles Cry: Contemporary Themes in Native American Spirituality," *American Indian Quarterly* 20, nos. 3-4 [Summer & Fall 1996]; see also Arif Dirlik, "The Past as Legacy and Project: Post-Colonial Criticism in the Perspective of Indigenous Historicism," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 20, no. 2 [1996]: 1-31).

27. Interest in gender and the experience of both missionary and missionized has received recent attention from Eleanor Leacock, "Montagnais Women and the Jesuit Program for Colonization," in *Women and Colonization: Anthropological Perspectives,* ed. Mona Etienne and Eleanor Leacock (Brooklyn, NY: J. F. Bergin Publishers and Praeger Publishing, 1980), 25-42; Karen Anderson, "Commodity Exchange and Subordination: Montagnais-Naskapi and Huron Women, 1600-1650," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 2, no. 1 (Autumn 1985): 48-62; Anderson, *Chain Her by One Foot*; and Natalie Zemon Davis, "Iroquois Women, European Women," in *Women, "Race" and Writing in the Early Modern Period,* ed. Margo Hendricks and Patricia Parker (London & New York: Routledge, 1994), 243-58; Adele Perry, *On the Edge of Empire: Gender, Race, and the Making of British Columbia, 1849-1871* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001); and Myra Rutherdale, *Women and the White Man's God: Gender and Race in the Canadian Mission Field* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2002).

28. Grant, *Moon of Wintertime,* 249.

29. Grant, *Moon of Wintertime,* 251.

The Contribution of John Webster Grant to Protestant Religious Historiography

PAUL R. DEKAR
Memphis Theological Seminary

As I have thought about the contribution of John Webster Grant specific to Protestant religious historiography, three themes come to mind. First, John Webster Grant laid foundations for our work as historians of Canadian Christianity. B.G. (Before Grant), historians emphasized that much of what Canadians did religiously was derivative. Protestantism was little more than a faith transplanted to Canada.[1] A.G. (After Grant), historians have highlighted Canadian themes such as the experience of church union, social Christianity, and the role of the churches in shaping a national identity, and a periodization specific to Canada.

In his 1968 Presidential Address to the Canadian Society of Church History, a paper entitled "The Reaction of WASP Churches to Non-Wasp Immigrants," Grant highlighted three themes. First, the response of Canadians to immigration helped crystallize vague suggestions of church union into a definite proposal for action. Second, Canadian Protestants were more radical than their American or European counterparts in shaping the church's social involvement during the Depression. Third, Canadianization was central to the work of Canadian Protestants. Now commonplace, these ideas were sufficiently controversial at the time that several academic journals rejected the paper which is known only through the pages of the annual *Canadian Society of Church History Papers*.[2]

Surveying our annual publication and several years of *Studies in Religion-Sciences Religieuses*, I am struck by the paucity of references to Grant. I have concluded that this is because many of the talks, articles, books, and anthologies he edited are used primarily as textbooks or as a springboard from which we undertake specialized and interdisciplinary work. That his work is a benchmark is given, and, outside Canada, historians regard Grant's *The Church in the Canadian Era* and *A Profusion of Spires: Religion in Nineteenth-Century Ontario* as "basic."[3]

This leads to my second point. While Grant did ground-breaking work, his perspective reflected something of a "Protestant consensus." Grant did not ignore Baptists, Lutherans, Orthodox, or members of other denominations. He broadened the field by including women, Native and Black Canadians. But he did concentrate on the Anglican, Catholic,

Methodist, and Presbyterian traditions as especially worthy of serious historical study, including how they actually have come to practice their faith and how their institutions have come to be.

In his twelfth lecture in the course "Religion in Canada," offered at Emmanuel College in the fall of 1990 six years after his retirement, Grant spoke of a "confusion of religious tongues." He opined, "My impression is that conservative evangelicalism may have peaked." While this remained a "live option for many Christians," Grant identified conservative Christians as those who watch the television evangelists and saw Canadians generally as highly secular. He seems not to have anticipated a broad spiritual awakening that may have already begun to emerge.[4]

In surveying the papers published by the Canadian Society of Church History, I found several colleagues, including some present here, who gently, but rightly chided Grant for his emphasis on the "mainstream." For example, Darren Dochuk faulted Grant for his treatment of premillenialists as religious fanatics; and Bruce L. Guenther corrected Grant for identifying the majority of William Aberhart's supporters as alienated evangelicals.[5]

My third point highlights Grant's commitment to the mission of the church, a theme highlighted in the Grant festschrift to which many CSCH members contributed.[6] In his 1949 Oxford D.Phil dissertation, later published as *Free Churchmanship in England 1870-1940*, Grant identifies the "free churches" (Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians) as an "expression of Calvin's side of the Reformation."[7] During the years studied, the nonconformist conscience was a power in the land, fuelling the social gospel movement and triumph of political democracy. [8]

During the 1957-8 academic year, Grant was Visiting Professor at the United Theological College of South India in Bangalore, India. That visit led to the publication a year later of *God's People in India,* a book that explored the difficulty of transplanting Christianity from one environment to another in a way that releases creative power.[9]

A prolific scholar, Grant was finishing yet another book at the time of his death. With the collaboration of friends and colleagues, he completed *Divided Heritage: The Presbyterian Contribution to the United Church of Canada*, published posthumously by Laverdure and Associates. Throughout the manuscript, we see Grant as maker and not simply interpreter of Protestant history.

Among autobiographical reminiscences, Grant describes growing up in Pictou, Nova Scotia, where he and his mother moved after his father

died of tuberculosis when John was two years old. Grant mentions family members who were missionaries. He honours them as representing the cutting edge of Christianity. Among these were the Grants of Trinidad, whose frequent furloughs made them and the island an integral part of his growing up. Among those who promoted Canadian Presbyterian missions were the members of the Women's Missionary Society. Grant observed, "I have no doubt that its active members were better informed about what was going on in various parts of the world than most members of Parliament."[10]

Grant's comment strikes me to be as true today as it was then. Moreover, I can attest personally to the importance of this outreach, for I have taught at St. Andrew's Presbyterian College in Trinidad, where the names of the Reverend and Mrs. Kenneth J. Grant are well remembered as founders of the congregation in San Fernando.[11]

For six months in 1949, Grant supplied the pulpit of the church in which he had grown up. Grant recalled, "Inevitably the town had changed. Most conspicuously many of the leisure activities now took place in a community centre that absorbed much of the time and energy that once had been devoted to the churches. One immediate result in this God-fearing town was that young people especially were busier than ever as they tried to do justice to both claimants on their time."[12]

From this or similar observations about other appointments, Grant described Presbyterian folkways with grace, insight, and feistiness. Recalling an assignment to the Evangelism and Social Service Committee of the Maritime Conference of the United Church not long after his ordination, Grant revised his views about resistance to church union. In an early publication, *The Canadian Experience of Church Union*, Grant stressed the greater awareness of ethnic origins and less coherent and disciplined organization of Canadian Presbyterians than either Methodists or Congregationalists as the root of opposition of many to church union.[13] At the end of his life Grant argued that, while many factors were involved, much of the resistance and the strength of the feelings it aroused were due not to specific features of the plan but to the distrust of unionists' motives and therefore nervousness about what the United Church would be like: "They [the opponents] could foresee a body careless about doctrine while insistent on conformity to a moral code, and they didn't like what they saw . . . a church not unlike the Methodism of the time."[14]

I predict that through this final book, Grant will inspire a fresh body of research, writing, and debate. This would be a fitting tribute to his

legacy. All of us who have studied Canadian Protestantism specifically, and religion in Canada generally, remain in his debt.

Poaching on John H. Young's tribute to John Webster Grant as a church leader, I observe that Grant was not an arcane historian. His empathy and appreciation of cultural diversity are apparent in his work as a member of United Church of Canada committees that dealt with issues such as evangelism, social service, and worship. In his 1990 report for the Working Group on the Changing Church, Grant offered trenchant warnings against "thoughtless change" and the need for ecumenical cooperation on such issues as the falling off of resources and the residential school scandals.[15]

Grant was a key member of the committee that planned *The Hymn Book* of the Anglican Church of Canada and the United Church of Canada. Published in 1971, it includes his setting to music of Psalm 122 and translation from Latin to English of four hymns that appear in recent hymnals.[16] Phyllis Airhart, Grant's successor at Emmanuel College, once heard him muse that this contribution might prove to be his most enduring legacy. If you take time to read them you can understand why. He had a gift for using words well, whether writing elegant academic prose, preparing coherent committee reports, or setting light verse to familiar hymn tunes.[17] It was a fitting tribute that, at a memorial service last December, congregants sang "O Holy Spirit, By Whose Breath."

A personal word may be in order. I began teaching Canadian church history in 1976. During department meetings of the Toronto School of Theology and at CSCH meetings, Grant was very supportive of me and other young scholars. As recently as July 2006, I taught at an Anglican school in Nunavut and used *Moon of Wintertime: Missionaries and the Indians of Canada in the Encounter since 1534*.[18] This book reflects our common interest in Christian mission as central to the wider story of Christian history.

Initially, when approached to make a presentation, I declined due to other commitments but left open a crack in the door. When asked a second time, I accepted because of my regard for one of the most gracious scholars I have known. My experience of John Webster Grant is congruent with that of others, as shared at these meetings, or in print.[19]

To close, if I had but one word to characterize John Webster Grant, it is integrity. He lived what he taught and created space in which he practiced obedience to truth. His legacy remains vibrant in the lives of relatives, former colleagues and students, even members the Trinidad

congregation he visited years ago, with whom I have talked to prepare this brief article, and in his many publications that broke ground we continue to till.

Endnotes

1. Neil Sutherland, "Introduction: Towards a History of English-Canadian Youngsters," in *Education and Social Change: Themes from Ontario's Past*, ed. Michael B. Katz and Paul H. Mattingly (New York: New York University Press, 1975), xii; and John S. Moir, "Religion," in *The Canadians 1867-1967,* ed. J.M.S. Careless and R. Craig Brown (Toronto: Macmillan, 1967), 601.

2. John S. Moir, "The Canadian Society of Church History – A Twenty-Year Retrospective," *Canadian Society of Church History Papers* (1979): 89.

3. Robert T. Handy, *A History of the Churches in the United States and Canada* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 442; and Mark A. Noll, *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992).

4. Course on Religion in Canada, lecture 12 "New Religious Movements," John Webster Grant Fonds, 2005.059V, Box 4, United Church of Canada/Victoria University Archives, Toronto, ON.

5. Darren Dochuk, "Redeeming the City," *Historical Papers: The Canadian Society of Church History* (2000): 68, n. 23; and Bruce L. Guenther, "Populism, Politics and Christianity in Western Canada," *Historical Papers: Canadian Society of Church History* (2000): 94-98.

6. John S. Moir and C. T. McIntire, eds., *Canadian Protestant and Catholic Missions, 1820s-1960s: Historical Essays in Honour of John Webster Grant* (New York: Peter Lang, 1988).

7. John Webster Grant, *Free Churchmanship in England 1870-1940 with Special Reference to Congregationalism* (London: Independent Press, 1958), 64.

8. Grant, *Free Churchmanship in England*, 394.

9. John Webster Grant, *God's People in India* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1959), vii.

10. John Webster Grant, *Divided Heritage: The Presbyterian Contribution to the United Church of Canada* (Yorkton, SK: Gravelbooks, 2007), 20.

11. Kenneth J. Grant, *My Missionary Memories* (Halifax, NS: Imperial Publishing Co., 1923); and Arthur Charles Dayfoot, *The Shaping of the West Indian Church 1492-1962* (Kingston, Jamaica: Press University of the West Indies, 1999).

12. Grant, *Divided Heritage*, 22-23.

13. John Webster Grant, *The Canadian Experience of Church Union* (London: Lutterworth, 1967), 54-55.

14. Grant, *Divided Heritage*, 200-201.

15. "Working Group," John Webster Grant Fonds, 2005.059V, Box 5, File 20. United Church of Canada/Victoria University Archives, Toronto, ON.

16. "#17, With Joy We Go Up to the House of the Lord"; "#246, O Holy Spirit, By Whose Breath" (#200, *Voices United*; #501 of *The Hymnal* of the Episcopal Church in the United States); "#248, Holy Spirit, Font of Light" (#228, *The Hymnal*); "#445, The Flaming Banners" (#161, *The Hymnal*); "#500, King of the Martyrs' Noble Band" (#236, *The Hymnal*).

17. Phyllis Airhart, "Memorial" entered into the minutes of the Senate of Victoria University, April 2007.

18. John Webster Grant, *Moon of Wintertime: Missionaries and the Indians of Canadian in the Encounter since 1534* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984); Dr. Grant signed my copy.

19. For example, letter of Sharon Wilson, *United Church Observer* 70, no. 8 (March 2007): 8.

Reflections on John Webster Grant's Influence on Catholic Historiography in Canada

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

The title of this short paper may be very baffling to many observers of Canadian religious history. John Webster Grant has been celebrated as one of the pioneer church historians in Canada for a corpus of research that was primarily concerned with the developments in Canadian Protestantism. This career began in the military in 1943, when he served on the Wartime Information Board, where he wrote on subjects germane to non-Roman Catholic Churches. John Grant never wrote a book or paper on an overtly and singularly Roman Catholic subject (although the first three chapters of *Moon of Wintertime* were effectively on Catholic missions in New France);[1] he did not, as a rule, attend sessions of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association, except during joint sessions with the Canadian Society of Church History, and his writing was almost exclusively in English, thus creating certain linguistic barriers between his work and the majority of Canadian historians studying Catholic history in this country. Given this litany of incongruities between the two principal subjects of this paper, perhaps I had better cease and desist in this line of thought.

Bear with me for a few moments and it may appear that there was method in my madness, and that the relationship between Grant's work and Canadian Catholic historiography is not such a far fetched idea. Significance is sometimes measured in odd ways. John Webster Grant's writings emerged from a period of great hope for the Canadian churches and the optimism inspired by the ecumenical movement of the 1950s and 1960s, as energized significantly by the work of the World Council of Churches and the declarations of the Second Vatican Council; this remarkable era provides an initial point of convergence between our two subjects. Secondly, historians of the Catholic tradition, particularly an emerging generation of professionally trained scholars in English Canada, could not help but become enamored by the quality of Grant's scholarship. As American historian Robert Handy cited, in a volume celebrating Grant, in 1988: "His appreciation for historical accuracy, theological flexibility, cultural diversity, and human empathy with every concrete situation make this work endure as a benchmark for its genre."[2] This type of critical

acclaim spoke volumes to a new generation of religious historians, many of whom were members of both the Canadian Catholic Historical Association and the Canadian Society of Church History. Thirdly, his three most significant monographs of his mid-and late career – *The Church in the Canadian Era* (1972; reprinted 1988) *Moon of Wintertime* (1984), and *A Profusion of Spires* (1988) – provided sweeping narratives of religious history that departed significantly from the biographical and denominationally-focused studies of the past. In this way, Grant's work helped to create a new environment wherein the writing of Canadian religious history was grounded in the grand sweep of Canadian history, and pushed Catholicism into the main narrative in a serious and scholarly way. This rethinking of the way in which "church history" was written provided the appropriate trans-denominational contexts in which Roman Catholicism found itself as a significant player among other churches across both regions and time periods. If one, however, is looking for a most tangible link one might find it by turning to Hymn 305 in the first edition of the *Catholic Book of Worship*. There one would discover "O Holy Spirit, By Whose Breath," to the music of Eisenach, with lyrics by John Webster Grant.[3]

John Grant's Great Ecumenical Project

John Grant's status as a United Church minister and his early fascination for the great ecumenical projects of the twentieth century were undeniable. In 1956, the appearance of his first book, *World Church: Achievement or Hope* signaled a deep and abiding interest in ecumenism and signaled an early thrust of his scholarship. Grant became known for his articles and books on the United Church of Canada, its founders, and its perceived mission. Rooted in an ecumenical tradition, inspired further, perhaps, by the developments at Vatican II in its declarations *Unitatis Redintegratio* (1964) and *Nostra Aetate* (1965), and surrounded by the optimism of the 1960s, it is not difficult to see why – as an historian – Grant would use his writing to build bridges between Christian groups, where few had existed before.

In their monumental multi-authored edition of *The Oxford History of the Christian Church in Canada*, Terrence Murphy and Roberto Perin (both historians of Catholic Christianity in Canada) identified this ecumenical concern as one of the salient themes within Grant's edition of a series of three volumes titled *The Christian Church in Canada*.

Commenting on Grant and his two co-authors H.H. "Nick" Walsh and Grant's lifelong friend and colleague John S. Moir, Murphy and Perin observed:

> In addition, the *History of the Christian Church in Canada* reflected the ecumenical spirit of the 1960s and 1970s and the intense preoccupation with Canadian identity which was characteristic of that era: the use of "church" instead of "churches" in the title signaled the authors' commitment to the ideal of Christian unity; and one of their central concerns was to identify what was distinctively Canadian about Christianity in the country.[4]

Grant's concern for all of the Christian churches and the common experiences they shared in Canada came at an interesting transitional point in Canadian religious historiography; John Moir has demonstrated that, until the mid twentieth century, our field of study had been dominated by providential approaches to history, denominational studies that scarcely looked beyond the walls of one's own congregation of communion, and rather pious biographies of clergy. When reflecting on the state of the craft at the 50th anniversary of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association, Moir confessed:

> Canadian Religious History in forms other than biography also seems to suffer from the same distortion [no denomination really wants to hear about the humanness of its particular saints]. In past denominationalism projected into history gave the reader so often the impression that the only Christians, perhaps the only humans, to inhabit Canada were members of "Denomination X."[5]

Grant had recognized this himself and had tipped his hand using a case from the history of Canadian missions. In his introduction to Moir's *The Cross in Canada*, Grant's thoughts could have been applied equally to the religious historiography of Canada in an earlier time:

> Similar as the churches of nineteenth-century Canada may appear to students of another era, contemporaries were most aware of their differences. The early mission to Canada was consciously conceived as so many separate missions to Canada, intersecting only at points of mutual irritation. It is actually possible to read the journals of some early missionaries without suspecting that any others were at work in

> the same region, for Canadian life outside the sphere of God's chosen emissaries is described to us in terms of complete spiritual destitution. Denominational conflict seemed to be the primary phenomenon, while the underlying unity of purpose was sensed only by a few leaders in moments of unusual clarity.[6]

Grant helped to change this. In his major works Grant was expert at pulling together the disparate parts of the Christian church together under one roof. Grant's own contribution to the Centennial trilogy, the third and final volume titled *The Church and the Canadian Era*, offered a sweeping overview that included all churches, and a careful eye to the developments of the Church in Quebec and how these related to other parts of the country. Upon reflection, the trilogy, and for that matter *Moon of Wintertime* and *Profusion of Spires* provided broad frameworks for the consideration of Christian development in Canada (or in the case of the latter, Ontario), or perhaps, what Paul Dekar once referred to as "the outer story."[7] In each of the major works Catholic and Protestant could be seen cheek-by-jowl with one another, working on their various enterprises in full knowledge of, admiration for, and, sometimes, hostility to the other.[8] An excellent example of this integration, or contextualizing the traditions, emerged in chapter eight of *A Profusion of Spires*, wherein Grant summarizes each of the Ultramontane movement, Tractarianism, and the Great Disruption in the Scottish Kirk as particular responses to the encroachment of the state on religious life.[9] In a sweeping analysis, Grant crossed denominations, demonstrated points of intersection, and discussed the transfer of ideas and movements from a European metropolis to a Canadian hinterland. Likewise, in the trilogy, Grant and his colleagues had provided a similar narrative structure inclusive of the major issues facing each of the Christian traditions, thus providing scholars young and old with fertile ground for rethinking the past and the posing of imaginative questions; as new generations of historians moved forward in their work, they would help to reveal the "inner stories" by means of thematic studies, denominationally-based studies on themes, or micro-historical studies. For Catholics, these works by Grant, Moir, and Walsh helped break down the silos in the historiography and encouraged some historians of Catholicism to see their own historiography in a different way.

The Canadian Society of Church History

In practical terms Grant's role as one of the founders of the Canadian Society of Church history in 1960 also enabled Catholic historians to come out of the cloister. Open to scholars of all denominations or no denominations, the CSCH served and continues to serve as an embodiment of what Grant and other founders had hoped for: a meeting of the minds on questions germane to the study of Canada's religious history. Although the Society functioned primarily in English (with joint sessions with French in 1987 in Hamilton, in 1989 at Laval and 1993 in Ottawa) and a majority of members were studying the numerous Protestant groups in the country, there was, and continues to be, many members of the society who study Canada's Catholic churches; co-operation was also evident when in "every-other-year" at the Learneds/Congress, the Canadian Society of Church History and the Canadian Catholic Historical Association, would meet in a joint session. There are numerous historians and archivists who are members of each.

In some small way this Society was an extension of Grant's abiding interest in the ebb and flow of religious history wherein all groups could be seen within the context of one another and, in these encounters, scholars could present and study themes that were trans-denominational in character, regionally specific, or grounded in one particular point of time. Moreover, the Society was a window on the transition that was taking place in the craft as the dominance of church historians who were professors of divinity, or active clerics, began to give way to a stronger representation of scholars who were trained in, or currently taught in departments of history, religion, or one of the social sciences. Whether conscious or oblivious to these developments, those studying the history of the Catholic Church in Canada have much to thank Grant for seeing the "big picture" and helping to foster these scholarly interchanges.

I for one am grateful. In 1968 his Presidential address to the CSCH was titled "The Reaction of Wasp Churches to non-Wasp Immigrants." It was a crisp and concise essay on how Protestant Canadians attempted to deal with the religious and cultural "others" who flocked to Canadian shores during the Laurier-Borden Period. Setting forth a template of Protestant responses that were categorized as a threat to church and society, a call to evangelize the *papist* and Orthodox hordes, and the challenge to maintain the values and virtues of Victorian Canada, Grant invited scholars to explore Catholic-Protestant-Orthodox relations in a new

and innovative way. I took up the gauntlet, under the watchful eye of Grant's colleague John Moir, and began the study of Ukrainians of the Byzantine Catholic Rite, their migration to Canada, and their interaction with Protestants and Latin Rite Catholics. There were other graduate students similarly engaged by Grant's probing questions and pleasant personal manner.

Grant's Work and "the Big Picture"

Finally, I would like to return to the three works that I consider important invitations to expand our historiography and discover the inner stories of Canadian Christianity, and Canadian religion for that matter. In Grant's major books, not only were all the varieties of Christianity gathered into one tent, facing and encountering their similarities and differences, they were also cast expertly within the context of their times. In *Moon of Winter Time, Church in the Canadian Era,* and *Profusion of Spires*, Grant was careful to engage the development of churches with the ebb and flow of life in Canada. It did not seem possible, having read Grant's sweeping approaches to religious history – which by and large were historical narrative with pointed themes running throughout the chronological approach – that historians of religion in Canada, let alone researchers of any specific denomination, could write their history without a sense of the history of Canada writ large. Grant appeared sensitive to the manner in which religious concerns were woven into the fabric of general historical developments, or how religion itself was transformed by social, economic, and political variables in the world around it, and vice-versa. Canadian religious historians would by necessity have to be better Canadian historians. Church history, in this sense, was not necessarily just another handmaiden to theology. For Canadian historians to appreciate fully the historical importance of religion in Canadian life, religious or "church" historians would have to do a much better job engaging the historiographical debates within the discipline and the changing trends afoot among mainstream Canadian historians.

In the wake of the 1960s and the reformulation of Canadian religious historiography by Grant and others, there has been a notable difference in the way in which the history of the Catholic Church in Canada has been approached. First, it has become increasingly clear that historians of Canadian Catholicism, by necessity, must transcend the linguistic divide and recognize the key relationships that existed within

Canadian Catholicism between Francophones, Anglophones, and Allophones. Moreover, as Grant's sweeping narratives indicated, there is more to Canada than central Canada. Those working in the Catholic historiography have had to become more aware of the need to break away from narrowly constructed studies of individuals, religious orders, and topical issues in Canadian Catholicism, and instead have set their research against the broad canvass of Canadian history. Terry Fay's recent survey *A History of Canadian Catholics: Gallicanism, Ultramontanism, and Canadianism* (2002) comes to mind as a Grant-style work, weaving together disparate players, salient themes, and the integration of religion (in this case Catholicism) with other aspects of Canadian society. What results is a concern for readers to not only appreciate the broad strokes of Canadian Catholic history, but to propose new points of departure, foster new research, and stimulate scholarly debate. Although Grant was neither the first to be conscious of the Canadian historical panorama, nor was necessarily the most effective, his major synthetic works set serious benchmarks for all those who would follow. If religion was to be taken seriously as a variable in Canada's historical development, it would have to be written with an attention to the sweep of Canadian history itself. Research and work by Terrence Murphy, Brian Clarke, Brian Hogan, Gerald Stortz, Vicki Bennett, Roberto Perin, Luca Codignola, Raymond Huel, John Zucchi, Robert Choquette, Elizabeth Smyth, Paula Maurutto, and Mark McGowan, reflect the need to see Canadian Catholic history as an integral part of Canadian religious history and Canadian history as a whole.

Perhaps these reflections have been entirely too personal, but to some extent I have been part of the historical generation most affected by the broad brush strokes painted by Grant and Moir. When I joined the CSCH in 1984 and attended my first meeting of the Society in Guelph, there was a different cast of historical characters in the audience; the presence of Moir and Grant loomed large over the room, even though they did not give papers. Where it showed most was in the question and answer session after every paper: their questions made you think, pushed your brain harder, and invariably challenged your historical certainties. John Webster Grant helped to open doors and open minds; historians of the Catholic Church in Canada are in his debt.

Endnotes

1. John Webster Grant, *Moon of Wintertime: Missionaries and the Indians of Canada in Encounter since 1534* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 3-70.

2. Robert T. Handy, "Foreword," in *Canadian Protestant and Catholic Missions 1820s-1960s: Historical Essays in Honour of John Webster Grant*, ed. John S. Moir and C.T. McIntire (New York: Peter Lang, 1988), ix.

3. *Catholic Book of Worship* (Ottawa: Canadian Catholic Conference, 1972).

4. Terrence Murphy and Roberto Perin, ed., *A Concise History of Christianity in Canada* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1996), ix.

5. John S. Moir, "Coming of Age, But Slowly: Canadian Religious Historiography since Confederation," *CCHA Study Sessions* 50 (1983) I: 91.

6. John Webster Grant, "Introduction," in *The Cross in Canada*, ed., John S. Moir (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1966), x.

7. Paul Dekar, "Church History of Canada: Where From Here?" *Canadian Society of Church History Papers* (1980): 11-20.

8. See *A Profusion of Spires: Religion in Nineteenth-Century Ontario*, Ontario Historical Studies Series (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), 67.

9. Grant, *A Profusion of Spires*, 118-34.

John Webster Grant and His Place in The United Church of Canada

JOHN H. YOUNG
Queen's Theological College

The title of my presentation, as it appears listed in the programme, is slightly misleading. I intend to talk about John Webster Grant's contribution to the United Church. I am not examining Grant as a "Church Leader" *per se*, but Grant as an individual who gave very significant leadership within The United Church of Canada. I want to look at five areas, some more briefly than others. I want to begin by acknowledging, albeit very briefly, Grant's role as a teacher. Then I shall examine his role in the production of the red *Hymn Book* that the United and Anglican Church co-published in 1971. Third, I wish to address some aspects of his very significant leadership role in the union talks that attempted to bring together The Anglican Church of Canada, the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), and the United Church. Fourth, I shall give some attention to his scholarly work that focussed upon the history of the United Church. Finally, I shall examine some of his United Church-related writing and speaking after his retirement from Emmanuel College. Grant did some significant reflection in these years, both in addresses and in essays, on what he saw as both the strengths and the weaknesses of the denomination he loved a great deal. In those retirement years he was sought out by some who exercised leadership in the United Church for the wisdom and the insight he could impart.

I begin with a brief biographical comment. John Webster Grant was raised in Pictou County, Nova Scotia, and his roots ran deep in the Presbyterianism that was such a dominant force in Pictou County. Church Union, which occurred when Grant was six years old, may have made many of these congregations United Church in name, but they continued to reflect strongly their Presbyterian heritage. Grant was shaped by that experience in many ways, not least in his attention to the intellectual dimension of Christian life and practice, his carefully reasoned approach to issues within the United Church, and his valuing of the tradition of the wider church.

John Webster Grant contributed to the United Church in many ways. First, he played a significant role as a teacher. When thinking of Grant as a teacher, the tendency is to focus on his twenty-one years (1963-1984) as

the professor of church history at Emmanuel College in Toronto. But he also spent one year at Pine Hill Divinity Hall in Halifax, nine years at Union College in Vancouver, and a year at the United College of South India and Ceylon. In other words, he taught for over thirty years at one or another of the United Church's theological schools. He would have taught about thirty-five per cent of the ministers the United Church ordained during those twenty-one years at Emmanuel. In that sense alone, he had a significant role in shaping the pastoral body of the United Church.

I have talked with some persons who studied under Grant during those years at Emmanuel. Three characteristics stand out for them – first, Grant's deep passion for the United Church; second, his gentle, gracious manner; third, his deep concern for his students, for whom he made time. They also remember an unassuming figure who did not call attention to himself. I suspect that many who studied under him did not realize the extent of his involvement in denominational matters during the 1960s and 1970s.

Hymnody represents a second key area of John Webster Grant's contribution to the United Church. The General Council that met in 1962 appointed Grant to the "Church Worship and Ritual Committee,"[1] but his primary role within the committee was as a member of the sub-committee that began work in 1963 on a revision to the United Church *Hymnary*, the then-existing United Church hymnal that dated back to 1930. The sub-committee charged with producing a new hymn book for the denomination reported to the General Council that met in 1964. In their report it was noted that "The Rev. Dr. John Grant of Emmanuel College has made a thorough study of the hymnody of Chas. Wesley."[2] In terms of the breadth of material he had to cover (Charles Wesley wrote some 6500 hymns), Grant drew the "short straw" on the revision committee. By 1966, in light of the acceptance by both the Anglican Church and the United Church of the "Principles of Union" developed in 1965, the two denominations agreed to publish a joint hymnal. Grant continued his involvement not only as one of the fifteen United Church representatives on the joint Anglican-United Church committee that produced the 1971 H*ymn Book* but also as a writer and translator of hymns. The 1971 *Hymn Book* included four of his translations of medieval Latin hymns. It also contained a hymn he wrote that was based on Psalm 122. Grant, throughout his career, had a concern to emphasize to the United Church its relation to, and its debt to, the wider Christian tradition; his contribution to the *Hymn Book* as a translator and an author reflects that concern. By

way of a tangential note, it speaks to the inevitable changes in time and taste in hymnody that only one of those hymns – his translation of the 9th century Latin hymn, "O Holy Spirit, by Whose Breath" – is included in the current United Church hymnal, *Voices United*, which succeeded the *Hymn Book* in 1995.

Grant's third contribution to the United Church was his leadership in ecumenical endeavours in general and in the union discussions among the Anglican Church, the United Church, and the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) in particular. When the national governing bodies of the Anglican and United Churches had accepted the "Principles of Union" in 1965 and 1966 respectively – the involvement of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) began when that denomination joined these talks in 1970 – the two denominations then appointed members to a general commission charged with developing a plan upon which the then two denominations could unite. Grant served on that general commission on union from its initial meeting in 1967. More significantly, he chaired its Executive Committee. He was also to chair the committee charged with developing the "Plan of Union."[3] During this time he became a key spokesperson within the United Church explaining the process toward union.[4]

Grant's commitment to, and passion for, these tri-denominational union discussions comes through in his own published reflections on the unsuccessful effort to bring the three churches together. In an article published in 1983, he described the culmination of his work as the chair of the committee that drafted the *Plan of Union*.

The final session of the general commission, held in the Queen of Apostles Renewal Centre at Mississauga, Ontario, from 13 to 16 November 1972, stands out as one of the most memorable experiences of my life. It was my responsibility, as chairperson of the drafting committee, to stand before the commission for several days, from early morning until late evening, answering questions and receiving suggestions, and then to meet the committee each night to consider possible revisions. No one could have been more thrilled when at the conclusion, the entire commission, including several prominent members of the House of Bishops, rose to endorse the *Plan of Union* and to sing the customary doxology.[5] While the failure of the three denominations to unite caused Grant much disappointment, it neither embittered him nor reduced his commitment to ecumenism.

Many United Church persons, ministry personnel and lay people,

who did not study with John Webster Grant, have experienced his contribution to the United Church through his fourth area of contribution, namely, his scholarly work on the denomination's history. I would in no sense be alone in that group in saying that I have been shaped in my understanding of my denomination's tradition and its place in the wider Christian tradition by his writing. His analysis of the movement that led to the creation of the United Church, namely his 1967 book, *The Canadian Experience of Church Union*,[6] still stands, in my judgement, as the most cogent book-length analysis of the church union movement that focuses on why and how this event came to happen in such an apparently unlikely place as Canada. Over the years, he published articles and delivered lectures that sought to demonstrate the crucial role late nineteenth-century Protestant liberal evangelicalism played in bringing the United Church into being. In an era when the term "evangelical" has come to have a very different meaning, particularly in popular parlance, Grant wanted contemporary United Church members to see their roots in the pan-Protestant evangelical tradition of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He believed that one could not understand "the founding vision" of The United Church of Canada without an awareness of that tradition. While Grant was unfailingly gracious and generous, he also expressed anxiety about the rather cavalier attitude towards history and tradition he frequently observed in United Church circles, and he sought to counteract it by making the denomination's history known and accessible.

The final area upon which I want to touch is his writing and addresses in the late 1980s and early 1990s,[7] addresses and writings directed to a United Church audience. I have always found it instructive of the regard in which Grant was held that in February 1989, the United Church's Division of Ministry Personnel and Education invited Grant to be their theme speaker at the Division's annual meeting. In light of the tension then existing in the United Church over the decision of the 1988 General Council that sexual orientation, in and of itself, did not constitute a barrier to ordination, the Division's leadership invited Grant to examine "the way our systems and structures, attitudes to scripture, authority, use of power, hierarchy or mutuality in ministry, etc., have affected our decision making."[8] Grant's addresses on that occasion represent, in my view, the best short analysis of the reasons for the tensions that had existed in the denomination for some time. Grant also offered, in his own self-deprecating way, some hints as to where he thought the United Church ought to go if it wished to reduce the unhealthy and divisive aspects of

those tensions.

Four points or themes are dominant in these addresses and in his other writings from this period directed to the United Church. First, in an observation he had already named as a weakness of the United Church when he wrote *The Canadian Experience of Church Union* in 1967, he asserted that the United Church, as a denomination, tended to focus on tasks, or on doing, rather than on giving attention to what it means to be a church. He asserted that as a denomination the United Church needed to become more self-critical, to ask who it was and who it wanted to be.

Second, he observed that a significant shift had taken place in the church's decision-making process. Whereas reason and logic in debate, following a carefully prepared presentation by experts that traced the denomination's past statements on the question, had been the method of bringing matters to church courts (and most especially to the General Council) up until the late 1960s, a change then occurred by which an issue or question was presented and the voting delegates were invited to reflect upon how they felt about the question. In the 1970s and 1980s at least, there was also a corresponding suspicion of expertise. Grant asserted that the United Church needed to achieve a balance between these left brain-right brain approaches to decision-making.

Third, he urged patience in decision-making. The only decisions that count, he averred, are ones the membership accepts. Adequate time for discussion and debate, not only at a meeting of the General Council but also throughout the church, might mean a slower pace for decision-making, but would probably also mean a more receptive and informed constituency.

Finally, he asserted that we needed to find a balance between flexibility and openness on the one hand and tradition, both our own and the wider Christian tradition, on the other. Too exclusive a focus on either would not produce a denomination with staying power. In his later writings from this period he appears to worry even more about what he called "the shortness of our memory" as a denomination.

It is too soon to assess the continuing effect of Grant's contributions to the United Church. That probably will require a panel such as this morning's sitting here twenty years or so from now. That said I shall make two observations. First, about a dozen years ago two of my faculty colleagues, then approaching retirement, commented to me that "your generation of teachers" in the UCC schools were more denominationally identified and paid more attention to "the tradition of the United Church"

than they had done. I do wonder whether Grant's emphasis on the need for denominational members and leaders to reflect more upon the tradition has been a factor for those of us who began teaching from the mid-1980s onward in United Church related theological schools. Second, when I teach a course in the history of the United Church, as I do from time to time, I have students read extensively from primary sources. But in the secondary sources I use, writings by John Webster Grant predominate. His works predominate because he offers those within the denomination some crucial insights into who we are and some thoughtful suggestions on how to approach our future. John Webster Grant contributed to the world of Canadian scholarship in so many ways, as the comments of other panellists today have made clear. He also contributed, in many and in diverse ways, to the particular denomination that was his ecclesiastical home.

Endnotes

1. United Church of Canada, *Record of Proceedings of the Twentieth General Council* (1962) (Toronto: United Church Publishing House 1962), 27.

2. United Church of Canada, *Record of Proceedings of the Twenty-first General Council* (1964) (Toronto: The United Church Publishing House, 1964), 438.

3. John Webster Grant, "Leading a Horse to Water: Reflections on Church Union Conversations in Canada" in ed. Horton Davies *Studies of the Church in History: Essays Honoring Robert S. Paul* (Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1983), 168.

4. For example, Grant was a member of a panel at a joint session in 1971 of the General Synod and the General Council to consider a first draft of the "Plan of Union." The panellists answered questions and provided background information. See United Church of Canada, *Record of Proceedings of the Twenty-fourth General Council* (1971) (Toronto: The United Church of Canada, 1971), 46.

5. "Leading a Horse to Water," 171-172.

6. John Webster Grant, *The Canadian Experience of Church Union* (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1967). This book was published simultaneously in Great Britain by Lutterworth Press.

7. John Webster Grant, "'They Don't Speak For Me': The United Church's Crisis of Confidence," *Touchstone* 6, no. 3 (September, 1988): 9-17; "Roots and Wings," Unpublished Addresses Given at the National Meeting of the

Division of MP&E, February, 1989; "What's Past is Prologue" in *Voices and Visions*: 65 *Years of The United Church of Canada,*ed, Peter Gordon White (Toronto: United Church Publishing House, 1990), 124-149; "Unauthoritative Reflections on the United Church's Story," *Touchstone* 12, no. 1 (January 1994): 4-12.

8. Grant, "Roots and Wings," 1.

CSCH Presidential Address 2007

Biography and Church History

ELEANOR J. STEBNER
Simon Fraser University

Biography is one of the most-loved genres within contemporary culture. Its popularity is observable in multiple medias – print, film, and television – and even on the internet, especially if blogs and Wikipedia are at least partially interpreted as biographical in form. Perhaps the prolificacy of biography is partially fueled by the celebrity culture of our day, but whatever the reasons, people are drawn by the stories of other people.

Many biographies focus on politicians, musicians, actors, royalty, and successful (and sometimes disgraced) leaders. Biographies on Albert Einstein and on the young Pierre Elliot Trudeau are current bestsellers, as are numerous biographies on Nelson Mandela.[1] Countless biographies – authorized or so-called non-authorized – have been written on Princess Diana, and popular biographies have been written on people such as Bill Gates, Conrad Black (and Black on Richard Nixon!), Martha Stewart, Bobby Orr, Elvis, and the Beatles. The list could go on and on. Indeed, even the absolutely delightful and heart-rending book, *Marley and Me*, is a biography, even though the central subject is a dog![2] "Lighter" or fluffier biographical genre is also observable in the popularity of various tabloids and magazines, such as *People*. Countless biographies are also written especially for children; such books aim to provide children with role models and pictures of virtuous individuals who often accomplish much

in the face of diversity.[3]

Biography as a genre is also pervasive in film and television. As with books or other printed materials, the subjects are often politicians, royalty, artists, or "heroes" of some kind. I think of three movies released in 2006 that are biographical in form, namely, *The Queen*, *The Last King of Scotland*, and *Amazing Grace*. But earlier biographical movies have also been quite successful, such as *Gandhi* (1982), *The Last Emperor* (1987), *Amadeus* (1989), *Schindler's List* (1993), *Frida* (2002), *A Beautiful Mind* (2001), *Finding Neverland* (2004), and *Kinsey* (2004). Television augments the genre of biography in contemporary society, with specialty channels such as A & E Biography, Biography Channel-Canada, and popular shows such as CBC's *Life and Times* (with Ann-Marie MacDonald).

While debates can and will continue to rage as to the historical accuracy and interpretation of biographies in print, film, and television, none of these debates seem to lessen the popularity of biography as a means of informing and perhaps inspiring countless people. It is my purpose today to ponder biography in connection with the discipline of church history, and to think about biography as a method to engage in – and perhaps popularize – our own research on the study of Christianity in Canada in particular.

Before I begin, I must make two disclaimers. First, I am not a biographer and I am not an expert on biography. I say this even though I have written biography and use biography – sometimes extensively – in my research on Christianity and on the study of religion in North America.[4] Because of my historical interests I have given some thought during the past decade to biography as a genre, but I would describe myself as a historian rather than as a biographer. Second, I do not consider myself a literary expert of any kind, although I do recognize biography when I read it, and I do know the differences between biography, autobiography, and memoir! In my courses, I find students are often quite engaged when they are assigned biographies to read. My remarks, therefore, must be understood as coming from my limited experience as a historian of Christianity and as a university professor who happens to dabble in biography and who finds myself curious about this genre that I use and which is so popular within our culture.

Many of us in the Canadian Society of Church History are not strangers to the genre of biography. Some of us have published books that

may be defined as biography or we have utilized biographical methods within our historical analyses. At the risk of omitting someone's work, I'd like to remind us of some of the more recent biographical monographs published by members of our society – was well as by other writers and scholars – that deal with the topic of Christianity in Canada. Many of these publications focus on particular church, denominational, or academic leaders. In this vein, I think of Mark G. McGowan's recent publication on Michael Power, A. Donald Macleod's book on W. Stanford Reid, Paul Laverdure's book on Brother Reginald, Neil Semple's book on Samuel Nelles, Shirley Jane Endicott's book on her mother, Mary Austin Endicott, Gwen R.P. Norman's book on her father, Richard Roberts, and my own slim contribution on Sister Geraldine MacNamara.[5] While few of these works deal with what may be called religious activists or non-conformists, some indeed are, including Nancy Knickerbocker on Mildred Osterhout Fahrni, and Barbara Roberts on Gertrude Richardson.[6]

Others of us have written what may be called group or collective biographies. In this category are the books by Marguerite Van Die on the Colbys of Carrolcraft, Marilyn Färdig Whiteley on Methodist women in Canada, and Ruth Compton Brower on Presbyterian women and missions in India.[7] While biographical dictionaries may also be included as a subset of this category (such as the one that I am currently editing for Westminster John Knox Press on women and religion in North America), such reference works, although biographical, have a different purpose than monographs on select individuals or collective bodies.

It is not surprising that scholars of Christianity – in Canada and throughout the world – utilize biography as a genre to interpret the past. Biography, after all, is firmly rooted within western Christian history and its foundation on Greco-Roman culture. Biographer Nigel Williams, in his recent history of biography, suggests that biography as a genre can be traced back to the cave drawings done by our human ancestors.[8] Despite its possible pre-historical roots, Plutarch is often referred to as the father of biography; Plutarch wrote on the lives of others as a way to uplift the questions of human morality and ethics. Martyrology developed as a way to remember individuals who laid down their lives for the Christian faith and as a way to organize saint and feast days. Hagiography grew out of martyrology; although today we use this word pejoratively to describe biographical works that idealize or idolize subjects, its initial purpose was to serve as a way to preserve and study the lives of those understood as

saints, as people worthy of remembrance and veneration.

Athanasius of Alexandria's fourth-century biography on St. Anthony set a standard for medieval biographies, followed by Einhard's early ninth-century biography on Charlemagne, the latter based (or modeled) on the earlier works of the Roman biographer, Suetonius. The Renaissance and the religious reformations and wars of the sixteenth century brought a new focus to biography, namely, a focus on the lives of non-saints or political leaders; this is seen in Giorgio Vasari's group biography on the *Lives of Artists* (1550). During the same period, John Foxes's *Acts and Monuments* (1563) provided the blueprint for biographical dictionaries.

The word "biography" itself emerged only in the late seventeenth century, and the word "biographer" emerged in the early part of the eighteenth century. Biography became tremendously popular in the nineteenth century. Mary Spongberg argues that this genre was a form that women began to utilize quite "enthusiastically." During the nineteenth century, biographies on male subjects served to uphold manly "heroism" and those on female subjects served to uphold womanly "domestic heroism."[9]

Given the popularity of nineteenth-century biography, it is not surprising that it is from this time period that we have the famous quote by Thomas Carlyle: "Rich as we are in biography, a well-written life is almost as rare as a well-spent one." But Carlyle did go on to advocate for more biographers. "There are certainly many more men whose history deserves to be recorded than persons willing and able to record it," Carlyle bemoaned.[10] It is, of course, Carlyle who advanced the "great man" theory of history, a theory that has been largely rebuked in recent years by political, economic or social interpretations of history.[11] We also have a popular saying from the nineteenth century, not attributable to anyone as far as I know, but reflective of the time period: "God created men and women, and then the Devil made biographers."[12]

The popularity of biography diminished somewhat through the mid-part of the twentieth century and then re-surged in popularity from the 1960s onward. Contributing to the renewal of biography was the emergence of biographies written by women on women; such biographies actually aimed to provide a more accurate portrayal of women's lives and their roles within historical time periods, rather than gender stylized ones.[13] Also from this time period we have emerging a clear distinction between popular (or mass) biographies, historical biographies, and literary

biographies. More recently, we see the emergence of postmodern biographies, namely, works that combine biography, autobiography, history, and sometimes travelogues.[14]

Given the history of biography and its links with Christian history, it is not surprising that scholars of Christianity still utilize this genre. What I do find surprising, however, is that the biographies that we have researched and published are largely unknown and unread in the wider culture beyond our academic circles and select religious or social communities. This observation forces me to ask several questions, questions for which I have no answers: Is the general populace simply not interested in biographies on religious people or on the intersections of religion, culture, politics, and ethics? Or are religious scholars not writing biographies in ways that can be read by non-specialists or non-religious people?

This, then, points to the heart of my dilemma: While biography thrives within popular culture, and while Christian and religious historians write biographies, what we write is not usually read beyond our limited circles. Is this because of how we write it? Is it because of the subjects on whom we choose to write? Is it because, whether we like it not, biographies on religious subjects might be dismissed as hagiographic even before they are read? Is it because we are not sophisticated enough in our works to draw out of our chosen biographical subjects the complexities, anxieties, quests, and mistakes of a particular time period? Or is it because biographies may be seen as regional histories or, even more critically, as narrow institutional or denominational or confessional histories? Or perhaps we are not publishing with publishers who have good marketing and distribution networks?

To repeat what I said earlier, I have no answers, but my observations regarding biography, contemporary culture, and church history – and the resulting dilemma arising from these observations – have led me to re-examine American historian Barbara Tuchman's essay entitled "Biography as a Prism of History" first delivered almost thirty years ago.[15] Tuchman discusses the genre of biography as a way to "encapsulate history."[16] She argues that biography is a valid historical method, much as portraits are valid within paint mediums, and she suggests that scholars who use biography need to think of themselves as artists who have a vision to communicate. Biography as prism, she suggests, needs to "please and interest" readers, and has the power to edify readers in how it may instruct

them on the "increased knowledge of human conduct." Biography "encompasses the universal in the particular," she says, and in this way helps readers to comprehend complexities within a scope that is manageable.[17]

Tuchman makes the distinction between biography and biographical sketches, but argues, nevertheless, that such genres – if we choose the subjects wisely – can help readers think of the "many layered elements" within a particular time period and culture.[18] Our biographies, however, need to be well written, which for her means that we ought to have fun writing them and that they ought to be page-turners for readers.[19] (I might add here that Tuchman was a popular historian, very successful commercially, but she was not employed by an academic institution.)

Tuchman then addresses some of the controversial issues around biography, namely, who should write them and what to include in them. She makes a distinction between what she calls primary and secondary biographies. Primary biographies are works that are written by biographers who have known their subjects; these biographers, she says, may be able to bring to their subjects a "unique intimacy" and, if they are relatively "honest and perceptive," they may be able to write better biographies than biographers not acquainted with their subjects. But primary biographers do not have the edge over secondary biographers – which is how most of us as historians would be classified – because they too need to struggle with questions of distortion and content inclusion.[20] In her view, no historian – whether a primary or a secondary biographer – ought to view his or her subject with "love and reverence."[21]

One of the most difficult aspects of writing biography, Tuchman suggests, is to refrain from including too much material and to attempt to give every detail equal weight. She again compares the art of a biographer with that of a portraitist, saying, "A portraitist does not achieve a likeness by giving sleeve buttons and shoelaces equal value to mouth and eyes." Selectivity is required on the part of the biographer or else readers end up with what she calls "laundry-list biographies."[22] Finally, perhaps as a stand against tabloid and celebrity reveal-all kind of publications, Tuchman is adamant that readers do not need to know about the "subject's private life" because "insofar as biography is used to illumine history, voyeurism has no place."[23]

Tuchman's insights both affirm and challenge the work that many of us have done and are doing – or perhaps will do – in the area of

biography and church history. My following comments, therefore, are directed to myself as much as they are directed to anyone else.

First, historians who write biographies need to remember that biography is the means – not the end purpose – of our work. While our focus may be on a particular subject, our work is to use that subject (or subjects, in the case of a group or collective biography) to illuminate a particular historical time period. Our subject must therefore be chosen with careful deliberation. Through the prism of this character – this person – readers ought to learn about a time period in its multiple dimensions. This means that if we write on church leaders, our prism ought to take us to the larger context of Christianity in the society itself. If we write biography as prism, our biographies ought not to be read as regional or denominational or confessional histories. Christianity has been and still is, I suggest, a significant lens through which society can be analyzed, but we – as biographers – are the ones who need to show this to readers. Our own personal perspectives ought to be challenged by interpreting our subjects as prisms of their whole society, not just illuminating the sub-cultures of their religious particularities, affiliations, or identities.

Second, we need to write in such ways that readers will be engaged. This means that our style of communication ought to be based on skills of storytelling. This means that we need to be selective in what we include and what we omit. This means, perhaps, that we will need to write in the style of non-academics. I've been told – whether this is true or not, I'm not sure – that academics are either unable or are not rewarded for interesting and engaging writing. I hope that neither of these comments is true, because it's my sense that interesting writing based on solid historical research is one of the best ways that we can communicate the history of Christianity in Canada. Whether we want to go as far as Tuchman and begin to think of ourselves as artists is another question. While I understand what Tuchman is saying, and while I would like to think of myself as an artist, it's a kind of self-definition that feels presumptuous or audacious to me. Perhaps this is exactly the attitude that Tuchman wants us to push against. I do agree with her, however, in the sense that we need to be aware that we are writing for others to read, enjoy, and learn.

Third, like all historians, we need to be careful not to revere or love our subjects. I don't think Tuchman's comments on this possible downfall mean that we can't have a degree of respect for our subjects or that we can't empathize with them. In fact, empathy is necessary to help us better

understand and interpret the choices and actions of our subjects. Indeed, in a recent essay, British scholar of biographical studies, Richard Holmes, suggests that the ultimate purpose of biography is "*to exercise empathy*, to enter imaginatively into another place, another time, another life."[24] If we want our readers to do this, we ourselves as writers must also engage in empathy. Yet we cannot view our subjects as other, as holy, or as unquestionable. Primary biographers often fall short on this point, but it is also a looming pitfall for secondary biographers. It is, after all, a twenty-first century form of hagiography. While our society clearly needs and desires heroes and heroines of substance, our biographies ought to reflect the lives of real people within their own historical contexts. This does not mean, however, that we trash our subjects; we are responsible for interpreting a life, not for disparaging it. The degree of personal revelations we provide for our readers is, of course, related to larger questions, some of which may deal with sexual identities, ethical concerns, and other possible controversial topics. Yet some of us, myself included, would question Tuchman's ban on discussing our subjects' private lives, because such topics may be insightful to the historical era that we wish to examine.

Even if we take into consideration Tuchman's guidelines, biography as a genre will, I suspect, remain questionable as a real academic endeavor. It does not and should not, after all, be overladen with theory and it should always be interpretive of theology. It is always susceptible to counter interpretations. The very need for selectivity opens biography to biases of its authors and – perhaps even more importantly – to the biases (or silences) of available source materials. The very subjects chosen may enforce power or ecclesiastical or race or gender or class dynamics that we ourselves personally would not wish to reinforce. And yet, even given these limitations, biography is a good method for scholars to use in exploring the history of Christianity in Canada. It is a way to entice contemporary readers to learn about this aspect of society, and also, if it is done well, it can help contemporary readers practice empathy.

People have an insatiable interest in the lives of other people. So rather than thinking of biographers as being "made by the Devil," I'd have us remember Carlyle's insight, namely, that there are many more women and men "whose history deserves to be recorded than persons willing and able to record it." These people's lives are important as a way to better understand the past, and therefore, to better live in and understand the present.

Endnotes

1. Walter Isaacson, *Einstein: His Life and Universe* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2007); and John English, *Citizen of the World: The Life of Pierre Elliott Trudeau,* vol. 1: *1919-1968* (Toronto: Knopf Canada, 2006). For a recent biography on Mandela, see Christina Scott, *Nelson Mandela: A Force for Freedom* (New York: Random House, 2006).

2. John Grogan, *Marley and Me: Life and Love with the World's Worst Dog* (New York: William Morrow, 2005).

3. CSCH member, Gordon Heath, reminded me of the popularity of this genre in the children's market, which often includes biographies on religious people. For example, numerous children's biographies have been written on Kateri Tekakwitha; for a recent study, see Anne E. Neuberger, *Blessed Kateri and the Cross in the Forest* (Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor Catholic Publishing Company, 2003).

4. My biographical publications include *The Women of Hull House: A Study in Spirituality, Vocation, and Friendship* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1997); *GEM: The Life of Sister Mac* (Ottawa: Novalis Saint Paul University, 2001); and "Young Man Knowles: Christianity, Politics, and the 'Making of a Better World,'" in *Religion and Public Life in Canada: Historical and Comparative Perspectives*, ed. Marguerite Van Die (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 219-36. I am currently the editor of the forthcoming biographical *Westminster Dictionary of Women in American Religious History*.

5. Mark G. McGowan, *Michael Power: The Struggle to Build the Catholic Church on the Canadian Frontier* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007); A. Donald Macleod, *W. Stanford Reid: An Evangelical Calvinist in the Academy* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004); Paul Laverdure, *Brother Reginald: A Poet in Moose Jaw* (Gravelbourg, SK: Redeemer's Voice Press, 2001); Neil Semple, *Faithful Intellect: Samuel S. Nelles and Victoria University* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005); Shirley Jane Endicott, *China Diary: The Life of Mary Austin Endicott* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2003); Gwen R.P. Norman, *Grace Unfolding: The Radical Mind and Beloved Community of Richard Roberts* (Endicott, ON: United Church Publishing House, 1998); and Stebner, *GEM: The Life of Sister Mac*. The above list is illustrative of recent publications in the area of Christianity and Canada and is not intended to be inclusive.

6. Nancy Knickerbocker, *No Plastic Saint: The Life of Mildred Osterhout Fahrni* (Vancouver: Talonbooks, 2001); and Barbara Roberts, *A Reconstructed World: A Feminist Biography of Gertrude Richardson* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996).

7. Marguerite Van Die, *Religion, Family, and Community in Victorian Canada: The Colbys of Carrollcraft* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006); Marilyn Färdig Whiteley, *Canadian Methodist Women, 1766-1925* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2005); and Ruth Compton Brower, *New Women for God: Canadian Presbyterian Women and India Mission, 1876-1914* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990).

8. Nigel Hamilton, *Biography: A Brief History* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007).

9. Mary Spongberg, *Writing Women's History Since the Renaissance* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 109, 111-12. Spongberg writes: "women engaged enthusiastically with historical writing throughout the nineteenth century . . . to the displeasure of men" and they most often wrote biographies or biographical collections" (109).

10. Thomas Carlyle, "Jean Paul Friedrich Richter" (1827), in *Critical and Miscellaneous Essay*, vol. 1 (London: Chapman and Hall, 1888), 6.

11. Thomas Carlyle, *On Heroes and Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History* (London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1908 [1841]). Carlyle's famous line is "Universal History, the history of what man has accomplished in this world, is at bottom the History of the Great Men who have worked here" (5).

12. Quoted by Gary Scharnhorst, "In Defense of Western Literary Biography," Western Literature Association Presidential Address, 1998 (Banff, Canada). Online at http://www.usu.edu.westlit/pastpresadd1998.htm; published in *Western American Literature* 33, no. 4 (Winter 1999): 345-53.

13. Carolyn Heilbrun, *Writing a Woman's Life* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1989), 12.

14. See Charles Montgomery, *The Last Heathen: Encounters with Ghosts and Ancestors in Melanesia* (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 2004); and Modris Eksteins, *Walking Since Daybreak: A Story of Eastern Europe, World War II, and the Heart of our Century* (Toronto: Key Porter Books, 2000).

15. Barbara Tuchman, "Biography as a Prism of History," in *Practicing History: Selected Essays* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1981), 80-90. I first read this essay for a doctoral course on "Biography as History and Theology," taught by Professors Rosemary Skinner Keller and James Stein at Northwestern

University/Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary in the fall of 1990. For a recent publication that explores biography as a genre, see Peter France and William St. Clair, ed., *Mapping Lives: The Uses of Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

16. Tuchman, "Biography as a Prism of History," 80.
17. Tuchman, "Biography as a Prism of History," 81.
18. Tuchman, "Biography as a Prism of History," 83.
19. Tuchman, "Biography as a Prism of History," 84, 89.
20. Tuchman, "Biography as a Prism of History," 87.
21. Tuchman, "Biography as a Prism of History," 87.
22. Tuchman, "Biography as a Prism of History," 89.
23. Tuchman, "Biography as a Prism of History," 90.
24. Holmes, "The Proper Study?" 17.