HISTORICAL PAPERS 1999
Canadian Society of Church History

Annual Conference
Bishop's University
3-4 June 1999

Edited by
Bruce L. Guenther

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

Please Note:

The paper presented by Michael Di Giacomo, "Aimee Semple MacPherson, the Big Bang of Québécois Pentecostalism," was not made available for publication. The paper presented by Jacques Kornberg, "Ignaz von Döllinger's *Die Juden in Europa*: A Catholic Polemic against Antisemitism," may be found in *Zeitschrift für Neuere Theologiegeschichte / Journal for the History of Modern Theology* Bd. 6 (Heft 2, 1999).

Canadian Baptists and the Jewish Refugee Question of the 1930s

ROBERT R. SMALE

Recent events in the former Yugoslavia have again heightened awareness that the world has largely failed to learn the lessons of the Holocaust. Kosovo is the latest in an endless array of genocide, ethnic cleansing and refugee crises that have plagued the world since l945. Governments around the world continue to utilize torture, arbitrary arrest, detention, forced exile, denial of freedom of conscience and genocide.

The continuation of both a lack of respect for the dignity and sanctity of life, and the flagrant violations of human rights constitutes is not only a major political and social issue but also a religious one. Religious institutions have a responsibility to speak out against such atrocities and to campaign for the cause of rights and freedoms. Due to their historic advocacy of liberty of consciousness, and their own historical experience as nonconformists, who were victims of persecution, it might be reasonable to expect that Baptists would be at the forefront of any such campaign. To what extent, however, was this the case during the Jewish refugee crisis of the 1930s?

This paper examines this issue in light of the responses and actions of Canadian Baptists (Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec) to the predicament, plight and flight of Jews in Europe from 1933-1939. Did Baptists, who were once themselves a persecuted religious minority, speak out against atrocities being perpetuated on the Jews of Europe? How aware of these atrocities were they? What actions, if any, did they encourage their government to take? Was the response limited to a few prominent individuals or was it more widespread? Were there significant differences

in the responses of fundamentalist and liberal Baptists? Baptists were not always consistent in their application to others of the standard of human rights that they demanded for themselves, so, was this true of their reactions and responses to the Jewish question of the 1930s?

With the onset of the Great Depression of the 1930s, Canada had all but barred its doors to the influx of further immigration. Years of public agitation, racial tension, nativism and xenophobic fears had persuaded the Canadian government throughout the 1920s to institute various regulations designed to control the influx of immigrants. Furthermore, without explicitly changing the Immigration Act, the government made several "administrative refinements" that were deliberately intended to prevent any further admission of Jews into Canada.[1] Consequently, racism, nativism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism, so pervasive in Canada especially after World War One, had "found formal expression in revamped immigration regulations."[2] With the onset of the Depression, the government tightened its restrictionist umbrella still further.[3]

Consequently, at a time when the Jews were seeking refuge from the Aryan Laws of Hitler's Third Reich, the corresponding boycotts and acts of brutality that attended their implementation culminating in the *Kristall-nacht* pogrom of 1938 and an ever mounting refugee crisis, the Canadian government, "as much in defense of a narrow notion of Canada as out of direct hostility to Jews," erected barriers not only "against their full participation in community life," but more importantly, given the growing crisis in Europe, their admission into Canada.

When it came to the subject of Jews and Judaism, Canadian Baptists were no better or worse in their stereotypical and racist views than any other Canadian Protestants. Like other Protestants of the day, they held to the same "general misconceptions and endemic ignorance of Jewish history and religion . . . as well as [to] certain anti-Judaic sectarian strains."[4] References to Jews as Christ "rejecters" and "killers" found their way into denominational literature. In 1933 the *Canadian Baptist* lamented:

> But to read the shameful story
> How the Jews abused their King,
> How they killed the Lord of Glory,
> Makes me angry when I sing.[5]

These attitudes towards Jews were found in both the liberal and the

fundamentalist strains of the denomination. Liberal or modernist Baptists tended to deal somewhat ambiguously with Jewish issues. On the one hand, Jews were praised for their "religious genius," yet on the other hand, Jesus was revered as a Jew who had transcended Judaism with his "universal mind and heart." "The Christian of any nation," the *Canadian Baptist* asserted, "never thinks of him as a Jew. Jesus belongs to all nations and to all ages. He is the world's centre."[6]

Fundamentalists like the dogmatic and vociferous T.T. Shields of Jarvis Street Baptist Church in Toronto espoused the traditional fables and clichés about Jews in conjunction with typical evangelical appeals:

> When Pilate said to the Jews of his day, "Will you crucify your King?" They said, "His blood be on us, and upon our children." And it has been! Oh, it has been! The Jews have already reaped a terrible harvest whatever their future may be. Their isolation, their place in history, the fact that no nation can assimilate them, that there is no possibility of obliterating their distinctiveness, whether in Germany, or in France, or Italy, or Britain, or Canada or America . . . they stand out identified as the children of those who shed the blood of the Lord Jesus, and His blood has been upon them! The awful record of their sufferings from then until now attests the fact . . .[7]

While willing to affirm the Jewishness of Jesus,[8] Shields, however, occasionally allowed anti-Jewish slurs to creep into his sermons: "Oh, but have you never heard the proverb, 'Worth a Jew's eye'? It means that a Jew can see money where nobody else can. That is the explanation of their searching around the garbage cans, picking up the world's refuse – and getting rich on it."[9] The Baptists' relationship with the Jewish community was, therefore, ambiguous at best.

As strong advocates and defenders of the principle of religious liberty, Baptists were apprehensive about the plans of the Nazi regime to construct a national Protestant church in Germany under the patronage of the state. As Dr. J.H. Rushbrooke, a leading figure in the Baptist World Alliance remarked, "it is impossible for them to accept any such relation with the State as would make them merely its dependents or tools."[10] The Nazis' intention to foster a monolithic culture inside of Germany understandably aroused the suspicion of Canadian Baptists, as it reminded them all too well of their struggles against the Roman Catholic Church during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Consequently, it is not surprising that many Canadian Baptists were resolved in their opposition

to fascism, which for them was manifest in three forms – Italian, German, and Roman Catholic totalitarianism.[11]

Baptist distrust of Hitler's intentions with respect to the Protestant churches in Germany also "alerted them to other aberrations in the new German Reich, particularly the Aryan laws and the persecution of the Jews."[12] As early as 6 April 1933, the *Canadian Baptist* recorded:

> When the world in the Great War termed the German nation Huns, the great nation along the Rhine writhed under the insult. In the heat of warfare truth has a habit of becoming sadly twisted at times; in calmer days less passionate terms are employed. But if a fraction of the atrocities against Jews with which Germany is charged today be true, Hun is the only word that can be used to describe the Hitlerite Teutons. In fact, it may be that an apology is due the ancient barbarians, for apparently nothing to equal the cruelties of the modern attack on Jews in Germany has been seen since Bartholomew's day in France, and that other period when the Spanish Inquisition was in full flower. The entire world is horrified by the tales of barbarism, which are coming from Germany through devious channels; its like reading the story of the Armenian massacres again. One did not expect much better things from Turks, but Germany, the birthplace of Protestantism, is on a different plane surely. German Jews, from peasant to professor, are in their dark Gethsemane and the rest of the world stands powerless to interfere. In fact, the lot of the sufferers seems to become more desperate every time a foreign voice is lifted in protest.[13]

Such accounts of Jewish abuse in Germany in 1933 influenced the tone of Dr. M.F. McCutcheon's Presidential Address to the Convention that year. Speaking on "The Church's Task in the Modern World," President McCutcheon asserted:

> If true to our faith every human life must be regarded as a reflex of divinity. Every act of wrong and injustice therefore, mars and defaces the image of God in man. "Oppression and exploitation are more than violations of social law. They are sacrilege and blasphemy." They thwart life – God's life in man. The religious man will not rest content with personal salvation. He will strive to bring about a social order which will issued to all men freedom for self-realization. He will weigh all social institutions in the balance of spiritual utility: "If found wanting, he will set about to reconstruct them, or, if need be,

> to destroy them. His morality will be militant, and when necessary revolutionary" . . . This makes it clear that the "preaching of principles" is not enough. "A principle after all, is a poor ghost, unless expressed in concrete material."[14]

The question of freedom and liberty, especially religious liberty, seems to have been of paramount concern to Baptists in 1933.[15] Dr. J.H. Rushbrooke, General Secretary of the Baptist World Alliance, commented that while there were elements of policy in the German government "which commanded the strong support of Baptists," the Reich would "gain enormously if it adopts a policy of respect for the rights of the free evangelical communities."[16] Hitler's suppression of free speech, freedom of the press, and spiritual liberty created the "unsettling conditions" that prevented the Baptist World Alliance from holding its fifth Conference in Berlin in 1933.

The Conference was eventually rescheduled and held in Berlin the following year. This decision fueled a fierce international debate in the Baptist community on the "suitability of this location," and Canadian, British and American Baptists expressed deep reservations about whether they should attend.[17] Canadian Baptists' decision to send delegates was predicated on Hitler and his associates guarantee of freedom "of deliberation."[18] Nevertheless, the decision to go was the "subject of adverse criticism." Canadian Baptists decided that such a Congress "can" and "should be held," because a "definite and unmistakable testimony" to distinctive Baptist convictions could be accorded in a nation whose political regime acceded marginal regard for principles of religious liberty or democratic rights. Baptists also wanted to ensure that the decision to hold a Congress in Berlin in no way implied their "approval of anti-Semitism, or any weakening in their view of our Lord's authority and of the Christian faith as supernatural and interracial . . ."[19]

Delegates to the Convention were obliged to listen to addresses promoting the virtues of the "new Germany;" nevertheless opposition to a number of Nazi policies was voiced, including Hitler's oppression of the Jews.[20] The Baptist World Congress voiced their commitment "to the conviction that racial prejudice and national antagonism are entirely at variance with the Christian conscience and that Baptists everywhere should seek by every possible means to exemplify and promote good will and understanding among all peoples."[21] The Congress further held that racialism, with specific reference to anti-Semitism, was "unchristian."[22]

The Congress did allow the Nazis to achieve a kind of propaganda victory. The delegates were accorded the liberty they were promised at the Congress, but more importantly, some left Berlin convinced that Nazi atrocities toward the Jews were grossly exaggerated and perhaps in some way understandable if not justifiable. The *Canadian Baptist* report on "Berlin 1934" remarked:

> It was revealed from many sources that the recent movements in Germany against the Jews were not religious or racial, but political and economic. Since the war some 200,000 Jews from Russia and other Eastern places had come into Germany. Most of these were Communist agitators against the government. The German Jews had also monopolized a majority of government, educational and economic positions . . . The German people resented this [control]. Naturally excesses occurred and irresponsible persons committed some atrocious deeds. But at the worst it was not one-tenth as bad as we had been made to believe. The new Government became the agent of adjustment of positions proportionate to population.[23]

However, less than two years later, the *Canadian Baptist* reported that,

> instead of hundreds of thousands of Eastern European Jews these official statistics reveal that between 1910 and 1925 the total number of Jewish immigrants into Germany and these immigrants included both Eastern and Western Jews – did not exceed 31,000. Between 1925 and 1933, 9,000 of them had left the country again. There were thus no more than a net of 22,000 foreign Jewish immigrants . . . among a population of 67,000,000. The devouring hordes are a myth.[24]

The article pointed out that Jews neither had a "stranglehold nor a monopoly" upon the professions and that Nazi allegations in this regard were "completely unfounded."[25]

Canadian Baptists, it would appear, were well aware of the existence of concentration camps in Germany as early as 1933-34. In a letter reprinted from the *Manchester Guardian*, Rennie Smith compared his visit to Dachau concentration camp outside of Munich to his experience as a prisoner of war in Germany in World War One. Smith asserted that "I do not hesitate to say that even at the height of Prussian Jingoism . . . the humanities as between German jailer and British civilian prisoners were

on an incomparably higher level in 1914 than is the treatment of Germans by Germans in the concentration camp of 1933."[26]

By the mid-1930s many Canadian Baptists recognized the inherent dangers that totalitarianism, whether Communist or Fascist, represented to international peace and security, as well as their overtly anti-Semitic biases.[27] Many Baptists expressed utter amazement and repulsion at the remarks of Germany's great military strategist of World War One, General Erich Lunendorff, that Christianity had been created for the special advancement of the Jews and that its one purpose was to "help the Jewish people to domination." His call for the complete renunciation of Christianity convinced many Baptists of the utter paganism of Hitler's Germany.[28] n an almost prophetic overtone, Lloyd M. Houlding warned Canadian Baptists that "we dare not close our eyes to the warnings prevalent in Fascism. It is true that Jews are building their ghettos in Germany to-day, and I venture to prophesy that it is equally true that the Christians will be building their catacombs, and twenty-five years from now there will be no Jews in Germany except in the ghettos and Christians except in the catacombs."[29]

While many Baptists were certainly aware and appalled at Hitler's treatment of the Jews, totalitarianism's (whether Fascism, Nazism or Communism) threat to religious liberty, democracy, and peace was the paramount concern of Baptists.[30] In fact, as Baptists gathered with other Protestants, Catholics and government officials at the public service to commemorate the eightieth anniversary of Holy Blossom Synagogue in Toronto in 1936, the *Canadian Baptist* remarked that the "anniversary itself was not the greatest thing," but the fact that this diverse group could meet together, bringing "greetings to the Jewish people" and sharing the "joy of the festive occasion." As the editor went on to remark,

> the service reveals what is meant by British religious and civil liberty; the service so largely attended by Gentiles could not have been held in many lands to-day – lands where Jews are treated as outcasts and harried from pillar to post, or rather, to prison and poverty. In British domains the Jew has rights equal to all other citizens; his liberty and life are as sacred as any other man's . . . The whole service was a tribute to British fair-mindedness and justice.[31]

One Baptist commentator, the Reverend R.G. Quiggin, even went so far as to see the events unfolding in Europe as part of some apocalyptic vision reminiscent of pre-war years, in which God would usher in a new

Christian age: "these violent dictatorships are not thwarting but fulfilling the will of God. They are but puppets in the hands of the Almighty." The church, the writer stated, had been "too soft" and "persecution" would only serve to "purify" it. "We are witnessing not the twilight of Christianity, but the dawn of a more Christian age." Then, in rhetoric characteristic of Baptists in the past, the writer asserted that, "Canada's contribution to the somewhat new civilization of North America [was] the strength and purity of British institutions," and that Baptists should march "shoulder to shoulder" with their "fellow Christians in a common effort to make Canada Christian."[32]

I will now compare the views of two leading Baptists of the period – one the volatile fundamentalist preacher of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, T.T. Shields, the other, a liberal-minded Baptist scholar and academic, Watson Kirkconnell. Given his own dictatorial tendencies, Shields initially held a certain fascination for the Fascist movements of Europe. He rejected the popular notion that Benito Mussolini, dictator of Italy, was the Anti-Christ: "To me, Mussolini is one of the world's greatest benefactors, and has not the first mark of the AntiChrist about him. He is a fine business manager who has saved Italy from a revolution like that of Russia."[33] Shields admiration for European Fascism, however, ended abruptly following the "Night of the Long Knives" in Germany and Italy's rape of Ethiopia. Thereafter, Shields saw both Hitler and Mussolini as nothing more than international gangsters. He even suggested that a price should be put on Hitler's head.[34]

Having gained a reputation as an impassioned orator, Shields soon unleashed his fervor against Hitler and Nazi Germany. Hitler, Shields charged, was an "unspeakable criminal," an "execrable murderer," "the biggest liar and the ugliest human creature the devil ever produced," the most "infamous deceiver and murderer of all time." He was, Shields contended, the very embodiment of the Anti-Christ.[35] Germany, he charged, "as a nation had been the world's greatest criminal since 1914," "the plague spot of the world for several generations," a greater menace to the moral health of the world than "Sodom and Gomorrah," the breeding ground "for everything that is criminal to human interest and divine government," and hence a "bandit" that needed to be hunted by the police.[36] Shields believed that "if the present tendency of European affairs continues it will produce a crisis" – namely a war.[37] As a result, he encouraged the Allied powers to take decisive action against Germany, including sending "an army of occupation into Germany at once to enforce

the terms of the Treaty of Versailles."[38]

Shields' savage attacks against pacifism[39] afforded him another opportunity to attack his liberal enemies, especially those in the Baptist Convention, many of whom were strong advocates of disarmament and anti-war motions.[40] Shields blamed "modernist influences"[41] for not only stripping Britain of her might, but also for the direction of her foreign policy, which sought to pacify and appease Hitler.[42] Shields expressed utter disdain for British Prime Ministers who he felt were leading the Empire into the abyss.[43] Responding to the Munich Agreement, Shields vociferated,

> . . . we lost a golden opportunity of breaking forever the power of Hitlerism and saving ourselves from the enormous burdens that now we must carry, by the utter un wisdom, the political and moral blindness of Premier Chamberlain. Surely there is no page in Britain's history of which we have a deeper reason to be ashamed than that which has been written by those who have managed our foreign policy in the last few years.[44]

Shields often expressed his opposition to racial and religious discrimination. Having read *Mein Kampf*, Shields condemned both its anti-Semitism and its anti-Christianity. He, likewise, dismissed the Aryan theories of the Nazis as being entirely unfounded.[45] The *Kristallnacht*, the infamous Nazi pogrom organized to terrorize the Jews on 9 November 1938, aroused an impassioned sermon from Shields entitled, "When Will the 'Jews Enemy,' the German Haman, Hang on the Gallows Prepared for Mordecai?"[46] While Shields noted that he could not condone the assassination of a German official in Paris by a Jewish student, such a tragedy did not warrant the persecution of a people for something for which they had no responsibility, namely, that they were born Jews."[47]

Shields carried his polemic even farther;

> . . . by remarking that THE ANTI-SEMITISM AND EXTREME RACIALISM OF OUR DAY ARE UTTERLY ANTI-CHRISTIAN, contrary to the spirit and genius of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ . . . if you allow yourself to take up an attitude of antipathy toward any race, however loudly you may profess your orthodoxy, in attitude and spirit, you are positively anti-Christian . . . This whole notion of racial superiority is a fiction which flatters human vanity. I am by no means sure that the boasted "Aryan" purity of the blood that

> flows in German veins can be absolutely demonstrated . . . Let us remember that the attitude represented by modern Germany and Italy, and a great many people in this country and in the United States – the anti-Jewish, anti-Semitic attitude is anti-Christian. It is not of God . . .[48]

Shields held that the actions of the German government during the *Kristnallnacht* demanded nothing less than a "universally prevailing indignation" of all peoples and all governments towards "Germany's atrocious treatment of the Jews."[49] He further expressed how "interesting," "hopeful," "encouraging" and "thankful" "we ought to be . . . though we are not Jews – to say the nations conferring together to see what can be done for the exiled Jew . . . May God support those who provide a place of refuge for people so terribly oppressed . . ."[50]

Yet, in spite of his acrimonious rhetoric against Hitlerism, racism and anti-Semitism, Shields' relationship with the Jewish community was ambiguous; he often allowed anti-Jewish (and some would argue anti-Semitic) slurs to enter his sermons. Shields had a reputation as a religious bigot.[51] Viewed in this context, his charges against racism and prejudice are shallow at best.

Furthermore, unlike most of his fundamentalist associates, Shields was against Zionism and the restoration of Jews to Palestine.[52] While Shields' focus here may have been partially directed at another theological enemy of his – dispensationalists – in whose eschatology the restoration of the Jewish state was a significant step to ushering in the millennium, it nevertheless illustrates the ambiguity of his relationship with the Jewish community. Shields was horrified at the treatment of the Jews by the Nazis, but his hatred of Nazism had less to do with anti-Semitism and more to do with the imminent danger Hitlerism posed to the British Empire, its institutions and its values (especially religious liberty), that Shields dearly loved.

Unlike Shields, Watson Kirkconnell was not a clergyman, but an academic and a scholar. Kirkconnell and Shields strongly despised one another.[53] Kirkconnell, like Shields, possessed the ability, albeit in prose, to deliver scathing assaults against his enemies, especially communism.[54] But if Communism was the major focus of Kirkconnell's wrath throughout much of the late 1940s and 1950s, Nazism bore the brunt of his onslaught during much of the 1930s and early 1940s. Noting that he had been the "first and only Canadian not merely to expose and denounce Hitler and Mussolini in Europe, but also to reveal in detail their intrigues against the

political life of Canada," Kirkconnell warned that,

> Naziism [sic], like Communism is a dynamic force that is world-wide in its activities, and no one who has even caught the perspective of its 'global' ambitions can forget for a moment the fate that awaits human liberties if the Brown Terror should ultimately prevail. The *national interest* of Canada surely includes the defeat of that revolutionary force which seeks to impose its brutal mastery, directly or indirectly, on all countries, including our own.[55]

Yet, like so many others, Kirkconnell initially expressed some reluctance at expressing outright condemnation of Nazism. In a radio lecture delivered on 7 May 1939, Kirkconnell, then President of the Baptist Union of Western Canada, remarked, "in a wholesale condemnation of that regime (i.e., Nazis) and all its works, I am not prepared to join. It has done wonders in rehabilitating German industry, in giving new spirit to the youth of the country and in redressing many historic wrongs against the nation."[56] While what Kirkconnell stated holds some truth, all this was accomplished under the guise of planning another war, and some of Germany's industrial recovery in the 1930s was due more to the policies of previous government administrations than to Hitler's. Nevertheless, to be fair to Kirkconnell, he also recognized

> it has worked ruthlessly by cold pogrom and concentration camp to suppress and exterminate every opinion and party differing from the will of the National Socialist Worker's Party. Towards the Jew in particular the regime has been brutal beyond description; but of the estimated million and a half victims of the police policies of the Third Reich fewer than fifty percent are Jews. Most of these are still in Germany, but subjected to such economic pressure as to make life increasingly impossible. Refuge abroad is imperative, yet the place of that refuge is still largely uncertain.[57]

Kirkconnell was under no delusion about the impending fate of the Jews, and why it was imperative for them to escape from Germany. In this regard he expressed his utter annoyance at the Canadian government's handling of the situation.[58]

Kirkconnell was one of a handful of Christian leaders bold enough not merely to lament the treatment of Jews, but also to adopt an active pro-refugee stance. While deploring Hitler as "a savage tyrant whose insatiable

ambition will not stop short of world domination," he asserted that Hitler had to be stopped.[59] He launched a bold attack against Nazi "reptilian propaganda," which had "already insinuated itself into our national life" with its "anti-Semitic virus of race hatred being injected into our veins."[60] The chief source of much of this propaganda was Bernhard Bott's *Deutsche Zeitung fur Canada,* which Kirkconnell denounced as "morbid and fantastic."[61]

But more than that, Kirkconnell actively supported the work of the Canadian National Committee on Refugees and Victims of Political Persecution. As well, he served as a board member of the Committee on Jewish-Gentile Relations. Throughout this period he campaigned and urged the government to alter its policies on refugees so more victims of Nazi persecution could be admitted into Canada. His efforts did not cease with the outbreak of hostilities in 1939, even though by that point they were in vain. As Baptists became aware of the extent of Hitler's homicidal anti-Semitism,[62] Kirkconnell actively campaigned on behalf of the National Committee in an attempt to once again convince the government to alter its stand.[63]

Throughout the 1930s, Canadian Baptists were kept abreast of the latest "accounts of the ill-treatment of Jews in Germany."[64] Two events altered the tone and nature of Baptist responses to the plight of Jews in Germany. On 7 November 1938, Herschel Grynszpan, a Polish Jewish student, assassinated Ernst vom Rath, a minor German embassy official in Paris. This assassination provided Reinhard Heydrich, Head of the SD, the pretext to order in retaliation the destruction of all Jewish places of worship both in Germany and Austria. In a period of approximately fifteen hours, bands of Nazi thugs systematically destroyed hundreds of synagogues and thousands of Jewish owned stores. In addition to countless arrests, Jews were forced to pay for the damages the Nazis claimed they had provoked. This amounted to one billion marks for the assassination of vom Rath and a further six million marks to cover the cost of the broken windows.[65] This incident and its aftermath fostered international outrage and unfavourable publicity for the Nazi regime.

The initial reaction of the *Canadian Baptist* was to a degree impertinent in its implying that Grynszpan was somehow responsible for the persecution of Jews in Germany in the wake of the assassination, when in reality the assault had long been planned. As the commentator in the *Canadian Baptist* remarked,

> perhaps he thought he would be doing his people a fine service by the slaying, but, in reality, he has added immeasurably to their sad lot . . . Probably his action will result in foreign Jews being driven from Germany – cast adrift in a friendless world once more. Hard has been the lot of the Hebrew the ages through; the brainless youth has made it infinitely more difficult for the race to live. Many people who had nothing to do with the deed . . . will have to suffer untold hardship because this Polish Jew killed an official of the Nazi regime.[66]

Not all Baptists shared these sentiments. At least some Baptists were beginning to realize that indignation, sympathy and prayers were not enough – the plight of European Jews demanded action.[67]

On 15 May 1939, the luxury liner St. Louis set sail from Hamburg with 907 "desperate German Jews" on board. These Jews considered themselves fortunate because they were escaping the horrors of Hitler's Germany. Their fortune was to change upon reaching Havana, Cuba on 30 May 1939. The Cuban government refused to recognize their entrance visas and their desperate search to find admittance to another Latin-American country ended in failure. On 2 June, the ship departed Havana harbour, hoping that either Canada or the United States might grant them entrance. In the end, the ship was forced to return to Europe, where the governments of Great Britain, Belgium and Holland finally offered "temporary shelter," because many would eventually "die in the gas chambers and crematoria of the Third Reich."[68]

In referring to this "voyage of the damned," the *Canadian Baptist* lamented the plight of Jewish refugees.[69] This Jewish tragedy finally prompted the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec at its Golden Jubilee Convention to pass a resolution imploring the Canadian government to admit refugees.[70] Petitions were sent to the Department of Immigration urging the government to lower its barriers.[71] And individuals, such as the former President of the Convention F.M. McCutcheon, urged the government to take action. In February 1940, the Social Service Board announced an essay writing contest; one of the four topics was "What Will the Church Offer the European Refugee in Canada?" Miss Marjorie Campbell won the contest with her essay entitled, "Canada's Responsibility For European Refugees."[72] In the end, all the efforts were in vain. Not only did the Canadian government ignore them, but on 1 September 1939, war erupted in Europe, which ended any hope for Jews trying to escape. The appeals on the part of Baptist groups and individuals had simply come too late.

Throughout the 1930s, Canadian Baptists were well informed of the political situation in Europe and of Nazi policies towards Jews not only through their denominational papers but also through various religious organizations of which Baptists were members. Many Baptists expressed abhorrence at the utterly brutal and uncivilized actions Hitler and his supporters directed towards the Jews of Europe. Inevitably, Baptists began to question the ethics of the Canadian government (who had essentially barred Jewish admission), calling for a change in policy so that these victims of persecution might find refuge. While Canadian Baptists can certainly be commended for this, their reactions and responses to the treatment of Jews was as much motivated by a fear of losing religious liberty (especially for Baptists in Europe), as it was out of a genuine concern for Jews. Even as late as 1938, while noting that "European nations are harrying the Jews of their territories as if they were gangsters of the vilest types," the *Canadian Baptist* asserted,

> battles that were thought fought forever may have to be re-fought for the dearly purchased principle of religious liberty will not be surrendered without a struggle. Perhaps the Baptists, foremost fighters for this idea in the past, will be required again to gird on their arms and lead in making the world safe; someone apparently must undertake the task or liberty will perish from the earth.[73]

Following the *Kristallnacht*, one Baptist commentator remarked: "the persecution of the Jews in Germany rightly rouses our indignation and protest, but what is happening now in Rumania and what has been happening to Baptists for the past ten years in Russia is just as bad."[74] The writer is admonishing fellow Baptists to keep their focus primarily upon the sufferings of their religious brethren in Europe to ensure that religious liberty was preserved.

Evangelistic concerns also remained part of Baptist response to the refugee crisis. Hazel E.R. Bates admonished, "What is the Baptist Church as an organization doing to get the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ to the Jews of Canada and of the world?"[75] The *Canadian Baptist* carried a report in 1939 which graphically recounted the flight of a group of German Jewish refugees to Belgium. R.M. Stephens, who visited the camp at Merxplas, noted that

> while much is being done for the moral and physical welfare of the refugees nothing is being done for their spiritual needs. Belgium is, of course, a Roman Catholic country, and there is a Roman Church on the premise, so that the matter is not an easy solution. The Jews,

> moreover, are not especially attracted by this form of religion. Even if a colporteur, were allowed inside the camp, the refugees have no money to buy Gospel and Testaments. For the moment, therefore the most practical means of helping spiritually is to show them that not only Jews, but Christians also, sympathize with them in their troubles. Then, as opportunity offers, such as when personally visiting the camps, a Gospel and a kindly word may be given here and there.[76]

This is not some kind of "afterthought," as Davies and Nefsky[77] assert, but it reflects the traditional evangelistic concern of Baptists in believing that even in the midst of unimaginable horrors, the Jews' greatest need was spiritual conversion.

The *Canadian Baptist* lamented the fate of the liner St. Louis and its Jewish passengers in 1939. It was this incident and the *Kristallnacht* that finally aroused the passions of Baptists enough that their Conventions adopted the following (or similar) resolution:

> WHEREAS there is still needed, on a vast scale, amelioration of the lot of the refugees and potential refugees, whether Jewish or Gentile, in Europe: AND WHEREAS some steps already have been taken to provide sanctuary for certain of these refugees in Canada; NOW BE IT RESOLVED that this Baptist Convention do urge upon the proper governmental authorities the desirability of admitting to Canada of carefully selected individuals or groups of refugees, as being desirable, not only from humane and ethical standpoints, but also because such immigration should prove a valuable addition to our national economy, by introducing skilled workers and new arts, crafts and industries. [78]

Canadian self-interest clouded the wording of this resolution. The grounds for the refugees' admission to Canada would fundamentally rest on their ability to aid Canada economically. Yet, from the point of view of Frederick Blair, Deputy Minister of Immigration, "certain of their habits" made Jews unassimilable. Nor were they desirable from an ethical or humane standpoint. They were unsuitable to the immigration needs of Canada given the existing economic conditions of the 1930s. So while Baptists may have eventually petitioned their government to admit more Jewish refugees, that government ignored the petition at least partially on the basis of the criterion it set forth as terms of admission.

Clearly reticence did not characterize the response of Baptists,

whether fundamentalist or liberal, to the plight of European Jews in the years from 1933-1939. Nevertheless, while some Baptists were vociferant, as was the case with Kirkconnell and Shields, many remained indifferent. Furthermore, though events like *Kristallnacht* and the St. Louis had some traumatic effect upon Baptists, and served to heighten awareness of the horrors being experienced by Jews, neither was able to elicit a massive outcry from the rank and file. For Baptists who had themselves once been victims of persecution and refugees in search of asylum, this is indeed shameful.

Furthermore, Baptists had the opportunity to exact direct influence on the nation's refugee policy, because one of their own co-religionists, Frederick Charles Blair (a church elder) "as director of the Immigration Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources . . . made almost all of the decisions – no matter how small – concerning who got into Canada."[79] As the individual responsible for the enforcement of Canadian immigration policy, Blair "mirrored the increasingly anti-immigration spirit of his times." He believed that, given the present economic conditions, "people should be kept out of Canada instead of being let in."[80] Baptists must, therefore, reflect on the fact that when European Jewry "most needed a friend at the gate, they had an enemy; instead of the philo-Semite they required, they had an anti-Semite; instead of a humanitarian, they got a narrow-minded bureaucrat."[81] Blair's utter "contempt for the Jews was boundless," yet his ideas were entirely compatible with those of the Canadian government, the public at large, and many members of his denomination. In the final analysis, responsibility for excluding Jews from Canada rests with Mackenzie King and his government. Nevertheless, it is disheartening to acknowledge that a religious man – a Baptist – was largely responsible for the implementation of that policy.

As advocates of religious liberty, Baptists in Canada have not consistently expressed a concern for human rights issues. Church ecclesiology sometimes hampered such support, while on other issues (e.g., temperance laws) offered no fundamental road blocks to denominational resolutions and actions. Nevertheless, Baptists' distinctive polity has meant that even when denominational resolutions are passed, their implementation (and their support) resides with each local congregation. Baptist involvement in broader social issues has therefore largely been dictated on the basis of (local) self interest or evangelistic concerns. As a result, Baptists have demonstrated not only an insensitivity to many issues, but also a larger pattern of inaction. The lack of a theological framework that not only permitted, but also demanded intervention on behalf of the interests of the oppressed, is ultimately what limited Baptist responses to

the plight of European Jews in the 1930s. While some prominent individuals spoke out against such oppression, like Kirkconnell and Shields, still others, like Blair, condoned it. Without large scale public support, it is highly unlikely that the Canadian government would have altered its refugee policy during the 1930s.

Endnotes

1. See I. Abella and H. Troper, *None Is Too Many: Canada and the Jews of Europe, 1933-1948* (Toronto: Lester Publishing Ltd., 1983), XII-XIII.

2. Abella and Troper, *None Is Too Many,* XI.

3. Abella and Troper, "Canada and the Jewish Refugees, 1933-39," in *Twentieth Century Canada: A Reader* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd., 1986), 258. Under PC 1957, only those immigrants with enough capital to allow themselves to establish and maintain farms were permitted access, while PC 659, banned all non-agricultural immigrants of non-British or non-American heritage.

4. Davies and Nefsky, *How Silent Were the Churches? Canadian Protestantism and the Jewish Plight During the Nazi Era* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1998), 80; and "How Jews Regard Christ," *Canadian Baptist*, 4 January 1923, 7.

5. "Holy Ground," *Canadian Baptist*, 6 April 1933, 10; and Davies and Nefsky, *How Silent Were the Churches?* 80.

6. "Why was Jesus a Jew?" *Canadian Baptist*, 14 December 1933, 6.

7. "Watching Jesus," *The Gospel Witness*, 06 July 1933, 4-5; and Davies and Nefsky, *How Silent Were the Churches?* 80.

8. "When a Christian is Not a Christian," *The Gospel Witness*, 15 April 1937, 5.

9. "My Beloved is Mine and I am His," *The Gospel Witness and the Protestant Advocate*, preached 07 November 1937, 05 November 1953, 12-13.

10. "From Many Lands," *Canadian Baptist*, 29 June 1933, 11.

11. Robert R. Smale, "'The Voice of One Crying in the Wilderness' or Verbal Bigotry – T.T.. Shields, The Gospel Witness and Roman Catholicism, 1922-1942," *Historical Papers: Canadian Society of Church History* (1997)*:* 16; *The Gospel Witness*, 06 November 1940, 6; and *Canadian Baptist*, 05 April 1934, 4.

12. Davies and Nefsky, *How Silent Were the Churches?* 81.

13. "Germany and the Jews," *Canadian Baptist*, 6 April 1933, 3; "Ill Treatment of Jews," *Canadian Baptist*, 27 April 1933; and "Barring the Jews," *Canadian Baptist*, 04 May 1933, 3; In 1933, forty delegates of the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work met in the city of Novi Sad. The new German church organization sent five delegates to present the point of view of German Christianity under the Hitler regime. The other delegates of the Council vigorously protested against "the evil things that are taking place in Germany." The meeting created a split between the German and non-German delegates who withdrew from the meeting. Following a letter from the German delegation expressing their desire not only to remain in the Council, but exoneration for the German state and German church, the Stockholm Statement was re-affirmed as a basis for continued cooperation. The Council, however, "expressed the anxiety occasioned in all lands [due to] the ruthless persecution of the Jews, as well as the complete denial of freedom of thought and conscience by the Hitler Government." The persecution of the Jews by the Church was acknowledged as "the blackest page in the whole history of Christianity," something that all nations and all churches were in the past responsible. It was, however, believed that such evil had been "outlived." However, as Henry A. Atkinson, General Secretary of the Church Peace Union and Member of the Executive Committee of the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work added, "this latest outbreak of fanaticism and savagery, is all the harder to understand and cannot be excused or condoned, even on the grounds of a 'revolution in Germany'" ("German Jew Problem at Novi Sad," *Canadian Baptist*, 12 October 1933, 14).

14. *Canadian Baptist*, 19 October 1933, 5.

15. "Hitler and Jesus," *Canadian Baptist*, 15 February 1934, 3.

16. "From Many Lands," *Canadian Baptist*, 29 June 1933, 11.

17. *Canadian Baptist*, 05 April 1934, 3ff.

18. "The German authorities with full knowledge of the program have given the assurance of *volle Verhandlungsfreiheit*" (*Canadian Baptist*, 21 June 1934, 16).

19. *Canadian Baptist*, 18 January 1934, 15.

20. *Canadian Baptist*, 16 July 1934, 2; *Canadian Baptist*, 23 August 1934, 3; *Canadian Baptist*, 30 August 1934, 2-7; and *Canadian Baptist*, 06 September 1934, 3-5.

21. *Canadian Baptist*, 06 September 1934, 3.

22. *Canadian Baptist*, 06 September 1934, 3; *Canadian Baptist*, 16 August 1934, 7; and *Baptist Yearbook*, 1934, 215-216.

23. "Berlin 1934," *Canadian Baptist*, 06 September 1934, 3.

24. "Germany and the Jews," *Canadian Baptist*, 20 February 1936, 15.

25. "Germany and the Jews," *Canadian Baptist*, 20 February 1936, 15.

26. "Dismissal of Jews in Nazi Germany," *Canadian Baptist*, 12 April 1934, 14.

27. "Liberty Lives, in the Middle Road," *Canadian Baptist*, 13 October 1936, 3.

28. "Ousting Religion," *Canadian Baptist*, 02 May 1935, 2.

29. "Democracy and Religion," *Canadian Baptist*, 06 August 1936, 15.

30. "Democracy and Religion," *Canadian Baptist*, 06 August 1936; "Baptists and Religious Liberty," *Canadian Baptist*, 16 March 1938; *Canadian Baptist*, 16 November 1933, 2; "The Baptist Challenge of the Hour," *Canadian Baptist*, 8-15 July 1937; and "1936 Year of the Dictators," *Canadian Baptist*, 07 January 1937.

31. "When Jews and Gentiles Sit Together," *Canadian Baptist*, 29 October 1936, 3. The editor's comments about the so-called equality of Jews in British dominions was a slight exaggeration as they were subject to prejudice there as well. Two years later, this scenario was re-created when Holy Blossom dedicated its new Temple. Lord Tweedsmuir, Canada's Governor-General, delivered the address ("This Could Not Happen in Germany," *Canadian Baptist*, 02 June 1938, 22).

32. "Crisis and Challenge," *Canadian Baptist*, 28 October 1937, 7.

33. "The Truth About Mussolini," *The Gospel Witness*, 14 September 1933, 5; and David R. Elliott, "The Intellectual World of Canadian Fundamentalism, 1870-1970," Ph.D. diss., University of British Columbia, 1989, 159-60. Shields admiration for Mussolini seems to have stemmed from the religious liberty he appeared to grant to Protestant missions in Italy and his expression of admiration for the British constitution.

34. *The Gospel Witness*, 14 March, 1935, 3; Shields charged that he would be "ashamed of the flag" if the government gave into Mussolini with respect to Ethiopia (*The Gospel Witness*, 05 September 1935, 4).

35. *The Gospel Witness*, 12 March 1936, 3; *The Gospel Witness*, 17 March 1938, 1; *The Gospel Witness*, 27 October 1938, 7; and *The Gospel Witness*, 29 September 1938, 6.

36. "Menace of Pacifism," *The Gospel Witness*, 05 July 1934, 4-6; "What Will Happen to Germany," *The Gospel Witness*, 26 July 1934, 6-7; and *The Gospel Witness*, 12 March 1936, 2.

37. *The Gospel Witness*, 04 April 1935, 7; *The Gospel Witness*, 06 December 1934, 7; and *The Gospel Witness*, 12 March 1936, 2.

38. *The Gospel Witness*, 04 April 1935, 7.

39. *The Gospel Witness*, 12 March 1936, 1; *The Gospel Witness*, 05 September 1935; "The Perils of Pacifism," *The Gospel Witness*, 19 March 1936, 1; and *The Gospel Witness,* 12 March 1936, 1. Shields held that those whose sought to bring about peace through a reduction in arms were "the worst enemies of the Empire," and that citizens of the Empire would be forced to surrender their citizenship "if the counsel of the pacifists had prevailed" ("Saul and Jonathan," *The Gospel Witness*, 04 May 1933, 5-6; "The Menace of Pacifism," *The Gospel Witness*, 05 July 1934; *The Gospel Witness*, 05 September 1935, 3ff; and "Folly of Pacifism," *The Gospel Witness*, 21 May 1936, 5-6).

40. This battle had been raging since the 1920s when Shields broke ranks with the Convention and formed his own Baptist denomination.

41. Shields asserted that modernist impulses were responsible for the "ravings of Hitler and his Lieutenants [and] of a Germanized, Hitlerized religion," which he had predicted more than twenty-five years before, when she let "loose her poisonous philosophies that polluted the springs of learning in all the universities of the world" ("Answering By Fire," *The Gospel Witness*, 09 November 1933, 4).

42. "Canada's Duty in View of the World Menace of Hitlerism," *The Gospel Witness*, 22 September 1938, 4.

43. *The Gospel Witness*, 02 July 1936, 2.

44. "How God Provides for Refugees," *The Gospel Witness*, 24 November 1938, 3; "When Will 'the Jews' Enemy,' the German Haman, Hang on the Gallows Prepared for Mordecai?" *The Gospel Witness*, 17 November 1938, 6; and "Amazing Credulity," *The Gospel Witness*, 09 February 1939, 2ff.

45. *The Gospel Witness,* 17 September 1936, 5; and "When Will 'the Jews' Enemy . . ." 4.

46. Davies and Nefsky note this sermon was delivered at Massey Hall, as the Jarvis Church had been recently damaged by fire, which many in the congregation felt was set by Nazi sympathizers (*How Silent Were the Churches?* 83).

47. "When Will 'the Jews' Enemy . . ." 6; see similar remarks in "How God Provides For the Refugees," *The Gospel Witness*, 24 November 1938, 3.

48. "When Will 'the Jews' Enemy . . ." 4-5.

49. "How God Provides for Refugees," *The Gospel Witness*, 24 November 1938, 3.

50. "How God Provides for Refugees," 5.

51. In one of his many attacks against Roman Catholics he asserted, "I do not trust them. Bigotry? All right. I will rest under the accusation. Intolerant? Very well, I am intolerant . . ." ("Shall Rome Be Permitted to Make a Spain of Canada?" *The Gospel Witness*, 21 July 1938, 8).

52. "Palestine and the Jews," *The Gospel Witness and the Protestant Advocate*, 10 February 1944, 5.

53. W. Kirkconnell, *A Slice of Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967), 196.

54. W. Kirkconnell, *The Red Foe of Faith* (n.p., n.d.), 2.

55. W. Kirkconnell, *Canada, Europe and Hitler* (Toronto: Oxford Press, 1939), 190. As he stated earlier in the book, "even more than Communism, Naziism (sic) is today a force seeking to dominate the world through revolution . . .The symbol of the Nazi world revolution is the concentration camp, the living grave of civil and religious liberty" (5-6).

56. W. Kirkconnell, "Canada and the Refugees," *Canadian Baptist*, 25 May 1939, 14.

57. Kirkconnell, "Canada and the Refugees," 4, 16.

58. Kirkconnell, "Canada and the Refugees," 14-16.

59. Kirkconnell, *Canada, Europe and Hitler*, 7.

60. Kirkconnell, *Canada, Europe and Hitler*, 189; and W. Kirkconnell, *Canadians All – A Primer of Canadian National Unity* (Ottawa: The Director of Public Information, 1941), 39-40.

61. Kirkconnell, *Canada, Europe and Hitler*, 123. See also his comments on concerning Hitler's racial theories and policies (10-11).

62. "They Were Not Just Foreigners," *Canadian Baptist*, 01 February 1943; and "Men and Affairs," *Canadian Baptist*, 01 July 1943.

63. W. Kirkconnell, "Canada and the Refugee Problem," *Canadian Baptist*, 01 January 1944, 2. See also his poem "Agony of Israel," which lamented the Jewish martyrdom in Europe and deplored the unwillingness of North America to accept other than a handful of Jewish refugees (*A Slice of Canada*, 273).

64. "Hitler and Jesus," *Canadian Baptist*, 15 February 1934; "Dr. Hoffman on Germany," *Canadian Baptist*, 14 March 1935; "Germany and the Jews," *Canadian Baptist*, 20 February 1936; "Moose Jaw and the Jews," *Canadian Baptist*, 01 December 1938; "Favorite Game of Europe is Baiting the Jews," *Canadian Baptist*, 14 April 1938; and "The Plight of Jewish Refugees," *Canadian Baptist*, 15 June 1939.

65. Louis L. Snyder, "Kristallnacht," *Encyclopedia of the Third Reich* (New York: Paragon House, 1976), 201.

66. Lewis F. Kipp, "I See in the Papers," *Canadian Baptist*, 17 November 1938, 2. The commentator was at least right in recognizing that the Jews were largely friendless in the world.

67. The resolution was put forth by the Baptist World Alliance at their Congress held in Atlanta, Georgia ("Baptist Alliance and Anti-Semitism," *Canadian Baptist*, 29 December 1938, 2).

68. Abella and Troper, " 'The Line Must Be Drawn Somewhere': Canada and the Jewish Refugees, 1933-39," in *Twentieth Century Canada: A Reader* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd., 1986), 256.

69. "The Plight of Jewish Refugees," *Canadian Baptist*, 15 June 1939, 3.

70. *Baptist Yearbook*, 1939, 78. The Baptist Union of Western Canada and the United Baptist Convention of the Maritime Provinces passed similar resolutions ("Convention of the Baptist Union of Western Canada, 11-14 July 1939 – Broadway First Baptist Church," *Western Baptist*, October 1939, 7-8; and *The United Baptist Yearbook of the Maritime Provinces*, 02 September 1939, 19). Also the resolution passed by the Canadian National Council of the World Alliance for International Friendship endorsed by the Executive Committee of the Christian Social Council of Canada, *Canadian Baptist*, 20-27 July 1939, 13. Note the tone of the statement "we warn our Government that no nation can successfully prosecute a holy crusade today when its own hands are stained with the blood of the innocent, and when it puts considerations of trade above those of law, sworn obligation and international morality." The various Baptist Conventions continued to pass various refugee resolutions throughout the war (*Canadian Baptist*, 01 July 1940, 2; "Supporting Jews Claims," *Canadian Baptist*, 13 February 1944, 3; *Baptist Yearbook*, 1940, 362; *Baptist Yearbook*, 1941, 208; and "On Refugees and DPS," *Baptist Yearbook*, 1945/46, 54).

71. "Social Service Board Report – Golden Jubilee Convention," *Canadian Baptist*, 15 June 1939, 5.

72. "Baptist Social Service Board Essay Contest," *Canadian Baptist*, 01 February 1940, 5; and "Winners in Essay Contest," *Canadian Baptist*, 01 October 1940, 2.

73. "Baptists and Religious Liberty," *Canadian Baptist*, 10 March 1938, 5; and "Dr. Rushbrooke at Convention," *Canadian Baptist*, 30 June 1938, 4.

74. "Baptist Preacher Jailed in Romania," *Canadian Baptist*, 29 December 1938, 6; *Canadian Baptist*, 03 November 1938, 6; and E. Gill, "Romanian Baptists at Last Ditch," *Canadian Baptist*, 03 November 1938, 14.

75. "Baptists and the Jews," *Canadian Baptist*, 17 March 1938, 12.

76. R.M. Stephens, "In a Jewish Refugee Camp," *Canadian Baptist*, 16 March 1939, 11.

77. Davies and Nefsky, *How Silent Were the Churches?* 91.

78. *Baptist Yearbook*, 1939, 78-79. See also the Social Services Board's Report calling for the admission of "good settlers"(*Baptist Yearbook*, 1939, 199-200).

79. Abella and Troper, " 'The Line Must Be Drawn Somewhere': Canada and the Jewish Refugees," 258-259.

80. Abella and Troper, *None Is Too Many*, 7.

81. Abella and Troper, *None Is Too Many*, 7.

Irreconcilable Differences: Wartime Attitudes of George C. Pidgeon and R. Edis Fairbairn, 1939-1945

GORDON L. HEATH

The German invasion of Poland on 01 September 1939, and the subsequent declarations of war on Germany by Great Britain and France on 03 September, put the Canadian government in the new position of having to decide whether or not to declare war on another nation. On 10 September, after parliamentary approval, the Canadian government pronounced its declaration of war on Germany.

The Canadian "national"[1] churches responded almost unanimously[2] with their support for the war effort; in fact, many of Canada's leading Protestant leaders had publicly supported the war effort even before Parliament officially declared war. While the Anglican, Presbyterian, and Baptist churches were all publicly united in their endorsement of the decision to go to war, the United Church of Canada (hereafter UCC) was a significant exception to this trend.

While the majority of UCC leaders supported the war effort there was a small, but active, group that urged the church to be pacifists throughout the conflict.[3] What is of interest in this paper is this polarization in a church united around the issue of social concerns. Like many of the American liberal socially conscious churches during World War Two,[4] the UCC was divided over the question of pacifism. Yet how could a church so concerned with national and international social welfare be so divided in its attitude to war? I will argue that the differences in the UCC towards the war effort were mainly the result of two radically opposing interpretations of history, scripture and church policy. More specifically, it will be

shown that both sides of the division had fundamentally different conclusions in their interpretation of: (1) the pre-war UCC statements on war and peace; (2) war guilt; (3) justice and the example of Jesus; (4) Canada's identity as a Christian nation; and (5) the effects of war. The way in which these differences will be identified is primarily by examining the wartime attitudes of two prominent leaders in the UCC, George Campbell Pidgeon[5] and Robert Edis Fairbairn,[6] leaders who were both recognized as having a strong social concern, but who were also on the opposite ends of the spectrum when it came to supporting the war effort.

Pre-War UCC Statements on War and Peace

After Canada declared war on 10 September the UCC's Presbyteries met and approved the position taken by the Executive of General Council in its expression of loyalty to the Canadian government. All Presbyteries did so, and "at their meetings the pacifists were made quite aware of their minority status as they remained defiantly seated while those around them rose in favor of endorsing the Church's policy."[7] Faced with such opposition, 68 pacifist ministers issued a "manifesto" entitled "Witness Against War" in the 15 October 1939 issue of the *United Church Observer*. A month later the *Observer* published an additional 64 names of both clergy and lay-persons. It would seem that Fairbairn was responsible for most (if not all) of the text of the manifesto.[8] The manifesto was a public "statement of faith and commitment" of the pacifist minister's opposition to directly "contributing to the war effort."[9] It was also a rebuke to a church that the ministers thought had abandoned its pre-war pacifist statements. Those who agreed with the manifesto were to communicate with Fairbairn.

The manifesto created a considerable stir in and out of the church. *The Star*, *The Globe and Mail* and *The Telegram* all had editorials that condemned the manifesto; many people considered it "disloyal," and others called for "strong action by the church and other authorities to condemn those who had signed it."[10] Even the Attorney-General Gordon Conant began an investigation into whether or not it violated Regulations 39 or 39A of the War Measures Act.

Central to the argument of the manifesto was the belief that the UCC had renounced war as a sin and would refuse to support any more wars: "We take our stand upon the declaration of our own General Council in 1938, that 'war is contrary to the mind of Christ,' and 'we positively reject

war, because war rejects love, defies the will of Christ, and denies the worth of man.'"[11] Fairbairn, along with the other ministers, was referring back to the four resolutions made by the UCC in 1932,[12] 1934,[13] 1936[14] and especially in 1938.[15] These resolutions reflected the rising tide of pacifist sentiment the English-speaking Protestant churches in the 1920s and 1930s.[16] After having lost his pastoral charge over the publication of the "Witness Against War," after growing increasingly frustrated over the church's lack of clarity on the war issue,[17] after writing in February 1941 a damning article in the *United Church Observer* entitled "Indictment" where he stated that the church was "incompetent and unworthy to serve the cause of God,"[18] after becoming increasingly isolated in the church, and after receiving a "tart" reply from the editor of the *United Church Observer* that closed his "relations with the Church paper,"[19] Fairbairn began his own newsletter in January 1943. It is in this newsletter that one can clearly see the importance which Fairbairn placed on the General Council's pre-war statements on war, and also how he interpreted them to mean that the church was to be opposed to war.

Fairbairn claimed that by abandoning its pre-war pacifist statements the UCC was in a position of apostasy. The church believed it was fighting a "just cause," yet it also had declared "war . . . contrary to the mind and spirit of Christ, therefore war is a sin and war-time is the occasion for every form of evil to increase and abound."[20] As a result of these two mutually contradictory statements by the church, Fairbairn saw taking part in the war as "setting aside the mind and spirit of Christ for the duration."[21] How else, he argued, could this be seen but a "deliberate profession of apostasy" by the church?[22] Throughout the next two and a half years Fairbairn continually used the church's pre-war statements against itself. He wrote that Jesus was repudiated when men said "Of course war is contrary to Christ, nevertheless we are obliged to wage war."[23] He criticised the church's playing it safe by "refusing to make any official statement . . . while it has ignored its own past declarations in four General Councils condemning war."[24] He considered the church to be a "weather-cock," switching its beliefs as the winds of trends changed,[25] and as a result, the UCC was a church that had lost his confidence and support due to its lack of integrity on the issue.[26]

Pidgeon, however, was one of those leaders in the UCC who took the opposite view of Fairbairn. He was well aware of the pre-war statements, but, for him, there were other considerations that had greater moral weight

than the statements formulated in the pre-war days of the 1930s.[27]

War Guilt

While Pidgeon was cautiously supportive of the war effort, he was also open about the contribution of the western nations to the tensions in Europe. As early as January 1939, at a time of increased tensions in Europe, he asked somewhat prophetically "are we sure we are right ourselves?" for did not the west's treatment of Hitler make war "inevitable?"[28] He went on to claim that "[we have] brought this on ourselves . . . [we are] reaping what [we have] sowed."[29] Immediately following the German invasion of Poland, while supporting the Allied side, he proclaimed:

> The statesmen of the world are claiming the right to command our lives and direct our doings. We consent there is nothing else to do. Yes, but those very statesmen have made, in their treatment of one another, this appalling mess of things, and have brought about the chaos which our boys are called to the colors to bring back to order. Hitler – the criminal of criminals? Granted, but Hitler was made possible by the victor nation's treatment of a fallen foe.[30]

The fact that "mistakes had been made in the past,"[31] that the western democracies failed miserably in their response to the crisis in Europe and Asia,[32] and that "the free nations of modern time have too often forgotten the high ideals and aims which alone can justify a nation's existence, and have concentrated their energies on profits"[33] did not deter Pidgeon from still endorsing the war effort in the first critical year of the war. His continued criticism of the west's complicity in the war, after tapering off in 1941 and 1942, actually increased as the war appeared to be won.[34] No doubt, as his sermon of 20 May 1945 indicates, this renewed emphasis on the guilt of the West was in part his effort to ensure that the same mistakes were not made again.

> The question for us to now answer is: Are we able to hold fast the ground gained in the eventful years just behind us? . . . The moment the enemy was downed [Germany in World War One] our old self-interest and self-indulgence reasserted themselves and brought on the world the dire curse from which we have just been set free . . . What

are we going to do with our religious freedom?[35]

Hopefully, and by Thanksgiving 1945 it seemed to Pidgeon that his hopes were being realized, the Allies would have learned from the past and do their "utmost with their unity sealed with the blood of their best" to stand for "the rights of the individual, for freedom of conscience, of worship and of speech, for government of the people, by the people and for the people, and for justice both in dealing with the criminals of the past and in planning for the social systems of the future."[36]

Fairbairn was also convinced of the war guilt of the west. He argued that the war was due to greed and economic exploitation[37] and the tensions that arose were due to the western nations' lust for empire.[38] Yet Fairbairn went beyond placing pre-war guilt on the west to claim that the Allied side was guilty of great hypocrisy and injustices during the war. He criticised Britain's fighting for freedom yet at the same time repressing India.[39] He asked "What is the worst you see?" and after citing the evils in the world due to Nazism and totalitarianism, he said "Look again. The worst of all is what the practice of successful war is doing to ourselves, in the steady descent into the moral hell of callousness."[40] The evils of Nazi Germany were great, but the callousness of their hearts had made the Allies do terrible things, so much so he was convinced that "the price of vistory [sic] is that we have become what we went to war to eliminate."[41] Echoing the concern expressed by other pacifists in the war, the bombing of German cities was foremost in Fairbairn's mind in this regard : ". . . that by embarking upon this campaign of ruthless destruction of life, civilian and military, we have reduced ourselves to the moral level of German and Japanese militarists."[42] Even if the reported executions and cremations that were beginning to trickle out of Germany near the end of the war were correct, Fairbairn asked "are they any more diabolical thsn [sic] our cremation alive with phosphorus bombs of the civilians of Hamburg?"[43] He went on to argue that the difference between German atrocities and the Allied atrocities (bombing) was a "matter of temperament and training. Our way seems more refined. Does it make the atrocity any less atrocious?"[44] Fairbairn placed the blame for this "degradation of civilization below the level of beasts" at the foot of the church, for the church "did have insight once into the nature of war, but forsook it quickly when called to heel by the State."[45]

Ironically, while Fairbairn's understanding of war guilt led him to

conclude that no side in the war could claim the side of righteousness, Pidgeon did not see it that way. In fact, Pidgeon was very much convinced that the Allied side was still on the side of justice.

Justice and the Example of Jesus

Although a pragmatic element to Pidgeon's resigned support for the war can be identified,[46] such pragmatism was rooted in his interpretation of God's justice. For Pidgeon, justice was the main rationale for supporting the war effort. While it was a theme that ran throughout his wartime sermons, it was one that he emphasized more in the dark days of 1940 and 1941 as a way of keeping spirits high and ensuring Canadians and UCC members of the rightness of their cause.

Pidgeon was convinced that the "free nations have the clear conscience that they are on the Lord's side . . . God is with them in their struggle"[47] and that "God is the author of the justice for which we fight today. He is pledged to its maintenance and vindication; we are on His side."[48] Even though he recognized the sins of the Allied nations, the degree of the evil of the totalitarian powers made the Allied cause righteous. For, as Pidgeon proclaimed, "We are righting a system which for barbarity, injustice, systematized plunder and destruction is beyond anything imagined by men in our time."[49] Using 2 Samuel 5:22-25 in a sermon entitled "The Battle is the Lord's," after thanking God for Winston Churchill's leadership and expressing the desire for a new world, Pidgeon stated that the task of the Allied side was clear: "the first necessity now as in David's day is the defeat of barbarism and the re-enthronement of justice among the nations."[50]

Preaching a sermon entitled "The Story of Rizpah" from 2 Samuel 21:1-14, a sermon that he had also preached in May 1917,[51] Pidgeon argued that the state had responsibility for ensuring that justice was done.

> According to this story and many others like it God clothes the ruler with authority to establish justice in the land. He holds the state responsible not only for doing right but for having the right done. If it fails and a crime is committed, the state is responsible for vindicating justice by bringing the criminal to account . . . If the state fails to do this, the people as a whole must bear the guilt and the consequences of the evil done by its individual members . . . Here you have

> the Old Testament idea of pure justice . . . [52]

After listing atrocities around the world in war-torn countries, he went on in the same sermon to say:

> Justice will not be mocked . . . Believing this as I do, I cannot think our country and Empire wrong in calling a halt to that sort of thing in Europe. There are many arrows in God's quiver which he waits to use, and one of them is the conscience of His people which drives them to avenge a wrong.[53]

Through nations, therefore, God was to accomplish "His purposes."[54] And his purposes were to oppose any actions which were contrary to the character of God, for "God is behind His attributes and everyone who attacks them challenges Him. He accepts the challenge."[55]

One of his main concerns of justice for the Allied nations was the just treatment of peoples. As the Allied defences were crumbling in France before the onslaught of the German *Blitzkrieg* in May 1940, Pidgeon proclaimed that all people were interdependent: ". . . according to the teaching of our text does not this make all men my brothers, and do not the responsibilities of brotherhood extend to all mankind? Never was the realization of this truth as necessary as now."[56]

Condemning the West's failure to act in the pre-war years, Pidgeon went on in the same sermon to attempt to inspire in what he considered an apathetic people a sense of their responsibility for those in countries where great injustices were occurring.[57] In his mind "children of the one Father are brothers and cannot escape the obligations of brotherhood."[58]

But what about the pacifist's emphasis on love? Pidgeon did emphasize the need for love and reconciliation, for when war broke out (and passions were not yet too high) he stated that "we cannot be Jesus's bond servants and disobey His central command – love your enemies."[59] He went on to say that "the most pitiable figure in human society is the man possessed of hate. He is the opposite of God; God creates while he lives to destroy."[60] Yet, throughout the war the few times that he seemed to be addressing the view of pacifists he was quite derogatory in his remarks. He referred to pacifism as a "fantasy of our own time,"[61] or "dreams and fancies impossible" which "gave the dictators their chance."[62] The New Testament did speak of love, but for Pidgeon "the New Testament does not

change the Old Testament doctrine of justice."[63] While Pidgeon may have appreciated the sentiments behind pacifism, he did not seem to consider it a realistic alternative in a world of totalitarian states.[64]

Fairbairn, however, could not have disagreed more. The critical concern for Fairbairn was not justice per se, but rather, it was Jesus. Throughout his *Bulletin* the example of Jesus was held up as the example and role model for all Christians. Any alliance of church and state was considered a compromise of the church's "supreme loyalty to Christ,"[65] and the UCC, according to Fairbairn, had committed such a grievous sin.[66]

Loyalty to Jesus, as Fairbairn interpreted it, was to chose Jesus' way; the way of non-violence. "Reconciling Jesus Christ and war" was considered an "impossibility," for Jesus Christ died "because he was a deeply convinced pacifist."[67] Jesus' repudiation of messianic expectations was understood by Fairbairn as the same as renouncing war.[68] The example of Jesus and the cross, however, was the ultimate example of Jesus's way of non-violence.

> Here [crucifixion] was indeed a form of warfare, the campaign of the spirit. Jesus was not merely resisting, he was attacking. There was no pacifism in his pacifism. He chose this way because he believed that even his own death would defeat evil and advance the kingdom . . . Jesus died because he was a deeply convinced pacifist . . . Omit this principle and insight, and you leave out the essential reality of the cross.[69]

It was Fairbairn's hope that a nation ("perhaps the non-Christian Hindus!"[70]) would go the way of peace even to death, and then people would see that "yes, even though our western civilization perish and go the way of Egypt, Babylon, Rome, and the other empires and civilizations that have put their trust in the sword, God's truth will arise from every Golgotha."[71]

On a more pragmatic note, after four and a half years of war, Fairbairn argued that "modern war "must in the nature of things be total war," and that meant that "if we must accept war we must accept the reality of war, and that means equipping ourselves for modern war in a modern way."[72] He went on to say that

> religious people who feel it necessary to accept war must stop fooling

> themselves with the vain imagination that war can be waged in a nice, refined, and Christian way. Not modern war! Its scale of destruction is too vast, too brutally impersonal, and, in addition, it calls for all those skills of personal attack by terror and savagery which in Red Indians we branded as treachery.[73]

As a result, Fairbairn concluded, it was the pacifist who was a realist over against the "unrealism of men who think they can equate Jesus Christ and war."[74]

Canada's Identity as a Christian Nation

Another of the reasons for the divergent views between Pidgeon and Fairbairn was their different understandings of a Christian nation. Fairbairn's attitude was summed up in his *Apostate Christendom*: "There has never been a Christian nation, ours are not Christian nations, there is no sign of a Christian nation."[75] With the war in Europe finished and the war in Asia almost over, reflecting on how Canadians considered their country (and the Empire in which is was located) to be "special in God's eyes," Fairbairn wrote:

> As I remember the common people of England, and as I know representative English-Canadians, they were, and are, obsessed by what they like to call "the Glory of the British Empire". [sic] Of course they had been propagandized into this religio-patriotism through generations; that is why they hold to, or it holds them, so tenaciously. That explains the strange phenomena of British Israelism and the celebration of Empire Day. There is sufficient truth in the suggestion that flag-waving patriotism is the Britishers [sic] other religion, if not indeed his working religion. All they ever get out of it is the privilege of having their sons die periodically in war. But the profiteers of Empire could not possibly get solid gain from imperial-ism, if the common people were not so solidly held in the delusion that it is the Will of Almighty God that Britain should dominate the earth.[76]

In condemning the notion that Canada (or Britain) was a "Christian" nation (or part of a Christian empire), Fairbairn was well aware that there existed "a wide-spread sentimental mass of belief which accounts for our recent

habit of calling our respective countries 'Christian nations.'"[77] Nevertheless, he rejected such a notion.

Pidgeon, like most Canadians was firmly convinced that they lived in a "Christian civilization," or in a Christian nation.[78] Making parallels with the Old Testament nation of Israel and Canada, Pidgeon concluded that Canada (and the other Western Allied nations) was special in God's eyes and had a unique role to play in His plan.[79]

> Now Israel was the elect nation chosen of God to prepare for the coming of His Son; none can take this honor from her nor share it with her. But there have been other races selected for other purposes. What about Greece? What about little Scotland and the place of her people in the modern world? And what about England's stand in the breech when the bulwarks of freedom went down before the foe? Do you not think that Canada has a similar purpose to fulfil?[80]

Pidgeon was so convinced of the fact that God was on the side of "Christian civilization" that he periodically referred to the war as a "crusade."[81] Because of Canada's special place in God's plan, victory was considered a result of God's assistance. Prayer was considered to have "hurled back the best equipped army the world had ever seen" in World War One,[82] and during the present war Pidgeon considered prayer and consecration to be essential to victory.[83] After the war certain "miracles" in battle were attributed to God's intervention.[84] God was considered to be "in the field"[85] responding to prayer and working out His plans and justice, and as a result, the Allies had God to thank for their victory.[86]

The Effects of War

It would be unfair to conclude, however, that Pidgeon was merely a puppet for the state. While supportive of the war which defended "Christian" Canada, Pidgeon did pronounce his judgement on the present and future effects of war. Here both Pidgeon and Fairbairn could agree. War was a terrible thing. Yet, the similarities ended there.

Pidgeon did not see the war ushering in a new world order. On the contrary, one was supposed to reject the idea that "the power which could crush and destroy could build up an enduring empire."[87] Pidgeon pointed out from the lessons of history that no such "new world order," established

by force survived.[88] War was good only for the purpose of stopping aggression. Even then, war only destroyed.[89] The real work of building was after the war. Consequently, he continually urged a spiritual renewal and deeper commitment to Christ, elements considered to be critical in winning the war, but more importantly, in winning the peace.[90]

Pidgeon, known for having had a deep sense of social responsibility, expressed throughout the war his concern for social ills that caused the war, were a part of the war,[91] and especially the ones that would be faced after the war. Pidgeon's guarded optimism at the end of the war was that the spirit of self-sacrifice so evident in the war would be continued after the war. If that attitude was carried over "from war to peace," he asked, "would not many of our social problems disappear?"[92]

Fairbairn had no such optimism. He was convinced that a study of history showed that war never accomplished anything. World War Two was a case in point, for "the war pulled down three dictatorships and has established another in unchallengeable power."[93] He hoped that the church would have learned (again) about the futility of war, but he feared that "a good deal of faith will perish in the process."[94] Sceptical about the effectiveness of the United Nations,[95] upset about the lack of leadership in the UCC,[96] and deeply concerned over the spiritual state of a Christendom at war, Fairbairn expressed a sense of foreboding about the future.

> Because of this lack of genuine faith we face with confusion of mind, foreboding, and a sense of inadequacy the problem of preparing for a more tolerable kind of post-war world. There simply *must* be a tremendous upsurge of Christian faith, understanding, conviction and devotion.[97]

Lamenting what might have been if the church had been "faithful to the gospel of Jesus" in the war he asked if they were not heading to a new "Dark Age?"[98]

Conclusion

This paper has shown that the division in the UCC over the issue of participation in World War Two was the result of radically different, and mutually exclusive, views on war. Both sides in the argument based their views on their interpretation of history, scripture and church policy. The

problem for the "united" church was that these views were so contrary to one another. Pidgeon felt that history vindicated the use of war to stop evil, yet Fairbairn felt that history showed the futility of war. Pidgeon recognized the war guilt of the West, but considered the Axis Powers' guilt was greater. Fairbairn, on the other hand, was convinced the both sides were equally guilty on all counts. Pidgeon equated the western Allied powers with Christian civilization, justice, and being on God's side in the conflict. Focusing on the example of Jesus, Fairbairn felt that Jesus' example of non-violence was the only Christian option to war. He also argued that there was no such thing as a Christian nation. Perhaps the greatest ammunition for Fairbairn in his attack on the stance of the UCC to war were the pre-war pacifist statements of the church. It could be argued that if these statements had not been made Fairbairn would not have had the case (or the expectations) that he claimed he had. As it was, the church did make such professions, and did stray from them. It also, in Fairbairn's opinion, did not clearly and decisively state its position on the war during the war years. As a result, Fairbairn considered the church apostate.

The gulf separating Pidgeon and Fairbairn was wide and deep. Their differences of interpreting history, scripture and church policy meant that they would inevitably be on opposite sides of the conflict in the church over the war issue. Fairbairn declared that Pidgeon recognized this when he responded to one of Fairbairn's inquiries by stating "it was impossible to discuss pacifism; our minds were too far apart."[99] In a divorce court such alienation between the two sides would be called "irreconcilable differences." The differences seemed just too immense, profound, emotional, and mutually exclusive for any dialogue and change to be possible.

Endnotes

1. Churches with "national aspirations" is the term used by Charles Thompson Sinclair Faulkner to describe the churches that had representation across the country and "aspired" to be national churches. Churches that he considers fit this description include Anglican, Presbyterian Church of Canada, United Church of Canada, and the four Baptist Conventions (see "'For Christian Civilization:' The Churches and Canada's War Effort, 1939-1942," Ph.D. Diss., University of Chicago, 1975).

2. Though not with the same enthusiasm that they had entered into war in 1914. In 1939 there was a subdued sense of the war being a "messy but necessary job" (see Robert A. Wright, "The Canadian Protestant Tradition 1914-1945," in *The Canadian Protestant Tradition Experience: 1760-1990*, ed. George A. Rawlyk [Burlington: Welch Publishing Company Inc., 1990], 188).

3. David R. Rothwell, "United Church Pacifism, October 1939," *Bulletin* XXII (1973-1975), 36-55.

4. W. Edward Orser, "World War Two and the Pacifist Controversy in the Major Protestant Churches,"*Protestantism and Social Christianity*, ed. Martin E. Marty (New York: K.G. Saur, 1992).

5. Pidgeon (1872-1971) as a Presbyterian minister was actively involved in church union leading up to 1925 as well as serving as the first UCC moderator. He was involved in social reform, radio ministry, ecumenical movements, numerous committees, authoring *The United Church in Canada: The Story of Union*, and pastoring the prominent Bloor Street United (Presbyterian until 1925) Church in Toronto for thirty two years (1915-1947) (see John Webster Grant, *George Pidgeon* [Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1962]).

6. Fairbairn (1880-1953) was active in arousing social awareness in the UCC, contributor to *Towards the Christian Revolution*, author of *Apostate Christendom* and *The Appeal to Reality*, pastor, founder and editor of a pacifist newsletter that circulated in the church, as well as one of the main leaders behind the pacifist movement in the UCC.

7. Rothwell, "United Church Pacifism," 37.

8. Rothwell, "United Church Pacifism," 38.

9. "Witness Against War," *The United Church Observer* (15 October 1939), 21.

10. Rothwell, "United Church Pacifism," 37, 47-50; Faulkner, "For Christian Civilization," 49-58; and Thomas P. Socknat, *Witness Against War: Pacifism in Canada, 1900-1945* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987), 200-211.

11. "A Witness Against War," 21.

12. *The United Church of Canada Yearbook* (1932), 61, 105-106.

13. *The United Church of Canada Yearbook* (1934), 63-64.

14. *The United Church of Canada Record of Proceedings* (1936), 54, 107.

15. *The United Church of Canada Record of Proceedings* (1938), 63, 77-79, 93-98.

16. Socknat, *Witness Against War*, chapters 4-6. For an example of the rise of pacifism in another Canadian denomination in the thirties see Gordon L. Heath, "Flirting With Nirvana: The Canadian Baptist View of Warfare, 1919-1939," Paper presented at the Canadian Baptist Historical Conference, Hayward Lectures, Acadia University, 1998.

17. Socknat writes: "The United Church had offered little guidance on the proper Christian response to war because its exact teaching on the issue was unclear. For this reason both pacifists and non-pacifists urged the church to justify its action in condemning the 'Seventy-Five' and to show how its members could at the same time vow allegiance to Christ while doing the necessary deeds of warfare" (*Witness Against War*, 212).

18. Fairbairn, "Indictment," *United Church Observer* (01 February 1941), 11. In the *United Church Observer* (15 March 1941), 16-17, 26, there was a summary of the responses to Fairbairn's letter. The editor noted that it was impossible to print all the responses, and would not be printing any more. See also Socknat, *Witness Against War*, 212-213 for a summary of the varied response to Fairbairn's article.

19. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #1*, 19 January 1943. Most of these bulletins were dated and given a bulletin number. There are no page numbers because the newsletter was only one a single sheet of paper, usually on both sides. There are some gaps in the collection during the war years. Fairbairn was the sole author of the bulletin, but he did solicit comments and often responded to them. The bulletin can be found at the UCC Archives in Toronto.

20. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #1*, 01 January 1943.

21. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #1*, 01 January 1943.

22. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #1*, 01 January 1943.

23. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #3*, 02 April 1943.

24. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #3*, 02 April 1943; *Bulletin #26*, 20 March 1945; *Bulletin #27*, (no date).

25. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #8*, 24 September 1943; *Bulletin #25*, 20 February 1945. He was critical of Dr. Morrison, the editor of the *Christian Century*, for the same reason. Fairbairn considered his change in attitude an "amazing example of rationalization" to the trends of the day (*Bulletin #3*, 02 April 1943; and *Bulletin #6*, 22 July 1943). Fairbairn may have felt a sense of betrayal by

Morrison's change of attitude, for earlier in the war Morrison, in the *Christian Century*, had championed the cause of the UCC pacifists and their "Witness Against War" (see N. K. Clifford, "Charles Clayton Morrison and the United Church of Canada," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 15, No. 2 [1969]: 82).

26. In an open letter to the moderator of the UCC about the church's desire to organize evangelism in the churches, Fairbairn wrote " . . . we find within ourselves little interest or desire to undertake the proposed protracted effort, and we wish to tell you why . . . unless the United Church of Canada can bring itself to do what for five years it has refused to do, we have no confidence that it possesses the insight into the nature of the Kingdom of God, the power to utter the Word of Christ, or the courage to walk in the Way of Christ, as are necessary to justify and implement any campaign for the Kingdom of Christ"(*Bulletin #25*, 20 February 1945).

27. Pidgeon seems to have considered that such statements by the church were not authoritative statements in the way that statements such as the Basis of Union were to the church. As a result he felt no qualms about taking a position contrary to such statements.

28. 29 January 1939, File #1617, Box 46, Pidgeon Papers (hereafter PP). Each of Pidgeon's sermons, found in the UCC Archives in Toronto, has a title and text, date, file #, and box #. Further references to Pidgeon's sermons will follow that order (without title and text). Robert Wright argues that the Protestant church in Canada was well aware of the increase of tensions in Europe and Asia, was very concerned about the direction that international relations seemed to be heading, and during specific crisis, did protest the actions of imperialistic states (*A World Mission: Canadian Protestantism and the Quest For a New International Order, 1918-1939* [Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991], chapter 7).

29. 29 January 1939, File #1617, Box 46, PP.

30. 10 September 1939, File #1647, Box 46, PP.

31. 05 November 1939, File #1658, Box 46, PP.

32. 19 May 1940, File #1698, Box 46, PP.

33. 23 June 1940, File #1705, Box 46, PP.

34. For example Pidgeon, taking a shot at the pacifists, argued that "preoccupation of religious people with dreams and fancies impossible of realization gave the dictators their chance" (28 June 1942, File #1819, Box 47, PP). Failure to listen to Churchill, trade with Japan, and isolationism also contributed to the war (05 December 1943, File #1891, Box 48, PP). Citing

the words of Dr. John R. Mott, "If you do not send ten thousand missionaries to Japan soon, you will be sending a million bayonets in my lifetime," Pidgeon claimed that the church, because it did not send the missionaries, saw the prophecy fulfilled (23 May 1943, File #1873, Box 48, PP). This linking of missionaries and peace was not new to Pidgeon, for, as Robert Wright argues, the church, as a part of its international concern the thirties, had believed that missionaries were the "true harbingers of world fellowship" and the best way to bring about peace (*A World Mission*, 242-244).

35. 20 May 1945, File # 1949, Box 49, PP.

36. 14 October 1945, File #1954, Box 49, PP.

37. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #31*, 20 August 1945.

38. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #9*, 28 October 1943.

39. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #22*, 20 November 1944.

40. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #12*, 24 February 1944.

41. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #27*, (no date).

42. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #27*, (no date).

43. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #27*, (no date).

44. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #28*, 20 May 1945.

45. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #27*, (no date).

46. There was a note of resignation in some of Pidgeon's early comments about the war. Phrases such as "we consent there is nothing else to do," and "In the meantime, we are at war. We loath the idea of it, but here it is. Our duty is clear . . ." betrayed his "crushing disappointment" that the war had to be fought (10 September 1939, File #1647, Box 46, PP; 05 November 1939, File #1658, Box 46, PP). Throughout the war years Pidgeon expressed the concern that if totalitarianism was not confronted great evil would befall the world. Most of these fears were expressed at the times of greatest military crisis in the war. They tapered off as victory seemed assured (see, e.g., "We cannot lose heart because that would mean the renunciation of our inherited hope for the future" [19 May 1940, File #1698, Box 46, PP]; "If Great Britain were to follow that policy [appeasement] now the future of humanity would be without a gleam of hope . . . " [1940, File #1702, Box 46, PP]; "Our just task is to win the war, and if we fail at this point, nothing else will avail . . . " [13 October 1940, File # 1717, Box 46, PP; 10 November 1940, File #1721, Box 46, PP; 28 September, File # 1775, Box 47, PP]; "Nothing else matters if the

Nazis prevail . . . " [16 November 1941, File # 1785, Box 47, PP; 28 December 1941, File # 1793, Box 47, PP]). At the end of the war in Europe Pidgeon proclaimed, "The evils from which the heroism of our armed forces delivered us were far more horrible than our worst imaginings" (01 January 1942, File #1794, Box 47, PP; 31 May 1942, File #1816, Box 47, PP; 11 April 1943, File #1864, Box 48, PP; 20 May 1945, File # 1949, Box 49, PP).

47. 09 January 1944, File #1897, Box 48, PP.

48. 21 November 1943, File #1889, Box 48, PP.

49. 05 December 1943, File # 1891, Box 48, PP.

50. 23 March 1941, File #1753, Box 47, PP.

51. A very discouraging time for the Entente powers in World War One. He also preached it again on 21 November 1943 with the new title "justice."

52. 21 January 1940, File 1675, Box 46, PP.

53. 21 January 1940, File 1675, Box 46, PP.

54. 26 May 1940, File #1700, Box 46, PP.

55. 1940, File #1702, Box 46, PP.

56. 19 May 1940, File #1698, Box 46, PP.

57. Pidgeon was actively involved in the ecumenical movement before the war and his concern for the church overseas was reflected in his sermons devoted to updating the experiences of the church in occupied lands (see 25 May 1941, File #1763, Box 47, PP). He also spent a considerable amount of time during the war travelling to the United States on "ecumenical business" (Grant, *George Pidgeon*, 148). Much of this ecumenical concern arose in the 1930's in the context of the totalitarian threat as church leaders began to become concerned for their brothers and sisters in oppressed lands (Wright, *A World Mission*, 232).

58. 25 May 1941, File #1763, Box 47, PP. This reference to the "brotherhood of men" as a justification for war is interesting, for one of the prime rationales for pacifism in the inter-war period was the idea of the brotherhood of men. Pacifists at that time questioned how one nation could fight against another when all were brothers. Here the argument has been reversed and was being used as a rationale for conflict.

59. 10 September 1939, File #1647, Box 46, PP.

60. 10 September 1939, File #1647, Box 46, PP. See also 01 February 1942, File #1799, Box 47, PP; 31 December 1944, File #1933, Box 48, PP. John Webster Grant notes that Pidgeon "detested the wartime hysteria that threatened the church's prophetic voice." These warnings about hate would seem to be one of the ways in which he sought to counter such hysteria (*George Pidgeon* [Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1962], 148).

61. 23 June 1940, File #1705, Box 46, PP.

62. 28 June 1942, File #1819, Box 47, PP.

63. 21 January 1940, File #1676, Box 46, PP.

64. Pidgeon did preach at least one sermon that had pacifist leanings. On 02 February 1941, in the sermon "The Law of Love" (he preached this before in 1923 and 1929), he claimed that "Christianity, the true Christianity, carries no arms; it wins its way by lowly service, by patience, by self-sacrifice" (see 02 February 1941, File #1743, Box 47, PP). Another interesting note in regards to Pidgeon's view of pacifism was that in the *Bulletin #1*, 19 January 1942 and *Bulletin #29*, 20 June 1945, Fairbairn asserted that Pidgeon had preached a pacifist sermon on the radio. Fairbairn claimed that he wrote to Pidgeon asking him how he could reconcile his sermon with his support of the war. Fairbairn went on to claim that Pidgeon "evaded the request, and later declined." A few years later, Fairbairn again made reference to this interaction and used it as an example of the lack of consistent thought and unfaithfulness of the UCC (*Apostate Christendom* [London: Ken-Pax Publishing Company Ltd., c. 1948], 31-32). There is, however, no record of correspondence between Fairbairn and Pidgeon in Pidgeon's extensive collection of correspondence at the UCC archives.

65. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #2*, 01 March 1943.

66. One example of this unholy alliance between church and state that Fairbairn noted was the church's support for war bonds. He stated "Think of the United Church, dependant for the covering of its deficit to a large extent upon war bonds! How could such a church give its prophets liberty to prophesy and still support them?" (see Fairbairn, *Bulletin #2*, 01 March 1943). Fairbairn was not alone in his criticism of the UCC's support and use of war bonds. The *Christian Century* (05 February 1941, 12) published an article critical of the UCC for its war bonds program. There was considerable outrage in the UCC over the *Christian Century* article. The Press Censorship Committee in Ottawa even considered an ban on the *Christian Century* (see Clifford, "Charles Clayton Morrision and the United Church," 83-85).

67. Fairbairn, *Bulletin # 5*, June 1943; Fairbairn, *Bulletin # 26*, 20 March 1945.

68. Fairbairn, *Bulletin # 5*, June 1943.

69. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #26*, 20 March 1945.

70. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #26*, 20 March 1945.

71. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #26*, 20 March 1945.

72. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #12*, 22 January 1944.

73. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #12*, 22 January, 1944.

74. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #12*, 22 January 1944.

75. Fairbairn, *Apostate Christendom*, 61-67.

76. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #31*, 20 August 1945.

77. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #8*, 24 September 1943.

78. 01 January 1942, File #1794, Box 47, PP. Pidgeon was not alone in his assumption that Canada was a Christian nation. Prime Minister Mackenzie King's speech to the nation on 28 October 1939, expressed well this link between Christianity and Canada, and also between Canada being a Christian nation and the justification for war. He said over the CBC that "the time has come when to save Christian civilization, we must be prepared to lay down our lives for its preservation. The young men who are enlisting in our forces today are first and foremost defenders of the faith"(MacKenzie King; cited in Rothwell, "United Church Pacifism," 52). Faulkner proposes that one of the main arguments that the Protestant national churches used to support the war effort in the first few years of the war was the argument that they needed to defend "Christian civilization." He also notes that democracy was considered by Canadian Protestant church leaders (as opposed to Canadian Roman Catholic church leaders) as a "necessary development of the Christian faith, and that the church's mission included the fostering of a healthy democracy" (Faulkner, "For Christian Civilization," 10, 129).

79. It should be noted that the most emphasis was made on this unique status (along with the expected divine deliverance) during the critical stages of the war.

80. 26 April 1942, File #1812, Box 47, PP. Three years later and victory in Europe assured, Pidgeon stated almost the exact same thing. In this context it was not to give hope in a time of despair, but rather, give inspiration for the tasks ahead. He said "Do you believe that Canada was given her freedom and independence in order to develop a type peculiarly her own and to make a unique contribution to mankind? Greece had such a privilege. So had little

Scotland. Consider what Great Britain's character and spirit have meant to mankind in this present crisis. Similarly God has a place for us in the future and will bring us to it. Our prayer is that He will fit us for it. What it may be no one can yet predict; but that a new northern race arose to enrich the soil of humanity is a necessity of the future and we may be equal to the demand if we will"(08 April 1945, File #1946, Box 49, PP; see also 19 May 1940, File #1698, Box 46, PP; 1940, File #1702, Box 46, PP).

81. 19 May 1940, File 1698, Box 46, PP; 26 April 1942, File #1812, Box 47, PP; 03 January 1943, File #1849, Box 48, PP. Pidgeon was not alone in his framing the war in terms of a "crusade." Prime Minister MacKenzie King, in his national speech in October 1939, referred to the war as a "crusade" (see Rothwell, "United Church Pacifism," 52). Other denominations also referred to the war as a crusade (see Faulkner, "For Christian Civilization," 70).

82. A reference to the British and French victory over the Germans at the Marne in 1914 (03 December 1939, File #1663, Box 46, PP).

83. Pidgeon recognized the National Day of Prayer as well as the Day of National Dedication throughout the British Commonwealth of Nations (08 September 1940, File #1713, Box 46, PP; 19 April 1942, File #1812, Box 47).

84. Operations Torch, Husky, the Dunkirk evacuation, and even the World War One Battle of Ypres, were considered the result of the miraculous intervention of God (13 May 1945, File #1948, Box 49, PP). Faulkner notes that all the national Protestant churches considered Dunkirk a miracle ("For Christian Civilization," 97-99).

85. 1940, File #1702, Box 46, PP.

86. 13 May 1945, Box 49, PP; 14 October 1945, File #1954, Box 49, PP. The Order of Service ("which may be used at the time of the cessation of hostilities in Europe or at the end of the war") provided by the Canadian Council of Churches dedicated victory to God's glory and offered thanks-giving for the "deliverance Thou didst vouchsafe to us" (see 13 May 1945, File #1948, Box 49, PP).

87. 28 January 1945, File #1936, Box 49, PP.

88. He used the examples of Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon, and Hitler who too would soon enough find out (02 May 1943, File #1870, Box 48, PP).

89. 23 March 1941, File #1753, Box 47, PP; 01 February 1942, File #1799, Box 47, PP; 27 December 1942, File #1847, Box 47, PP.

90. 17 March 1940, File # 1687, Box 46, PP; 30 June 1940, File #1707, Box 46, PP; 28 September 1941, File #1775, Box 47, PP; 19 April 1942, File #1811, Box 47, PP; 26 April 1942, File #1812, Box 47, PP; 01 November 1942, File #1837, Box 47, PP; 06 December 1942, File #1844, Box 47, PP; 11 April 1943, File #1864, Box 48, PP; 02 May 1943, File #1870, Box 48, PP; 19 September 1943, File #1879, Box 48, PP; 12 December 1943, File #1893, Box 48, PP; 23 April 1944, File #1908, Box 48, PP; 14 May 1944, File #1911, Box 48, PP; 01 April 1945, File #1945, Box 49, PP.

91. Pidgeon also preached wartime sermons on prohibition and on the rise of sexual promiscuity and disease.

92. 19 September 1943, File #1879, Box 48, PP.

93. Fairbairn, *Bulletin # 31*, 20 August 1945; Fairbairn, *Bulletin #28*, 20 May 1945; and Fairbairn, *Bulletin #4* (no date).

94. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #8*, 24 September 1943.

95. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #6*, 22 July 1943; and Fairbairn, *Bulletin #27.*

96. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #25*, 20 February 1945.

97. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #8*, 24 September 1943.

98. Fairbairn, *Bulletin #12*, 24 February 1944.

99. Fairbairn, *Apostate Christendom*, 32. Fairbairn also recognized their irreconcilable differences when he stated in 1943 that only one side in the argument could be right: both sides could not be right (*Bulletin #3*, 2 April 1943).

They "left us pretty much as we were": American Saloon/Factory Evangelists and Canadian Working Men in the Early-Twentieth Century

ERIC CROUSE

At Winnipeg's Queen's Hotel in October 1907 almost 500 people "jammed into the bar" to hear William and Virginia Asher preach of God's love. According to the *Manitoba Free Press*, the tavern audience listened carefully and was quick to participate in the singing of gospel hymns. At Toronto's Taylor Safe Works in January 1911 over 100 workers "blackened from their morning toil [and] seated on workbenches, sectional vaults, and large steel frames" listened to William her relate "the old, old story" of sin and salvation. In the early-twentieth century, the Illinois-based husband and wife evangelist team of William and Virginia Asher, under the leadership of American evangelist J. Wilbur Chapman, preached at taverns, pool halls, factories and workshops in Winnipeg and in the Ontario cities of Orillia, Brantford and Toronto.[1]

Studies by Lynne Marks and Doris O'Dell on late-Victorian Protestantism in small Ontario centres show that working-class religiosity was vibrant and that the working-class favoured the emotionalism associated with revivalism.[2] Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau provide some examples of evangelical leaders reaching out to workers, particularly during the 1914-1925 period.[3] In the case of the Ashers, a limited number of press reports between 1907 and 1911 suggest that the Ashers were well-received by Canadian working men at saloons and industrial worksites. Yet the Ashers enticed very few male workers to overlook social barriers and

become church members. Although there are a number of reasons why evangelism among workers bore little fruit, two of the main ones can be traced to the issue of class. First, in the early-twentieth century, institutional Christianity lost ground in its connections and understanding of working-class experience. Second, Canadian evangelical leaders spoke about the importance of enticing workers into the church fold, but their actions said otherwise.

Between 1901 and 1911 the population of Canada increased 34% from 5,370,000 to 7,210,000, and the country witnessed unprecedented economic growth. Workers, however, faced new pressures. With the advent of "scientific management" – including job simplification and standardization, cost accountancy, and the use of autocratic foremen to insure greater employee productivity – many skilled workers were forced to relinquish a significant degree of shop-floor autonomy. Labourers and those in semi-skilled positions, many of whom were newly arrived immigrants, often "lacked traditions of labour resistance and organization." Defined in terms of maternal and domestic roles, female workers were also prone to exploitation at the worksite and their unfavourable work circumstances (low wages and poor work conditions) were a result of both class and gender relations.[4] With rising manufacturing and industrial wealth there were few signs of improved work and home conditions for working-class men and women. A number of studies show that increases in the Gross National Product did not guarantee an improvement of the standard of living for most Canadian urban labourers. As prosperity increased among the ruling class many workers experienced alienating work, a cycle of insecurity, poor health and dispiriting living conditions.[5]

Outside the domestic sphere male working-class space included many taverns and factory worksites. Tavern space usually provided a sharp contrast to the respectability and convention which was common in Protestant church life. Many working-class taverns embodied a culture that spurned a preoccupation on moral responsibility, character formation and discipline. In this "environment of the crude and the rude" male workers were often provided with a public forum to discuss working-class grievance. By "refusing concession to the hypocrisies of the consolidating bourgeois ethos" tavern culture rejected notions of respectability and the individualistic, competitive philosophy of modern industrial life. The acts of drinking and gambling themselves were the antithesis of the disciplined virtues of industrial capitalism, virtues that were championed by church-

attending capitalist leaders. It was this masculine and plebian milieu of the tavern which was opposed by Protestant clergy and lay leaders, and that a significant number of working men escaped to after work.[6]

As was the case in taverns church life made few direct forays into industrial worksite space. The only time available for religious services at worksites was early in the morning and during the lunch break. Often overworked, men were not likely to relinquish their limited time of freedom. There are, however, some examples of religious services occurring regularly at work sites. In early twentieth-century Toronto 100 workers of the Canada Ship Building Company, for instance, participated in Bible classes conducted at the work site by the YMCA.[7] Managers of the Christie Brown Company in Toronto had promoted gospel lunch-hour meetings for female and male employees for over twenty years. At one Toronto foundry, owners W. Greey and J.G. Greey constructed a chapel on the job site and for sixteen years conducted daily meetings between 7:00 and 7:30 in the morning.[8] There were chairs and hymnbooks for over 100 workers and one employee usually played the piano while another led the singing. While an organized-type of evangelism was rarely seen in industrial space the few exceptions indicate that evangelicalism was welcomed by working men.

The Ashers' provide one of the best examples of evangelism among early twentieth-century Canadian workers. Virginia Healey was born to Irish Catholic parents in 1869 in Chicago. Attending a Protestant church, she accepted Christ as Saviour at the age of eleven. Scottish-born William Asher who lived his early years in Ontario was also converted at the same church. Virginia and William were married in 1887.[9] While a pastor at a church in Minnesota William was concerned that thousands of men filling the local saloons were denied the saving knowledge of Christ. Viewing this as a great opportunity Asher asked a saloon keeper for permission to hold a meeting. In a tavern crowded with lumbermen, miners, sailors and labourers, some openly responded to Asher's message to forsake sin. According to Asher, "that meeting led me to see that the masses could be reached by the Gospel, if we went after them, instead of waiting for them to come to us." Holding numerous open-air meetings among working men, the Ashers' evangelism among the "unreached" caught the attention of well-known American and Presbyterian evangelist J. Wilbur Chapman. In the early years with the Chapman campaigns, the Ashers conducted over 800 meetings in saloons, jails, and other sites.[10] For Virginia, visiting

saloons was difficult in the beginning: "It was never a place familiar to me, and it took a year's battle with myself and God before I came to the point where I gave myself up before I could say I was willing to do the work which God had willed that I should do."[11] Inspired by God, she understood the importance of evangelism in male working-class space.[12]

Having linked up with Chapman the Ashers visited Canada when Chapman brought his revival campaign north between 1907 and 1911. While Chapman and his other associates focused on major churches throughout the cities they visited the Ashers held meetings in taverns, pool rooms, a number of stores and factories.[13]

When working as a team William usually preached while Virginia played the organ and sang gospel music that reportedly "melted" the hearts of many working men. Virginia frequently held her own noon-hour meetings at factories.[14] Both of them were driven to work among the unreached people, a task they pursued optimistically because they believed that many were waiting for someone to speak to them about their souls. To a large group of Toronto industrial workers Asher revealed that he and his wife held special meetings at factories "because of the great need of personal salvation." In Brantford, William declared, "Almost without an exception every man I ever met intends before the end of his life to give his heart to God."[15]

The Ashers' theological message was uncomplicated and non-denominational: "I'm not advocating any particular creed or denomination or religion . . . except that of a man who came down to seek out and to save all from sin – Jesus Christ." As Asher saw it, continued indulgence in sin meant "separation through all the dark ages of eternity from those most dear – from God himself. There is a hell as sure as there is a heaven and your destiny is surely shaping you to one or the other."[16] At a Toronto meeting, he explained that all had sinned and fallen short of the glory of God. Sinful desires of the heart allowed the devil to take individuals down the wrong path. Asher did not see the need to always specify particular sins: "When I say sin, every fellow among you is next to himself. For we have all sinned against ourselves, our families, our countrymen, and God. What I try to do in these meetings is to tell you how to get mastery over sin." To be saved, all the workers had to do was "believe in Him."[17]

Rather than promoting social activism and legislative remedies for economic problems the solution to economic and social problems was personal salvation. By adhering to Christ's teaching, people would be more

loving and thus more caring to others.[18] The Ashers' theological orientation was shaped by their close association to the theologically conservative Moody Bible Institute located in Chicago. Many people influenced by Moody held a premillennial interpretation of end times, the belief that the millennium or one thousand years of righteousness could only begin with the arrival of Jesus, instead of a postmillennial interpretation which said that a Kingdom of God on earth could be established before the second coming of Christ. The Ashers had little faith in grand social reform schemes, and promoted individual over collective action. The concern that Chapman and the Ashers had for the working-class was not rooted in the recent social gospel movement that focused on building a Kingdom of Heaven on earth. Rather, the Ashers' sympathy for the plight of working men was otherworldly and based on conservative evangelical beliefs that Richard Allen views, in his study of the growth of the social gospel, as "irrelevant" in offering a legitimate Christian ethic for industrial Canada.[19] The Ashers' simple gospel message of ruin by sin and redemption by Christ, however, shared a continuity and conceptual framework with older forms of popular religious expression, which could still attract the attention of Canadian working men looking backwards to simpler times.

The Ashers' sermons in taverns usually lasted between 15 and 30 minutes.[20] They did not discuss the ethics of the saloon business or moralize about drinking. Rarely, if ever, did they ask for an offering. Still, it was striking that bar owners did not see the Ashers as a threat to their business and allowed them to hold evangelistic meetings in their taverns. William gained the masculine respect of saloon regulars by communicating effectively in the vernacular. One commentator wrote: "It is a wonderful thing to watch the faces of the men [in saloons], as he shows that he is as familiar with their 'lingo' as they are themselves."[21]

At saloon meetings men were also comforted by Virginia's manner. At the Savoy Hotel in Winnipeg, for example, bar-room patrons asked her to pray for them and, reportedly, "men who had not seen the inside of a church for years publicly acknowledged their belief." On the tavern floor, "fully 100 men knelt" and then sang the popular old hymn "Nearer, my God." Although the Ashers only planned the singing of the first two verses the tavern crowd insisted on singing more of the song. With comforting lyrics void of theological complications, gospel hymns could capture hearts in ways that sermons could not.[22] Hymns like "Nearer, my God" embodied the themes of darkness but also of mercy, themes which many of the

proletariat struggling against the forces of industrial capitalism could contemplate. Sung by a caring and maternal Virginia hymns played upon childhood memories of church life. The same working men who rejected the femininity of Protestantism could not always withstand the emotional tug on their hearts when Virginia sang in their presence. The hardened guard of rough masculinity could be vulnerable, at least temporarily.[23]

Typical was the Winnipeg meeting at the Mariaggi Bar where the Ashers were given a "most reverent and respectful" hearing.[24] During a meeting at Queen's Hotel, there was "dead silence" as approximately 500 patrons listened to the message "And God so loved the world." Every available seat was occupied at one service at the Coffee House where listeners displaying the "marks of a hard and checkered life" were affected by William's exposition of the parable of the prodigal son.[25] As reported in the *Presbyterian*, "Night after night they [the Ashers] are holding services in different bar-rooms and are having large audiences and as respectful attention as if they were ever in a church." At one service "not a drink could be bought for love or money."[26] There were always a number of men who responded to the Ashers' message, some coming forward and shaking hands with the evangelists. Accounts of the 1907 Winnipeg campaign suggest that the gospel message of personal sin and atonement was fairly well-received by working men. Likewise, meetings in Ontario the following year made an impression on working-class men in Orillia and Brantford. The men from the E. Long Co. foundry in Orillia welcomed the Ashers and even raised money to be sent to Virginia. The Ashers received a $20.00 gold piece from the men of J.R. Eaton & Sons' factory.[27] A report in the *Orillia Times* recounted the Ashers' impact on a tavern audience in another city. William began by telling the story of the prodigal son in the vernacular of the bar-room while Virginia sang a song. She was then asked to pray for the patrons "as a mother or sister might." The result was that "the whole crowd of hardened, crime-stained, drink-sodden men sank to their knees." Then William signalled out the tavern owner and challenged him to give up his old life and accept Jesus Christ as a personal Saviour. Remembering his sordid and violent past, the man "hesitated, flushed and then turned pale, but in a moment he squared his shoulders, looked the little preacher square in the face, and said "I will."[28]

It mattered little that this story was written in a melodramatic fashion; males did respond to evangelicalism presented outside the confines of mainstream churches. The press described how vice was

conquered and how "debauched" individuals were reclaimed by the message of Christ. One such individual was an Orillia labourer converted at a "large manufactutory." He presented William Asher with a cigarette box, tobacco, clay pipe and a cocaine bottle, stating "I surrendered all to Jesus and will take Him for my life."[29] An Orillia journalist commented that the Ashers' work "will long be remembered here, particularly for their kind ministration to the poor and the neglected."[30] At an Asher service in Brantford at the Kerby House men clasped a "tankard of beer" with one hand and a "gospel hymn leaflet" with the other. They gradually pushed their beers away, discarded their cigarettes, cigars and pipes, and listened intently and silently to the Ashers as they spoke of "the message of Jesus Christ." At a meeting in the Commercial Hotel bar-room, a large Brantford crowd demonstrated "order and devotional interest" in the Ashers' biblical message and hymn singing. Even when few were present, as at one meeting in Kelly's pool hall, the Ashers' service was "very heartily entered into."[31]

As in other Canadian cities the Ashers appear to have had some success in reaching out to Toronto working-class men. Reports in the newspapers in 1911 indicate that workers were interested in the services and in the message of sin and salvation the Ashers preached. The Ashers' efforts, according to one *Toronto Daily Star* account, were "rewarded by a hushing of the crude life." In respect for the evangelists, Toronto working men were at their best behaviour. The *Toronto Mail* reported that at the Grand Trunk freight sheds "a fair number of the railway-men turned up to listen to some good Gospel and good singing" compliments of William Asher and W.W. Weaver, another member of the Chapman campaign.[32] Although attendance at noon-hour services in Toronto varied because some employees went elsewhere for lunch, workers were receptive to a basic evangelical message of personal sin and redemption through Christ.

Besides hearing the Ashers in saloons and factories, working men attended other services conducted by Chapman evangelists. During the Chapman campaigns there were meetings held in churches in most districts of the cities including some in and around working-class neighbourhoods. Moreover, there were meetings at neutral sites, such as the Orillia Palace Roller Rink, Toronto's Massey Hall, and Winnipeg's Walker Theatre, where meetings for "men only" were held.[33] These sites attracted male workers who might have found "respectable" mainstream city churches

threatening. Unlike the formal atmosphere of some city churches, halls and roller rinks offered a more egalitarian and less institutional setting. The *Orillia Packet* commented on the large numbers that crowded into the Orillia roller rink night after night for the 1908 Chapman meetings: "Here were gatherings that stirred up this whole community, taking first place before politics and even business."[34] Given that the rink meetings attracted at least 2,000 people every evening of the week in a small city of approximately 5,000, there were a large number of working-class attenders at the emotional revival meetings. During the 1911 Toronto campaign the main meetings at Massey Hall alone attracted "fully 100,000" people. At one Massey service there were "some considerably aged unshaven working men in rough clothes and the immaculately attired. A leading Toronto physician mounted the platform and told the meeting of his change of heart, while the broken English of an Italian was heard with others in earnest prayer."[35]

Yet the revival enthusiasm of the Ashers and other Chapman evangelists was tame, at least compared to the earthy, emotional, soul-saving preaching of an earlier era. Historians David Marshall and Phyllis Airhart draw attention to the decline of emotional evangelical services in the nineteenth century and how early twentieth-century evangelical leadership struggled to recapture past glories.[36] The *Voice*, a Winnipeg labour paper, described the Winnipeg campaign as "a modern, up-to-date, business-like affair" managed by "polished gentlemen" with the "old revival seance beaten about as far as the new electric cars have it on the old Red river cart."[37] One of the first hints that the revival meetings did not necessarily generate greater church involvement among workers came within a few weeks after the Winnipeg campaign. One commentator concluded that the meetings had failed to attract workers to church life.[38] Indeed, an examination of Winnipeg church memberships suggest that the Ashers and other Chapman evangelists failed to have a major impact on church growth. The *Presbyterian* believed that the "whole city" had been "deeply moved" yet did not offer any data of conversion numbers to substantiate this claim.[39]

In the aftermath of the 1911 Toronto campaign the denominational press questioned the effectiveness of revival meetings. For example, the *Canadian Congregationalist* admitted that despite the efforts of the evangelists the city continued "as though nothing had happened." Similar assessments were published in the *Canadian Baptist* and the *Christian*

Guardian.[40] The Rev. W.G. Wallace and the Rev. A. Logan Geggie, two Presbyterian clergymen closely connected to the campaign, agreed that the number of converts fell short of expectations.[41]

Such assessments are confirmed by the membership numbers in 1911 for the Toronto Presbytery and Toronto Methodist District. From 1909 to 1913, the best year for the Presbyterians was 1910, the year before the arrival of the American evangelists. Methodist gains did not rise significantly until one and half years after the visit of the Ashers and other Chapman evangelists. Still, some churches did better than others. It may be significant that while Central Methodist Church, situated near wealthy Rosedale, lost members in 1911, Parkdale Presbyterian Church, located near working-class neighbourhoods, had the largest rise in membership. Overall, however, the 1911 Toronto campaign brought few workers into the church fold.[42] Thus, while newspaper reports indicate that working-class people attended campaign meetings, few of them joined mainstream churches.

Church membership figures are problematic. As religious historians have found, many church people never bothered to sign up for official membership, even when they feel and act like members. Nonetheless, both the denominational commentary on the evangelists' impact and church membership numbers give the unmistakeable impression that the un-churched masses were not flocking to the mainstream churches in large numbers. Many young people averse to church participation walked city streets as revival attenders were inside singing "Rescue the Perishing."[43] While future studies may show that lesser known evangelical sects and churches attracted significant numbers from the "laboring classes" into membership, mainstream Protestant churches had not.[44] The Ashers and other evangelists did preach to working-class people, but evangelism was not very successful. This was worrisome especially since mainline Protestant church attendance and membership were in decline relative to the growth of the population.[45]

So why did working men receptive to the Ashers' message neglect to join mainstream churches? One reason was that many of the working-class were recent immigrants with different cultures and languages.[46] But working men who were native-born Canadians or of Anglo descent, while interested in a traditional message, were also unlikely to join mainstream churches. The reason for this varied. Some of these workers saw themselves as good Christians without any need to become church members.

Geographical mobility of working men searching for employment from city to city often discouraged the development of church and family bonds. With the growth of sport activities, male workers had a greater number of options for their time. And the perceived feminization of Protestantism played a significant role in preventing male workers, particularly single men, from joining church activities. Not only were the majority of church adherents women, but church activities such as ladies' tea meetings, sewing societies, and strawberry socials presented a stereotype of a feminine church.[47] These are important arguments, but press commentary during these years suggests that class-consciousness was a pivotal reason why many male workers were reluctant to share their religious faith with others in a church setting.

For example, there were workers who were suspicious of the alliance between the Chapman campaigns and clergy and business leaders. As the Winnipeg revival campaign was in progress, the *Voice* reported that the birth of the Chapman evangelistic movement was fathered by wealthy American capitalists, including those who were ardently against union activity.[48] Two months after the Winnipeg campaign, the Rev. Hiram Hull of the McDougall Methodist Church stated that men stayed away from churches because they thought it was "a class institution."[49] Into the twentieth century, the task of enticing working men into the churches became more challenging, especially when, in the eyes of many Canadian workers, evangelical church leaders tended to adopt a conservative stance on the issue of labour activity and a laissez-faire attitude to the material well-being of the labouring poor. In a 1907 article entitled "How Shall We Reach the Masses?," Baptist R.D. Warren stated: [W]hen ever a minister of Christ identifies himself with a class or a party, he wrecks the church, discredits himself and loses his influence." Stating that lifting one's hat respectably to both labourers and millionaires represented equality, Warren not only demonstrated his lack of understanding of working-class need and grievance, but also his incapacity to admit that church operations (including ministers' salaries) were funded and guided by wealthy parishioners to a significant degree.[50]

The bourgeois nature of ostentatious churches that attracted wealthy members also led some to believe that the social message of Christ was muted. Writing to the *Voice*, one commentator declared that when the pulpit stopped preaching the gospel of "Dollars and Cents" soon crowds will go to the churches and "dispel the idea that Christ's gospel has lost its

influence among people." Another person argued that "many preachers preach to Labor about Labor on Labor problems and yet they do not understand that problem themselves." As a result, "work people everywhere get tired of sermons."[51] Shortly before the Ashers' 1907 arrival in Winnipeg, one commentator reported that the gulf between workers and the church was due, in part, because the church had "taught labor humility and contentment when it should have taught courage and ambition." Walter E. Hadden was even more forthright: "[T]he Christian churches are largely responsible for the deplorable social and industrial conditions which prevail, through their support of the present competitive system of industry, a system which is contrary to all the teachings of Christ." Within working-class circles, numerous others protested that the clergy allowed employers to oppress labour and thus illustrated the church's lack of understanding of the working and material conditions of many workers.[52] Perceiving the church as a pillar of capitalism some working-class activists were especially condemning of those who protected their own business interests in the name of Jesus Christ. The *Western Clarion*, a voice of Canadian socialism, declared that if Christ appeared and preached "the doctrines that He propagated nineteen centuries ago, the ruling class of the twentieth century would rise in its indignation and wrath and . . . send Him to a prison or a scaffold."[53]

In the case of the Chapman campaigns there was a significant number of wealthy Canadian capitalists supportive of the meetings.[54] Ironically, these Protestant lay leaders might have been initially concerned over the Ashers' close contact with workers in working-class space. But Chapman assured that he never had to apologize for any action that William Asher had done over the years.[55] Given that the Ashers avoided any mention of the problems that workers faced in an exploitive capitalist system, business leaders had little reason to worry that the meetings might provoke action for social change. The Ashers and other Chapman evangelists harmonized with mainstream Protestant churches which, for the most part, adopted a laissez-faire attitude to social and labour problems.

The Ashers might have been forgiven for not raising the issue of labour inequality in their 15 to 30 minute soul-winning sermons, but extravagant city churches catering to bourgeois ideals were not easily exonerated. In an earlier period, the financial success of Protestant leaders in Canada resulted in the extension and growth of churches. For example,

the enhanced social status of Methodist leaders, beginning in the 1850s, "revitalized the evangelical impulse rather than marked its deathknell." An affluent Methodist membership played an essential role in securing the necessary money and enthusiasm for Methodist church expansion and extension into growing town wards where they drew from a wide spectrum of society.[56] But with the encroachment of a late nineteenth-century capitalism that was more exploitive and oppressive, the close relationship between church life and the financial success of the Protestant laity tempered rather than enhanced church growth. The "accommodationist stance" characteristic of earlier class relations was in the process of being undermined by a "movement culture" that challenged the perceived inequalities of an entrenched industrial capitalism. In regards to Protestantism, Christian beliefs did not necessarily kindle workers' anger of capital, yet the disparity between Christ's message and capitalism would have fuelled such outrage.[57]

Ignorance was no excuse for Protestant leaders failing to appreciate the problems that workers faced. These years saw the increasing use of strike action to combat the loss of shop-floor control and the erosion of real wages. In the 1901-1914 period, Toronto witnessed 198 strikes. Even the much smaller centre of Brantford had 14 strikes in these same years. In April 1908, for example, 120 union stove mounters employed at the Buck Stove Works went on strike and were still off the job when the Ashers held a revival meeting there in October.[58] The Ashers and Chapman evangelists were aware of the difficulties of many of those they encountered. In Toronto, one Chapman evangelist discovered an aged woman in an impoverished state "living in a dark, unheated hovel on Front street east." The Rev. H.D. Sheldon, describing the miserable quarters of Mary Cotey, claimed: "Nothing to compare with it in New York's notorious Hell's Kitchen." Mary's husband employed at a tannery had died and her working son Harry was injured; without an income they were "reduced to the lowest state of destitution."[59] But in most cases evangelicals were unwilling to challenge the status quo.

Ironically, social gospel leaders who were sensitive to the plight of workers jettisoned much of the pietistic and traditional evangelical core which working people had identified with over the years and instead favoured a more intellectual and social controlling message. Scholarship suggests that the petty bourgeois rather than the working class were likely the main supporters of the new theology that many social gospellers

promoted.[60] Other Protestant leaders who took a middle road between conservative evangelicalism and the social gospel did not have any better success in representing the needs of the working class. A recent study argues that early twentieth-century Presbyterian leaders, applying modern business methods to the church, preached more on the suppression of social vice that threatened bourgeois ideals than on the compelling love and grace of God.[61]

Evangelical leaders' support for direct working-class outreach was also poor. In 1909, there was a concerted effort to reach the working class in the Kootenay mining and lumbering region in British Columbia, but the evangelists involved were mainly lesser-known Americans. Examples of Canadian mainstream evangelical leaders entering and focusing primarily on working-class culture are not easily found. The efforts of J.S. Woods worth among Winnipeg workers is noteworthy, but Woodsworth was no gospel evangelical. The examples that Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau provide of early-twentieth century evangelism in working-class space – by Canadian evangelicals – are all the more striking on the basis that they appear to have represented isolated events.[62] On no consistent basis did evangelical clergymen initiate direct working-class evangelism in Canadian urban centres. Commenting on the issue of reaching central Canadian workers Presbyterian clergyman Rev. E.I. Hart declared: "[w]e must cease to despise the Gospel waggon, the Gospel tent, and the street preacher."[63] Speaking as one who should know, William Asher, at the conclusion of the Toronto campaign, warned that saloon evangelism – "an undeveloped field" – could not be continued to be overlooked.[64]

Given that evangelical leaders often talked about the importance of reaching the common masses, it is surprising that the work of the Ashers in Canada received meagre attention in the press. Professor Joseph Gilmour, a Baptist who wrote numerous reports of the 1911 Toronto campaign for the *Toronto Star*, gave the work of the Ashers one paragraph. The reports in church publications were equally dismal. In its commentary on the various Chapman campaigns, the *Christian Guardian* made no mention of the Ashers. The *Canadian Baptist* devoted one short paragraph on William Asher. The *Presbyterian* wrote a few more sentences, but only for the Winnipeg campaign.[65] Having lost touch with industrial workers, Canadian evangelical leaders failed to give the work of the Ashers the attention it deserved.

And yet the Ashers preached in an era when Protestantism was

contested. Evangelicalism was not the sole property of employers. For workers at the grass-roots level, evangelical ideas, traditions, and beliefs likely did not change dramatically over the years; workers could not easily be divorced from an evangelical message which was not entangled with status quo ideals of Christian behaviour. Indeed, Canadian working-class publications contained a surprising amount of Christian rhetoric; even some Canadian socialists admitted that Christianity was an important component of their lives. In William Cooper's mind, there should be no hostility between socialism and Christianity since "[t]aking the latter to mean simply the sayings of Jesus Christ, there is nothing there that is opposed to anything we have to say." Thus, as industrial capitalism grew and American evangelists appeared in Canada many working-class men continued to embrace Christianity but more on their own terms.[66]

William and Virginia Asher's work was distinct in that they focused virtually all their attention on the rough culture of masculine working-class life. Their approach was quite radical compared to the efforts of local mainstream evangelical churches. Attracted to a gospel message of personal sin and atonement, many early-twentieth century working men listened. But the Ashers' efforts did not represent a sustained working-class religious movement. They and other Chapman evangelists had a negligible impact on mainstream Protestant church growth in the Canadian cities they visited. Speaking to the Winnipeg branch of the Labor Party, William Cooper concluded that, despite the abundance of preparation and effort, the campaign "left us pretty much as we were."[67] This statement could also apply to the actions of many mainstream evangelical churches throughout early twentieth-century urban Canada since they overlooked the rougher element of the working class. Overall, it was more the case that churches deserted the workers rather than workers deserting Christianity.

Endnotes

1. *Manitoba Free Press*, 30 October 1907; and "Revival in the Shop," The *Evening Telegram*, 20 January 1911.

2. Lynne Marks, *Revivals and Roller Rinks: Religion, Leisure, and Identity in Late-Nineteenth-Century Small-Town Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996); and Doris O'Dell, "The Class Character of Church Participation in Late Nineteenth-Century Belleville, Ontario" (Ph.D thesis, Queen's University, 1990).

3. Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau, *A Full-Orbed Christianity, 1900-1940* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996); and Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau, "'The World of the Common Man Is Filled with Religious Fervour': The Labouring People of Winnipeg and the Persistence of Revivalism, 1914-1925," in *Aspects of Canadian Evangelicalism*, ed. George A. Rawlyk (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997).

4. For more on the social formation of this period, see Bryan Palmer, *Working-Class Experience: Rethinking the History of Canadian Labour, 1900-1991* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1992), 155-163; and Bryan Palmer and Craig Heron, "Through the Prism of the Strike: Industrial Conflict in Southern Ontario, 1901-14," *Canadian Historical Review*, 58, No. 4 (December 1977): 423-432. On working-class women, see for example, Shirley Tillotson, "'We may all soon be "first-class men"': Gender and Skill in Canada's Early Twentieth-century Urban Telegraph Industry," *Labour/LeTravail* 27 (Spring 1991): 106-107.

5. On the issues of wages, working conditions, and housing, especially helpful is Michael Piva, *The Conditions of the Working Class in Toronto – 1900-1921* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1979), 27-142; Terry Copp, *The Anatomy of Poverty: The Condition of the Working Class in Montreal, 1897-1929* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1974); and Bryan Palmer, *Working-Class Experience: The Rise and Reconstitution of Canadian Labour, 1800-1980* (Toronto: Butterworth & Co. Ltd., 1983), 144-147.

6. Peter DeLottinville, "Joe Beef of Montreal: Working-Class Culture and the Tavern, 1869-1889," in *Readings in Canadian History: Post-Confederation, eds.* R. Douglas Francis and Donald B. Smith (Toronto: Harcourt Brace 1994), 237-263; and Palmer, *Working-Class Experience*, 102-106.

7. Frank Yeigh, "The Twentieth Century Bible Study Revival," *Presbyterian*, 9 May 1907.

8. *Toronto Daily Star*, 9 January 1911.

9. *Orillia Packet*, 24 September 1908, records that William Asher was born in Keith, Scotland whereas the *Brantford Expositor*, 4 November 1908, claims that he was born in Canada.

10. "Life Stories of the Evangelists," *Orillia Times*, 8 October 1908. The *Orillia Packet*, 24 September 1908, provides a somewhat different version, stating that Jessie Ackerman of the WCTU encouraged them to be involved in saloon meetings.

11. "Told of Work in Slum Districts," *Toronto Daily Star*, 6 January 1911.

12. Virginia Asher was interested in reaching working-class women whenever possible. Yet in Canada, the majority of the Ashers' meetings were held in the predominantly male working-class space of taverns and factory worksites.

13. For example, Toronto factory sites visited included: Ontario Wind Engine and Pump Company, Eclipse Whitewear Company, A. Barthelmes and Company, Canada Motor Cycle Company, Diamond Flint Glass Company, Christie Brown Company, and Grand Trunk sheds. The majority of sites had male workers only; the Christie Brown Company was one exception. Occasionally other Chapman evangelists also preached at worksites.

14. *Orillia Times*, 15 October 1908; "Some Leaders in the Winnipeg Campaign," *Presbyterian*, 7 November 1907; and "Woman's Pity for Woman," *Manitoba Free Press*, 5 November 1907.

15. "A Great Meeting at Taylor Works," *Toronto Daily Star*, 6 January 1911; and "Life Stories of Evangelists," *Brantford Courier*, 29 October 1908.

16. "Bar Room Rally in the Revival," *Brantford Expositor*, 20 October 1908.

17. "A Great Meeting at Taylor Works," *Toronto Daily Star*, 6 January 1911.

18. Virginia Asher, speaking at one Methodist church, implored church people to open their homes to the young people who are new to the city. "Invite them informally to tea or for a little music in the evening," she said, "Show them that you care" (*Manitoba Free Press*, 12 November 1907).

19. Richard Allen, *The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada 1914-28* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971), 356.

20. "Told of Work in Slum Districts," *Toronto Daily Star*, 6 January 1911.

21. *Orillia Times*, 15 October 1908.

22. "Mrs. Asher at the Savoy Hotel Last Night," *Manitoba Free Press*, 8 November 1907. For lyrics see Ira D. Sankey, *Sacred Songs and Solos: Twelve Hundred Hymns* (London n.d.), 581. See also David Marshall, *Secularizing the Faith: Canadian Protestant Clergy and the Crisis of Belief* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 91-93.

23. "Told of Work in Slum Districts," *Toronto Daily Star*, 6 January 1911.

24. "Bar-room Experiences," *Manitoba Free Press*, 29 October 1907; and "Bar-room Talks," *Manitoba Free Press*, 30 October 1907.

25. *Manitoba Free Press*, 30 October 1907; and "At the Coffee House," *Manitoba Free Press*, 9 November 1907.

26. "Some Leaders in the Winnipeg Campaign," *Presbyterian*, 7 November 1907.

27. "Chapman-Alexander Evangelistic Campaign," *Orillia Packet*, 15 October 1908. No information was provided on whether these gifts were initiated by workers or owners. In an earlier campaign, Virginia Asher received from a saloon owner a small portable organ which she used night after night at tavern meetings ("A Chapman Evangelistic Campaign," *Presbyterian*, 4 April 1907).

28. "Wonderful Revival of Religion," *Orillia Times*, 15 October 1908.

29. "The Chapman-Alexander Campaign," *Canadian Baptist*, 22 October 1908.

30. "Chapman-Alexander Evangelistic Campaign," *Orillia Packet*, 15 October 1908.

31. *Brantford Daily Expositor*, 20 October 1908; "Bar Room Meeting," *Brantford Daily Expositor* 24 October 1908; and "Are Active," *Brantford Daily Expositor*, 22 October 1908.

32. Told of Work in Slum Districts," *Toronto Daily Star*, 6 January 1911; and *Mail*, 19 January 1911.

33. "Local Items," *Voice*, 18 October 1907.

34. *Orillia Packet*, 15 October 1908.

35. *Toronto Daily Star*, 28 January 1911; and "Police Obliged to Keep Crowds from Massey Hall," *Globe*, 27 January 1911.

36. See Marshall, *Secularizing the Faith*, 91-93; and Phyllis D. Airhart, *Serving the Present Age: Revivalism, Progressivism and the Methodist Tradition* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992), 95-100.

37. "The Home of the Evangelist Movement," *Voice*, 1 November 1907.

38. William Cooper, "Socialist View of Religion," *Voice*, 3 January 1908.

39. *Presbyterian Acts*, 1905-1909; and "The Winnipeg Evangelistic Campaign," *Presbyterian*, 21 November 1907.

40. *Canadian Congregationalist*, 9 March 1911; *Canadian Baptist*, 16 March 1911, and "What Was There in the Chapman-Alexander Campaign?" *Christian Guardian*, 8 March 1911.

41. "Chapman-Alexander Simultaneous Mission: Impressions of the Campaign," *Presbyterian*, 2 February 1911.

42. *Methodist Minutes*, 1908-1914; *Presbyterian Acts*, 1908-1914. The interest generated by Chapman, the Ashers and others did not in most cases generate significant church growth between 1907 and 1911. In Orillia the Baptist church increased its membership by fourteen in 1908, but one year after the campaign the Baptists had a better year, drawing 23 into the fold. Membership figures for Baptist churches in Brantford had one church lose four people, another church gained only two, and another added sixteen. Only Calvary Baptist showed a significant improvement with a net gain of 61 [*Baptist Year Book*, 1908-1914].

43. "Plea for Non-church Goers," *Toronto World*, 22 January 1911.

44. In the British context see the "labour sects" of E.J. Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Manchester: University Press, 1963), 126-149. According to Norman Knowles, "Christ in the Crowsnest: Religion and the Working Class on the Western Canadian Coal Mining Frontier," a paper presented to the BC Studies Conference, Malaspina University College (May 1997), revival meetings at western mining communities in 1909 likewise did not raise church memberships significantly (30).

45. In a "Plea for Non-church Goers," *Toronto World*, 22 January 1911, a commentator wrote: "I wish to put in a plea for the men and women of this city who do not attend the regular church service and that is "a great multitude," more than half of its population, and the number is rapidly increasing."

46. See "New Conditions Call for New Methods," *Voice*, 24 January 1908.

47. Marshall, *Secularizing the Faith*, 73; Marks, *Revivals and Roller Rinks*, 14, 29, 83, 162; Betty DeBerg, *UnGodly Women: Gender and the First Wave of American Fundamentalism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 29, 75-98; "Men and the Church," *Voice*, 17 January 1908; Tim Heinrich, "The Last Great Awakening: The Revival of 1905 and Progressivism," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1991, 355; and "The Feminization of the Minister," *Wesleyan*, 16 February 1910.

48. "The Home of the Evangelist Movement," *Voice*, 1 November 1907.

49. "Men and the Church," *Voice*, 17 January 1908; Marks, *Revivals and Roller Rinks*, 34, is helpful. She argues that for some men, "conflict in the workplace may have heightened class-consciousness and led a reluctance to worship with employers . . ." See also Knowles, "Christ in the Crowsnest," 21.

50. "How Shall We Reach the Masses?" *Canadian Baptist*, 17 October 1907.

51. "Labor Problems," *Voice*, 22 November 1907; and "Losing its Power," *Voice*, 15 November 1907.

52. "In Pulpit and Platform,"*Voice*, 27 September 1907. See also Walter E. Hadden, "To the Social and Moral Reform Committees of Local Churches," *Western Clarion*, 12 June 1909; other voices of protest can be found in "The Church Cannot Afford to Remain Neutral," *Industrial Banner*, October 1907; "Labor Problems," *Voice*, 22 November 1907; "Socialist View of Religion," *Voice*, 27 December 1907; "True Struggle of Freedom," *Voice*, 10 January 1908; "Want it Explained," *Voice*, 10 January 1908; "Woman's Column," *Voice*, 7 February 1908; "Prof. Osborne Lectures," *Voice*, 14 February 1908; and "Why the Sacrifice?" *Saskatchewan Labor's Realm*, 3 July 1908.

53. "Peace on Earth Good Will Toward Men," *Western Clarion*, 25 December 1909. For more criticism of churches and Christianity in general see, "Correspondence," *Western Clarion*, 9 March 1907; and "Spurious Salvation," *Western Clarion*, 6 April 1907. The latter article is an attack on the Salvation Army ("Correspondence," *Western Clarion*, 10 March 1907; "Note and Comment," *Western Clarion*, 30 March 1907; "The Church Always Against Socialism," *Western Clarion*, 1 June 1907; C.M. O'Brien, "'Rev.' Ralph Smith," *Western Clarion*, 16 November 1907; Jack Reay and C.M. O'Brien, "Socialists on the Warpath," *Western Clarion*, 23 November 1907; and W.R. Trotter, "Salvation Army and Emigration," *Saskatchewan Labor's Realm*, 29 May 1908).

54. Some examples include successful businessmen such as Winnipeg's J.A.M. Aikens, G.F. Stephens, William Whyte, and Sir Daniel McMillan, Orillia's J.J. Thompson, and Toronto's J.N. Shenstone, to name a few.

55. "Some Leaders in the Winnipeg Campaign," *Presbyterian*, 7 November 1907.

56. Marguerite Van Die, "'A March of Victory and Triumph in Praise of 'The Beauty of Holiness'": Laity and the Evangelical Impulse in Canadian Methodism, 1800-1884," in *Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience*, 81, 83, 87.

57. Greg Kealey and Bryan Palmer, *Dreaming of What Might Be: The Knights of Labor in Canada* (Toronto: New Hogtown Press, 1987), 283-291; and Marks, *Revivals and Roller Rinks*, 151.

58. Bryan Palmer and Craig Heron, "Through the Prism of the Strike: Industrial Conflict in Southern Ontario, 1901-14," *Canadian Historical Review* 58 (December 1977): 423-458; and *A Glimpse of the Past: A Centennial History of Brantford and Brant County* (Brant Historical Society, 1966), 31-36.

59. "Evangelist Finds Destitute Family," *Globe*, 14 January 1911; and "Sheldon was Shocked," *Evening Telegram*, 14 January 1911.

60. Christie and Gauvreau, "'The World of the Common Man Is Filled with Religious Fervour,'" 341-342. For more on the social gospel movement in Canada, see Allen, *The Social Passion*; and Christie and Gauvreau, *A Full-Orbed Christianity*. An aside to this is a *Western Clarion* editorial, 29 May 1909, that declared, "Socialists" who propagated atheism tended to be "characteristic of bourgeois radicals than of proletarian revolutionists . . ."

61. Barry Mack, "From Preaching to Propaganda to Marginalization: The Lost Centre of Twentieth-Century Presbyterianism," in *Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience,* 138, 142.

62. Christie and Gauvreau, *A Full-Orbed Christianity*; and "The World of the Common Man Is Filled with Religious Fervour."

63. Quoted in Christie and Gauvreau, *A Full-Orbed Christianity*, 63.

64. "Saloons Needs Attention," *Toronto Daily Star*, 30 January 1911.

65. Indicative of this short treatment was an advertisement for the Chapman campaign in Winnipeg which relegated the Ashers to the status of "personal workers" rather than "associates," the term applied to the other supporting evangelists (*Manitoba Free Press*, 23 October 1907).

66. See Marks, *Revivals and Roller Rinks*, 149-151. One can find, for example, evidence of Christian rhetoric in the *Voice's* "Woman's Column." See, the following issues: 13 September 1907, 15 November 1907; "Ottawa, Ont." *Western Clarion*, 5 November 1910; William Cooper, "Socialist View of Religion," *Voice*, 27 December 1907; and "Another View," *Western Clarion*, 22 May 1909. In "A Lady's View," *Western Clarion*, 28 January 1911, Mrs. W.D. wrote: "There has been so much in the Clarion of late about religion one would think that the Socialist party had turned into a camp meeting." The debate, printed in numerous editorials and letters to editors in the *Western Clarion*, is a fascinating one to read, especially since letters were sent from coast to coast. For socialists defending Christianity in the *Western Clarion*, see: W.G.L. "Correspondence," 9 March 1907; W.E. French, "The Party and Religion," 1 May 1909; Spencer Percival, "A House Divided," 15 May 1909; K. Kingston, "In a Christian Spirit," 15 May 1909; Spencer Percival, "Socialism – Christian and Otherwise," 29 May 1909; (Rev.) A.F. Cobb, "A Sky Pilot's View," 29 May 1909; H. Gildemeester, "Dirty Face Protests," 29 May 1909; W.W. Restelle Shier, "Religion and the Socialist Party," 29 May 1909; Fillmore, "Fillmore's Turn," 28 January 1911. Those against Christianity did not always take a hostile stand. One editor wrote: "By Logic, it would

appear Socialists cannot be Christians. By observation we know that some of them are, and are good Socialists" ("Metaphysiced Materialism," 14 January 1911).

67. William Cooper, "Socialist View of Religion," *Voice*, 3 January 1908.

Deaconess Redefined: Seeking a Role for Women in the Holiness Churches of Ralph Horner

MARILYN FÄRDIG WHITELEY

"The Holiness Movement Church has no history apart from the labours of women. It is true they did not organize it, but it is equally true, that they were the pioneers of it. They were efficient in evangelism. There were a good many Circuits raised up by their labours."[1] The author of this 1909 statement was Ralph Horner, founder the Holiness Movement Church and later of the Standard Church of America. Horner's words indicate the importance of women in these two groups, something common throughout the Wesleyan/Holiness tradition. Yet the words also suggest a limitation imposed by the usual role of such women: they were evangelists and founders of new communities of believers. As holiness groups developed into churches and gained denominational organization, women's leadership within them became problematic.

The devolution of women's role is frequently seen when young movements develop institutional structures. Yet the groups founded by Horner are distinctive in that he attempted to negotiate a place for female leaders. He instituted the position of Deaconess, and filled that term with content far different from that which defined the deaconess orders of his day. This study analyses that adaptation, its successes and its limitations, and also seeks to identify the response of women to Horner's initiative. Finally, it looks at the ideas of Horner which, while permitting an expansion of women's role, simultaneously placed boundaries upon it.[2]

Ralph Horner was born in 1854 near Shawville, Quebec. He was converted in 1872, and two months later received the second work of grace,

also called sanctification or perfection, that was the mark of the Wesleyan/Holiness tradition. Soon he began to conduct services, and in 1882 he was received on trial for the Methodist ministry. He was ordained in 1887. Both before and after his ordination, Horner worked as an evangelist. Many Methodists felt uneasy regarding some aspects of Horner's evangelism such as simultaneous prayer, uncontrollable laughter, and prostration, and in 1895, when Horner's name was removed from the list of Methodist ministers, the issue of physical manifestations had certainly contributed to the feeling against him. The basis for the decision, however, was his breach of church discipline: he refused to serve a circuit because he maintained that he was called to and ordained for evangelism. After Horner was deposed, he again obtained ministerial status, this time through the Wesleyan Methodist Connection in New York. He and his supporters subsequently incorporated as The Holiness Movement Church in Canada.

From the early days of his career, Horner had made use of the evangelistic work of women. He had trained lay people in evangelism while he was still a Methodist minister, and it is clear from contemporary reports that many of these were women.[3] In 1893, suspicion regarding the methods of Horner had caused the Montreal Conference of the Methodist Church to license non-ordained evangelists. According to the examinations, six of the seven evangelists examined for the propriety of their beliefs and methods were women.[4] Four of these six soon became evangelists in Horner's new church.

Horner justified women's preaching by use of scriptural arguments familiar to those in the Wesleyan/Holiness tradition.[5] Susie C. Stanley has stated that "when groups value prophetic authority, they recognize the gifts of the Holy Spirit regardless of whether men or women receive them," and Horner's religion recognized this authority given by religious experience.[6] He asserted that "[w]omen who receive the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit, can not but prophesy. We read, 'Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,' also, 'on My servants and on My handmaidens I will pour out of My Spirit, and they shall prophesy.'"[7]

In practical terms, the results of evangelistic women's work were essential to the movement. The *Holiness Era*, newspaper of the new denomination, printed testimony to the work of these evangelists. In 1899, for example, A.B. Van Camp traced the brief history of his congregation in Kingston, Ontario. In the fall of 1897 came "two holy women of God," Lois Moke and Agnes Coulthart. Eva Birdsell and Inda Mason followed them the

next spring. In the summer of 1898, the author's sister Cora Van Camp, and a Miss Hamilton began to hold tent meetings in Kingston, so that by autumn, according to the writer, "It is safe to say that nearly half the city was brought in touch with and felt the effect of the Holy Ghost preaching."[8] These were among the women "efficient in evangelism" who "raised up circuits," and it was essential that Horner find a place for them in his new church.

The commonly used term for such women was "lady evangelist," and this continued to be the dominant term. Yet within the Methodist Church, except for those licensed by the Montreal Conference, lady evangelists had enjoyed no official status and were under no denominational control.[9] When Horner attempted to make a place for the leadership of women in the new denomination, however, he simultaneously acknowledged their value and place them under the church's authority by giving them a new, official role, the role of deaconess.

The Holiness Movement Church opened its first General Conference in November of 1899. The earliest minutes do not pay specific attention to the role of women within the new group, but a newspaper report of the next year's Conference referred to Agnes Coulthart, "deaconess."[10] Subsequent issues of the paper have not survived, and early minutes of the General Conference contain no more information about women's leadership. From the records of a related holiness group, the Gospel Workers Church, however, it is clear that by spring of 1903, the Holiness Movement Church *Discipline* referred to deaconesses.[11]

The title was, of course, an old one, going back to New Testament times, but taking on new life in the nineteenth century. Among the groups using it was the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, which instituted an order of deaconesses in 1888. Canadian Methodists were familiar with this initiative, and some sought approval for a similar Canadian order. At its General Conference in 1890, the Methodist Church passed a motion to allow any Annual Conference to make provision for an organization similar to a deaconess order, and subsequently the Toronto Conference organized a Deaconess Aid Society, and opened a Home. The 1894 General Conference instituted a deaconess order.

The Canadian order was founded for the same purposes as deaconess groups elsewhere. Throughout the history of the church, women had been strong supporters of its mission, but in the latter part of the nineteenth century, their work became much more conspicuous as women organized their volunteer labour both within their denominations and in such societies

as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Methodist officials recognized the advantages of organizing for its own use "this woman force, that is fast becoming a power throughout the world," and feared that "if shut off this force might soon work out on its own line."[12] Problems connected with increasing urbanization and immigration suggested an area which seemed particularly suitable for deaconesses: work among the sick and the poor. Church leaders were happy to use the skills of women in the gender-appropriate activities of nursing and social work.[13]

The General Conference instituted the deaconess order during the same year that the Montreal Conference suspended Horner from the ministry, and Horner could not have escaped familiarity with the idea of deaconesses. Their traditional activities, however, were not those that his new church would assign to the women with this title. Instead, Horner and his colleagues infused new content into the position of deaconess, thereby giving ecclesiastical status to the lady evangelist.

Horner had been ordained by the Wesleyan Methodist Connection in New York, but he did not receive his ideas on how to incorporate women into the structure of his church from that group. Not until 1923 did the Wesleyan *Discipline* include a section on Deaconess Work. The duties described there could have described equally well the work of a Methodist Episcopal or a Canadian Methodist deaconess, including as they did, "ministering to the poor and needy; laboring with the sick and dying; [and] comforting the bereaved and sorrowing." They were not those undertaken by Holiness Movement deaconesses.

The Holiness Movement Church sought to regulate females in leadership roles as it did males. Its *Discipline*, revised in 1907, set forth requirements for study and time of service before a woman could become a deaconess, comparable to the study and probation requirements to be met by a man seeking ordination. Once she fulfilled the requirements, she could be ordained deaconess, or could, if she wished, obtain a certificate of standing to labour as evangelist. Some of these women left to work in missions supported by the denomination, principally in Egypt and in China. For those who remained in North America, as either deaconesses or evangelists, their work would be the very demanding activity of "constant evangelism."[14]

In 1910, the General Conference specified the wording of the "letters of standing for lady evangelists." The letter certified that the bearer "is hereby authorized and recommended as a proper person to conduct the public worship of God, and to minister to the flock of Christ, as long as her

spirit and practice are such as will adorn the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ."[15] At the General Conference three years later, this certificate was reworded so that it no longer mentioned the more pastoral role of "minister[ing] to the flock of Christ."[16] The omission is significant because although women continued to do public evangelism, they did not have as large a role in the pastoral work that became increasingly important as the denomination developed.

A.B. Van Camp's report shows the energy of women in the early years, as they pioneered new locations, and followed one another in waves to strengthen fledgling work. The *Holiness Era* announced revivals held by women, and gave notice of holiness conventions which simultaneously reached out to the unsaved, and strengthened those who were already holiness members. Some notices only stated that "some lady preachers are expected to be present."[17] At other times, however, female evangelists, especially Birdsell and Mason, received specific mention: "Elders Horner, Sproule and Claxton, and Evangelists Birdsell and Mason ... and others are expected to be present."[18] They were sufficiently prominent in the movement so that the use of their names would attract readers to the meetings.

When Van Camp described the pioneering evangelistic work of women, he was writing to solicit aid for a chapel that "we are building" in Kingston. The building of a chapel indicates the direction that the movement was taking. From the time of the Wesleyan revivals in Britain a century and a half earlier, converted individuals had been joined together in groups for their nurture in the faith. These communities of believers needed both places in which to meet, and continuing pastoral oversight. The ongoing congregations with formal places of worship were served, not by travelling evangelists, but by ministers appointed to circuits. Since the young congregations were generally small, it was customary to appoint one preacher to minister to the faithful at several preaching places. The Holiness Movement Church adapted the very successful organizational pattern which Horner had known in the Methodist Church.

Another development in the denomination was the growing attention to Sunday Schools; this is seen in the references made in the minutes to the preparation of lesson materials and the appointment of a Sunday School committee. Although the offspring of church members were expected to enter the church following a conversion experience, the group felt a responsibility to prepare them for this through Sunday Schools. The denomination continued to reach out to the unconverted by means of such

evangelistic work as camp meetings, but its concern for the nurture of its youth is further evidence of the denomination's increasing focus on its congregations, those groups of members and adherents who both needed and desired pastoral oversight.

Unfortunately there are no stationing lists from this time to show how the women of the Holiness Movement Church were deployed. Statistical lists from 1910 through 1912 reveal that evangelists made up approximately one fourth to one third of the leadership of the group.[19] The lists, which enumerate not circuits but chapels and preaching places, show that there were enough chapels and preaching places so that each of the male ministers and lady evangelists could have been assigned to one. The nature of the circuit system, however, makes it highly likely that a much smaller number of leaders would have been assigned to the oversight of circuits comprising more than one place of worship. Thus these figures fail to indicate what portion of the women were still assigned to "constant evangelism," and whether some were stationed ministering to the flock.

The women clearly took an active part in the internal work of the church. Evangelists frequently contributed to the *Holiness Era* not only news but articles on a variety of religious topics. They were assigned to prepare lessons for the increasingly important Sunday Schools, and to serve on committees regarding religious education; both of these activities appeared appropriate for women. Some who gave long-term or outstanding service earned their way to more active participation. Cora Van Camp, one of the early evangelists at Kingston, served as a missionary in Egypt. Back in Canada she presented "valuable information" to the 1909 General Conference Special Committee, made an address on the political situation in Egypt at the 1910 General Conference, edited the missionary page of the paper, and served actively on various committees before her return to Egypt. Only in the careers of exceptional women, however, did church assignments thus transcend the limitations imposed by gender.

The next years were a period of upheaval in the Holiness Movement Church. Friction that had been evident by 1914 reached a point of crisis in the General Conference of 1916, when Horner left in protest, and the group remaining passed a motion that he had forfeited his right to retain the office of Bishop. Those attending both a Special Session and the scheduled Ottawa Conference in 1917 were predominantly supporters of Horner, and negotiators tried unsuccessfully to bridge the gap between that group and the General Conference Special Committee. In 1918, the rift was formalized as

a new roll was formed for the Conferences of the Holiness Movement Church, and Horner and his supporters held the first session of the Annual Conference of the Standard Church of America.[20]

During this time of rupture, women as well as men on conference rolls were forced to decide where their loyalties lay. By 1922, none of the Holiness Movement women who had been working in Canada at the time of the disruption remained on its rolls; only a few women who had been abroad as missionaries reappeared on later lists. The movement into the Standard Church was much stronger among the women workers than among the men. This striking difference is best understood as evidence of the agency of Hornerite women, who moved with Horner into the Standard Church to ensure a continuation of their active role in Christian ministry.

At issue in the division was leadership; this was no conflict over theology or church polity. The church had become an increasingly complex institution, a denomination with its own school, publishing house and newspaper, administering its own missions. It had developed the administrative and leadership capabilities of a number of its members, and some of these leaders came into conflict with Horner. He was aging, and his leadership style was autocratic, a natural corollary of the personal characteristics that had led him to found the group. As the issue in the division was leadership, people took sides in part on the basis of their loyalty to Horner.

Although Holiness Movement women participated in the work of the Ottawa Conference, and some few such as Cora Van Camp were participants in the General Conference, their names seldom appear in the minutes except in connection with their assigned committee work. They were rarely the movers and seconders; they seldom entered into debate; they were not the leaders who might contest the power of their aging Bishop.

On the other hand, women knew that Horner had encouraged them and claimed a place for their evangelistic role. At a memorial service held in 1922 following Horner's death the previous year, several testified regarding his support. Edna Hepburn was converted in about 1912, and soon after that she felt that God called her to preach. She testified, "I had a severe struggle over this, and I backed down. But I knew, all the time, I had the Bishop's sympathy. I felt he went through the struggle with me. I got restored and settled that question." Stella Brown reported a similar struggle when she felt called to preach: "I did not know there were lady evangelists, and thought the suggestion came from the devil. I was in that state of doubt when I met Bro. Horner."[21] These women are among those who began their preaching in the

Holiness Movement Church, and were beneficiaries of Horner's strong support for evangelism by women. Apparently satisfied with the position he made for them and their ministry, they followed Horner into the Standard Church to ensure a continuation of their active role.

While the sources do not clearly indicate to what work women were stationed in the Holiness Movement Church prior to the division, stationing lists printed in the pages of the new denominational paper the *Christian Standard* show that a number of these women undertook work in Standard Church pastorates. It was not, however, deemed suitable for them to serve alone: they were assigned in pairs. In 1922, for example, Alma Crawford and Gladys Johnson were sent to Sydenham; Eva Alexander and Stella Brown to North Augusta; and E. Dack and Myrtle Morris to Harley.[22] This pattern is continued in a 1930 list, on which Caldwell and Mina Eastman were sent to Belleville, and Alexander and Dora Haggarty to Peterboro.[23]

In 1923, Deaconess Eva James addressed the Kingston Annual Conference on "the usefulness of lady evangelists." Her remarks show that while she recognized the opportunity afforded to women leaders in the church, she was also acutely aware of their difficulties: "She spoke very feelingly of the church with an open door for women preachers; of a calling much above the greatest secular pursuits; and followed with a stirring appeal to all her sisters in the ministry to be true, even under persecutions, afflictions, and all that may come."[24]

Although some women were stationed in pairs for pastoral work, others continued as evangelists, and there is a suggestion that these were insufficiently employed. In 1931, during the depression years, the Standard Church looked for ways to exercise a "new aggressiveness," launching more and longer revival campaigns. The Conference Committee on Evangelism recommended that "greater use be made of our lady evangelists in the special sphere of work to which they are consecrated."[25]

The surviving records of the Holiness Movement Church are not parallel with those of the Standard Church of America. Newspapers of the latter group furnish valuable information, but there is no available collection of minutes. The minute book containing the records of the pro-Horner meetings at the time of the split was returned to the Holiness Movement group, and that group's minutes continue until the denomination's merger with the Free Methodist Church in 1959. In this case, however, there is a lack of newspaper sources. Thus it is difficult to make direct comparisons, but

similar themes emerge, especially that of the problem of making full use of the gifts of women in leadership roles.

Following the division of Horner's followers, the Holiness Movement Church recognized the need for deaconesses. As noted earlier, the Ottawa Conference had lost all its women workers, and its leadership ranks were sorely depleted. At the 1919 Ottawa Conference, two deaconesses were ordained, and these were soon followed by the others, until a significant portion of those on the ministerial roll were women.[26] In addition, two of the three persons working under official authority were women, as was one of the six probationers.

The women did not necessarily find it easy to participate fully. In 1923, when Deaconess Josie Trotter was "called upon to give her experience" at the Conference meeting, she "remarked that she would prefer preaching to the unsaved rather than address this Conference."[27] At the same meeting, Cora Warren felt more than reticence. She intimated "that her services were not appreciated, and contemplated discontinuing her labours"; the group then gave her assurance of its "appreciation of her services ... in song, prayer etc., and desire that she may see her way clear to ... continue to labor" with them.[28]

There is no further indication regarding the basis of Warren's complaint, and no way to assess its validity. Scattered items during the following years, however, give evidence of problems in denomination's use of deaconesses. One difficulty was financial: in 1925 and in 1927, subcommittees on pastoral support showed concern for the level of remuneration given to lady evangelists, and saw the need to ensure that they received their promised payment.[29] This difficulty was compounded by the insecurity of their employment. Pastors were assigned to specific circuits, but evangelists bore the responsibility for arranging their own assignments.

Concern for levels of support and employment were combined in the Pastoral Support Committee's report to Ottawa Conference in 1930. It recommended: "That this Conference encourage our lady evangelists that they continue in our work. That those who are not stationed on circuits be employed by our pastors, where possible, in special services; and those employing them become responsible for a reasonable remuneration."[30] Similarly at the 1938 meeting of the Ottawa Conference, it was moved, "that the conference urge every pastor to engage our lady evangelists for at least one revival campaign each year."[31] Thus during the depression years of the 1930s, in the Holiness Movement Church, as in the Standard Church of

America, the leadership urged greater use of lady evangelists. Despite Horner's initiative, women had obtained only a limited place in the pastoral work of their denomination.

According to the rules of the Holiness Movement Church, a deaconess severed her connection with Conference when she married, although she might be granted her former standing "upon her special request." Some women made that request. Others became members of Conference sometime after marriage to a minister. A few women in both denominations were able to serve as part of clergy couples, but in the records their work became attached to that of their mates, making it difficult to discern the women's level of activity. Other ministers' wives held positions as lay delegates to Conference, as members of various Conference committees, and as contributors to denominational periodicals and writers of Sunday School lessons.

A few single women made independent contributions in pastoral roles. A late example of this is Marion Gilmer, of the Holiness Movement Church. She became a probationer in 1943, and a deaconess in 1945. During the years immediately after her election as deaconess, she worked as Sunday School Field Secretary; following that she was stationed at various appointments, sometimes with another woman, but increasingly on her own. She remained in the ministry of her denomination until it joined with the Free Methodists, and was subsequently listed in the pastoral appointments of that group. Yet Gilmer was an exception, a single woman who took her place beside the brethren.

During the pioneering years of aggressive evangelism in the Holiness Movement Church, spirit-filled women took up the work at a rate seldom seen outside the ranks of the Wesleyan/Holiness movement. The women in this movement appeared to enjoy an advantage not shared by women in other Holiness denominations: Ralph Horner created the position of Deaconess to recognize this activity and give it a place within the structure of the organizations. Women valued his initiative: this is shown in the strong movement of women leaders from the Holiness Movement Church into the Standard Church of America at the time of its formation. They did so to ensure that they might continue to take an active leadership role. A number of women had the an opportunity to exercise their calling to religious leadership in the office of deaconess on the mission field, in the stationed pastorate, or as travelling evangelists.

Yet although their opportunities were greater than those of most of their contemporaries, they were still severely limited. In practical terms, this was because in Canada and in the few areas of the United States where the group established itself, it came in a short time to take on the organizational characteristics of a denomination, and in particular of the Methodist denomination from which Horner and many of his early leaders had come. These included a settled pastorate looking after the needs of the group's members and their children.

Despite his affirmation of the prophetic authority of spirit-filled women, Horner still accepted the era's ideal of woman's domestic role. This is seen in the same 1909 article in which Horner so firmly endorsed the labours of women. He argued that "It means more for women to preach, than it does for men. They have more to sacrifice. It means much to give up home. Home is the natural place for a woman. It is super-natural for a woman to be without a home." Only a few women could be so "carried away in the Spirit . . . so lost in God, that they lose sight of home, etc." Ultimately, for Horner, a woman did not make a home; a home was something provided by for a woman by her father or her husband. Thus as stationing became the norm within Horner's churches, the place of women in church leadership became more ambivalent. It was not normal for women to establish the homes that were a necessary part of the lives of stationed ministers. Thus many were left in the role of lady evangelist, but that role became increasingly peripheral as more of the attention of the denominations was focussed on its own congregations and less on evangelization of the stranger.

Pleas for the use of lady evangelists in both denominations indicate that this arrangement failed to utilize fully the consecrated women available in these religious organizations where the norm for leadership had become the settled pastorate. Horner redefined the position of deaconess, and within that new definition many women found opportunities to live out their call to ministry. Yet although Horner maintained that "like the men He has made them able ministers of the New Testament," only a few of the women "anointed to preach the gospel" found opportunities that reached beyond a narrow definition of their work as "lady evangelists."

Endnotes

1. Ralph Horner, "Lady Evangelists," in *The Magazine of the Holiness Movement Church* 1, No. 2 (December 1909).

2. Minutes of the Holiness Movement Church General Conference, the Holiness Movement Church Ottawa Conference, and the Gospel Workers Church are in the possession of Reverend Robert Buchanan, Markham, Ontario; microfilm of these records is available in the United Church/Victoria University Archives, Toronto. Although the Holiness Movement Church also had Manitoba and Egyptian Conferences, I have not located minutes of those groups. I have gained access to the *Christian Standard* through the generous cooperation of Reverend Earl Conley, Nepean, Ontario.

3. Ralph Horner, *Ralph Horner, Evangelist: Reminiscences from His Own Pen* (Brockville, Ontario: [Mrs.] A.E. Horner [c. 1926]), 110.

4. These examinations are in the holdings of the Montreal and Ottawa Conference of the United Church of Canada, in Montreal.

5. Lucille Sider Dayton and Donald W. Dayton, "Your Daughters Shall Prophecy: Feminism in the Holiness Movement," in *Methodist History* 14, No. 2 (January 1976): 67-92; Nancy Hardesty, Lucille Sider Dayton, and Donald Dayton, "Women in the Holiness Movement: Feminism in the Evangelical Tradition," in *Women of Spirit: Female Leadership in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*, ed. Rosemary Ruether and Eleanor McLaughlin (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979), 225-54; and Nancy E. Hardesty, *Women Called to Witness: Evangelical Feminism in the 19th Century* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1984).

6. Susie C. Stanley, "The Promise Fulfilled: Women's Ministries in the Wesleyan/holiness Movement," in *Religious Institutions and Women's Leadership: New Roles Inside the Mainstream*, ed. Catherine Wessinger (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996), 142.

7. Horner, "Lady Evangelists."

8. *Holiness Era* [hereafter *HE*], 11 January 1899.

9. Marilyn Färdig Whiteley, "Modest, Unaffected and Fully Consecrated: Lady Evangelists in Canadian Methodism," in *Changing Roles of Women within the Christian Church in Canada*, ed. Elizabeth Gillan Muir and Marilyn Färdig Whiteley (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 183-200.

10. *HE,* 26 December 1900.

11. Gospel Workers Church, Conference Minutes, 1903, 33-34.

12. *Christian Guardian,* 8 October 1890.

13. John Thomas, "Servants of the Church: Canadian Methodist Deaconess Work, 1890-1926" in *Canadian Historical Review* 65, No. 3 (September 1984): 371-95; Mary Agnes Dougherty, "The Methodist Deaconess: A Case of Religious Feminism," *Methodist History* 21, No. 2 (January 1983): 90-98; and Jeannine E. Olson, *One Ministry Many Roles: Deacons and Deaconesses through the Centuries* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1992).

14. Holiness Movement Church, General Conference Minutes [hereafter HMC GCM], 1907, 108.

15. HMC GCM, 1910, 120, 122.

16. HMC GCM, 1913, 181.

17. *HE,* 10 February 1897.

18. *HE,* 24 February 1897.

19. Holiness Movement Church, Ottawa Conference Minutes [hereafter HMC OCM], 1910, 21-22; 1911, 46; 1912, 65.

20. Marilyn Färdig Whiteley, "Sailing for the Shore: The Canadian Holiness Tradition," in *Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience*, ed. George Rawlyk (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997), 265-67.

21. *Christian Standard* [hereafter *CS*], 4 August 1922.

22. *CS,* 9 June 1922.

23. *CS,* 31 October 1930.

24. *CS,* 2 November 1923.

25. *CS,* 6 February 1931.

26. HMC OCM, 1919, p. 257. See the ministerial rolls for the Conferences of 1920 through 1923, on pages 227, 317, 347, and 381 of the Ontario Conference Minutes.

27. HMC OCM, 1923, 405.

28. HMC OCM, 1923, 389-90.

29. HMC OCM, 1925, 483; 1927, 565.

30. HMC OCM, 1930, 99.

31. HMC OCM, 1938, 403.

A Toolshed from Gate #4: The Dominion Iron and Steel Company and the Formation of an African American Church

JENNIFER REID

In 1900, as part of an industrial boom in Cape Breton Island, the Dominion Iron and Steel Company began production in Sydney, NS. As a result of a program of active recruitment on the part of the company, a number of African Americans were induced to emigrate from the economically ravaged islands of the West Indies and to settle in Sydney. Relocated by the company in a area separated from the rest of the city (Whitney Pier), the community numbered 600 people by 1923,[1] and had become the most visibly segregated community in Sydney.[2] Throughout the 1920s, black immigrants in Whitney Pier created a number of community organizations;[3] and, carrying on a pattern of church affiliation established during the previous decade, attended various churches and missions without demonstrating a firm communal commitment to any. In 1928 a fledgling congregation succeeded in erecting St. Philip's African Orthodox Church, and almost overnight St. Philip's became the fulcrum of the black community.[4]

Historians have attempted in a variety of ways to account for the failure of other churches in Whitney Pier and the success of St. Philip's in becoming the focus of this immigrant community. Robin Winks perceived a direct relationship between the politics of the UNIA and the emergence of St. Philip's, to the extent of describing the church as "the most militant of the Canadian Negroes' religious expressions."[5] Nothing could be further

from the truth. Although the two organizations shared certain key individuals, St. Philip's was from its inception an institution dedicated to a peaceful and accommodating relationship with the dominant white population of Sydney.[6] James W. Walker, while avoiding any suggestion of militancy, nonetheless interpreted the establishment of the African Orthodox Church in Sydney as simply an offshoot of the UNIA.[7] Other explanations have drawn direct links between the church's success and its capacity either to incorporate "the African and West Indian background of its congregation" into its ritual and organizational structures, or to resist "the majority culture and its capitalist symbols."[8] All of these explanations betray a commonality of interpretation in their tendency to reduce this religious phenomenon to social or economic factors; and I wish to suggest that it may be impossible to arrive at a fuller explanation for the prominence of St. Philip's without taking seriously its religious significance.

St. Philip's is a church, after all. Further, it is a church in which a majority of Sydney's early black population chose to carry on some form of relationship with God. In addition to considering social and economic factors, then, we must take seriously the meaning of God if we wish to arrive at an explanation for the church's central role in that community. Ultimately, I wish to suggest that this explanation lies, to a substantial degree, in St. Philip's tangible capacity to reflect the nature of religious consciousness of Sydney's black population.

The experience of God contains both a material and an ontological structure. Mircea Eliade directed attention to this structure when he suggested in *Patterns in Comparative Religion* that the forms or materiality of the world are religious phenomena. When appreciated in consciousness, these forms present the human with the stark understanding of its finitude. For Eliade this meant, for instance, that the experience of the sky corresponded with a primary encounter with the infinite; or again, that of stone with the understanding of negation – that which cannot be overcome. The forms of the world then, as apprehended in consciousness, present us with both the knowledge of our finitude and the necessary correlate of an oppositional structure. For Rudolph Ott, this structure was "wholly other;" and for Gerardus van der Leeuw, it was a nebulous "Somewhat" that he identified as opposing itself to the human as "being Something Other."[9] The experience of this ontological "other" is directly related to the experience of those forms of the world that force the human being to confront its finite nature. The "other" – or God – simultaneously presents

itself as an oppositional structure and an affirmation of the "concrete modalities" of our existence.[10]

Turning to the subject of a church (in this case, one particular church), the experience of such a God – in a sustained and localized manner – may necessarily require that the oppositional structure God represents be placed in relation to the material forms of the world from which the knowledge of human finitude emerges. In other words, a church – as a locus for God – must be an arena that reflects the material and ontological structure of religious consciousness. St. Philip's was the only church in Whitney Pier that provided such an arena for its immigrant black population.

The community for which St. Philip's was to become the focal point was born in the industrial boom that occurred in Cape Breton at the turn of the twentieth century. More specifically, this community was created out of steel. Active overseas recruitment on the part of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company (DISCO), which opened in 1900, resulted in immigration of African Americans from the West Indies to Sydney. Coming principally from Barbados (but also from Grenada, St. Vincent, and British Guyana), the immigrants settled in Whitney Pier – a district on the east side of the DISCO plant and set apart from the rest of the city of Sydney by the plant itself and a large creek. By 1923, there were 600 such immigrants living in the area, along with an ethnically mixed population of Italians and eastern Europeans from Poland, Hungary, and the Ukraine.[11]

For the most part, early black immigrants from the West Indian British colonies gravitated to St. Alban's Anglican church. Yet, over the next quarter century, the community exhibited what one historian has characterized as an "ambivalence of affiliation," attending various churches and missions, but lacking a collective and affinitive relationship with any.[12] A small number of blacks attended Holy Redeemer (Sydney's largest Roman Catholic church), while others appeared at the Ukrainian and Polish Catholic churches; the United Mission, a joint creation of Whitney Pier's Presbyterian and Methodist churches attracted some members of the black community, as did St. Cyprian's, a mission of St. Alban's Anglican church.[13] The African Methodist Episcopal Church (AME) attempted to establish itself in the area in 1923, but after an initial demonstration of support from the community, interest waned; late in the decade, land was purchased by a Toronto interest group on which to construct a church but the project was never begun.[14] Records indicate that

when St. Cyprian's was closed in 1932, a few of its parishioners moved to Victoria Methodist church, and then on to the United Church.

In spite of this erratic pattern of affiliation, most of the black population eventually settled at St. Philip's African Orthodox church so that by 1930 nearly all African Americans in Sydney were firmly associated with the AOC.[15] The establishment of this church in Sydney was undertaken in a manner that differed from the other churches and missions that attempted to serve the black population of Whitney Pier. St. Alban's, Holy Redeemer, Holy Ghost, and St. Mary's were established institutions in which blacks, to varying degrees, were unable to gain acceptance. The work of St. Cyprian's and the United Mission were undertaken by groups outside the black community; and even the AME, a strong institution in the United States and central Canada[16] did not receive its impetus in Whitney Pier from the African American population. Rather, the AME presence was a result of the church itself seeking to establish a foothold in Sydney.[17]

Unlike all these churches and missions, the AOC in Sydney was a product of an impulse from within the community itself. At the request of a group of steel workers, George Alexander McGuire (then Chaplain-General of the UNIA) sent William Ernest Robertson to establish an "independent episcopal" at Whitney Pier in August of 1921. McGuire resigned from the UNIA around the same time and proceeded to establish the African Orthodox Church, which officially came into being on 2 September 1921. The independent episcopal in Sydney subsequently became St. Philip's AOC in November of that year. St. Mark's (a former Presbyterian church) was used initially by the fledgling congregation, which subsequently moved to a number of other buildings (including the home of one of its pastors[18]) before settling in 1928 in the structure that became its permanent location.[19] The opening of St. Philip's appears to have signalled a shift in church attendance, as most members of the black community became affiliated with the AOC shortly thereafter.

The question, of course, is why this occurred. The fact that St. Philip's was a product of an impetus from within the community was undoubtedly a factor; and yet, the AOC did not become a focus for the community until after the building itself was constructed. It is my contention that St. Philip's' success was related to its capacity to reflect the structure of religious consciousness of Sydney's black population – that it constituted an arena in which God could be experienced in direct relation

to those forms of matter that were implicated in the knowledge of finitude that is presupposed by the experience of the "wholly other."

The principle form of matter in this case was steel or, more precisely, the steel company; since the steel company was associated, in one manner or another, with myriad impositions of limitation on the black community that were specific to the time and space in which it was situated. In its early years of operation, DISCO owned all the land and residences in its vicinity. All immigrants who came to Sydney to work its mill were consequently located by the company in a two square-mile area separated from the rest of Sydney by water, the plant itself, and a web of railroad tracks. In the case of African American immigrants, the separation was more complete, creating what would become "the most obviously segregated group in Whitney Pier."[20] These immigrants were located in the area closest to the plant – the loudest and most toxic area due to its proximity to the tar plant and coke ovens that filled the air with clouds of pollutants.[21] In the first instance, this position impacted on the health of the community, particularly in respect to an early preponderance of fatal lung diseases.[22]

In a variety of other ways, the black steel-working population was subjected to imposed limitations that were virtually impossible to counter. The somewhat nomadic patterns of church affiliation that characterized the community until the late 1920s, for instance, were to a substantial degree a result of a refusal by whites in the area to extend the parameters of their congregations to include African Americans. As one woman recalled in 1993, "The coloured people used to go to the churches down the Pier and remarks were passed . . . they didn't want Blacks in their church."[23] A Diocesan Report of 1924 referred to a "problem" at St. Alban's Anglican church, for instance, resulting from the fact that all the pews in the church had been bought by whites and so blacks, in the words of a later archbishop of the AOC, "found the church doors to be open, but there were no seats for them." An Anglican minister during the same period refused to perform the rites of burial for a deceased member of the church who was black. The community fared little better at the Roman Catholic church where, in the 1930s, the priest (Father Kiely) was forced to castigate members of his congregation for refusing to sit beside West Indian immigrants at Mass. The United Mission and that of St. Cyprian's, while providing arenas that encouraged full black participation, discouraged both the immigrants' movement into the wider community, and their participa-

tion in the administration of the churches.[24] St. Cyprian's, in particular, was established to solve the seating problem at St. Alban's by removing blacks to their own congregation; and by 1927, the archbishop for the Diocese was lamenting the fact that the Mission congregation was not supporting " the work which has been undertaken [by whites] . . . among the coloured people."[25]

This ghettoized community, living in the shadow of the coke ovens was sufficiently distant from the field of vision of Sydney's white population that it became, in the eyes of the dominant population, a monolithic community defined for the most part in relation to the steel plant. This was starkly illustrated in the city's newspaper, the *Sydney Post*, during the period. An article concerning the AME building campaign in 1923, for example, assured the public that there was "steady work" at the steel plant, and the headline said nothing of the building of a church. Rather, it pointed out that the "Coloured People at Whitney Pier are Industrious." Readers were assure by the press that support of the campaign was desirable because it would provide local blacks with "an opportunity to attain a high level of Christian Citizenship." In other articles, the immigrants were described as "a colony of colored people" who, when "taken as a whole," were "capable of the very highest social, religious, and intellectual development," "when afforded the proper facilities and environment." It was conceded that "As everyone knows, living conditions out where the colored folks are situated are not what they ought to be," but the public was reassured that "campaigns for social and religious betterment" would nonetheless be fruitful.[26] West Indian blacks, from the perspective of whites, were defined as members of a socially, religiously, and intellectually underdeveloped colony, firmly connected with the steel mill. The image clearly did not reflect the actual community, but the limits within which whites were prepared to accept a West Indian presence in Sydney. Foremost, this meant that the community had to be defined as socially and intellectually inferior.

There is no question that the latter part of the equation was a white fabrication. The community's social and intellectual character, by no stretch of the imagination, rivaled that of any other contemporary group of people in Sydney. The African American population in 1923 numbered a mere six hundred; yet within that population there were school teachers, professional musicians, skilled tradespeople, owners of small businesses, two physicians, and seventeen men studying – among other professions –

law and medicine at Dalhousie University in Halifax.[27] The tendency to reduce this multifaceted community to an inferior appendage of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company had dramatic repercussions for members of the black community. Principally, they were forced to accept the fact that the most densely polluted sector of the city was the only physical space they were permitted to inhabit. Those who so much a ventured from the area after 8:00 p.m., for instance, were routinely beaten.[28]

There is no doubt that the African American community in Whitney Pier emerged out of a relationship with steel. Blacks immigrated to the area in order to meet DISCO's need for labour, and were subsequently accepted by whites only in terms of that relationship. The lives of these early immigrants were defined substantially by physical segregation, pollution, alienation from establish churches and their administrations, and derogatory images created and propagated by whites. Steel was the physical substance that gave rise to a series of imposed limitations that could not be altered – limitations on health, association, mobility, and self-determination in Sydney. Steel created, for this community, an experience of finitude that was absolutely new – a product of a particular people's situation in an equally particular temporal and spatial context.

Returning to the initial discussion of religious consciousness, it is possible to expect that an experience such as that of Sydney's African American immigrants would relate specifically to the experience of God. God, as a structure of opposition, can be known only through a knowledge of finitude created by a confrontation with the concrete. Such a structure, while presenting itself as absolutely "other," simultaneously affirms the temporal and spatial realities that make its apprehension possible. One would consequently expect that in Whitney Pier in the 1920s, God – to be experienced as God – would have had to be in some manner situated both in relation to and in opposition to steel – that very particular configuration of matter that presented the black population with a form of limitation specific to that context.

Of all the churches in Whitney Pier, St. Philip's African Orthodox was the only one that presented the black community with an arena in which this could occur. Like the community itself, St. Philip's was also a product of steel. The church was originally a shed, which was moved by the community to its permanent location in the Coke Ovens area in 1928. It was reconstructed out of materials that were ready and affordable –

spruce and pine boards, and gold paint, for instance; but more importantly, much of it was acquired from the steel company. The building itself was purchased from the company where it had been used as a storage shed inside Gate # 4 of the plant. The altar rail and crosses were constructed of wrought-iron pipe, and the bell was acquired from a steel company engine.[29]

This was a church that starkly reminded black residents of the Pier that steel was an inescapable reality. Steel presented these people with constraints and limitations; and yet, this church, constructed substantially out of steel company materials, became the focus of their religious and cultural lives. The experience of God in this context confirmed the concrete modality of their lives in Whitney Pier.

In a sense, St. Philip's was an architectural mirror of religious consciousness. Steel confronted West Indian immigrants with an understanding of finitude specific to their situation. Because a sense of finitude born in confrontation with the materiality of the world correlates with the ontological experience of a structure of opposition, it is clear that steel in this case was not simply related to limitation; it was also related to the experience of God. To put it plainly, God was present at St. Philip's not simply as an ontological structure, but as an affirmation of the concrete reality of life lived in relation to particular constraints.

No other church in Whitney Pier provided a context in which the dual nature of God as being both prior to and known only through concrete forms of life in time and space could manifest itself. St. Philip's did not become the focal point of Sydney's black population after 1928 principally because of West Indian cultural continuity, militancy, nor capitalist symbols. Rather, St. Philip's provided a space in the shadow of the coke ovens in which the material and ontological structure of a people's religious consciousness was afforded authentic expression.

Endnotes

1. From the *Sydney Post*, 20 January 1923; cited in Elizabeth Beaton, "Religious Affiliation and Ethnic Identity of West Indians in Whitney Pier," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 20, No. 3 (1988): 113.

2. Elizabeth Beaton, "A Tale of Three Cities: Ethnic Architecture in Sydney, Nova Scotia," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 16, No. 3 (1984): 91.

3. These included an active chapter of the UNIA (with its own hall and two bands), the Menelik Co-operative Society, and the Ethiopian Community Club (see A.A. MacKenzie, "The Irish and the West Indians in Nova Scotia." in *Work, Ethnicity and Oral History*, eds. Dorothy E. Moore and James H. Morrison [Halifax: International Education Centre, 1988], 47.

4. Beaton, "Religious Affiliation," 125; Elizabeth Beaton, "Case Studies: St. Philip's AOC, Holy Ghost Ukranian Greek Church, St. Mary's Polish Church" (Sydney: Beaton Institute Reports); and MacKenzie, "The Irish and the West Indians," 47.

5. Robin W. Winks, *The Blacks in Canada: A History* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1971), 354.

6. Each organization supported the other. When Marcus Garvey visited Sydney in 1938, for instance, the chairman who presided over his public oration was Father James Adolphus Ford, pastor of St. Philip's from 1936-1938. However, the "radical" elements of UNIA doctrine were not present within this African Orthodox community, and quite possibly absent from the UNIA chapter itself. Father George Anthony Francis, who became pastor at St. Philip's in 1940, wrote in his "History of the Black Population at Whitney Pier": "The Aims and object of [the UNIA] was to promote a better understanding between the Black and white races, and to give the Black people their right place in society." Father Francis' successor, Archbishop Vincent Waterman, later claimed that St. Philip's had never been a militant organization, but was simply an expression of people's desire to have "something of their own" (see "Marcus Garvey Speaking in Menelik Hall, Sydney, Nova Scotia: The Work that has Been Done," *The Black Man*, 3 No. 10 [July 1938]: 7; "Black Culture in Whitney Pier," Cultural and Recreation Project,The Beaton Institute, Toby Morris Collection, file # 5; George Anthony Francis, "History of the Black Population at Whitney Pier" [Sydney: Beaton Institute]; and interview with Vincent Waterman, cited in Beaton, "Religious Affiliation," 123, n. 44.

7. James W. Walker, *A History of Blacks in Canada* (Hull: Canadian Government Publishing Centre, 1980), 123.

8. Beaton, "Religious Affiliation," 125.

9. Rudolph Otto, *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and its Relation to the Rational* (London: Oxford University Press, 1958); Gerardus van der Leeuw, *Religion in Essence and Manifestation* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1938), 23; Charles H. Long, *Significations: Signs, Symbols, and Images in the Interpretation of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 25. Charles Long described the

"Wholly Other" as, "a power which is other than whatever kind of power one has . . . The power greater than any other which people usually talk about is called 'God'" ("American Religion," Course taught at Syracuse University, 1990).

10. Long, *Significations*, 25. Long suggests that "this manifestation has a double meaning: it makes itself known through some concrete form of cultural life, and its showing testifies to the reality of a mode of being that is prior to and different from the ordinary cultural categories" (27-28).

11. Beaton, "Religious Affiliation," 112-113; Beaton, "Case Studies;"31; and MacKenzie, "The Irish and the West Indians," 45.

12. Beaton, "Religious Affiliation," 118, 124; and "The Black Settlement in Sydney, Nova Scotia," *Scrapbook* of the Sydney Reunion Association (Sydney: Beaton Institute, 1985), 3.

13. Beaton, "Religious Affiliation," 115-116, 188; and "Black Culture in Whitney Pier."

14. "New Church to be Erected at Whitney Pier," *Sydney Post*, 19 January 1923; cited in Beaton, "Religious Affiliation," 117-118.

15. Beaton, "Religious Affiliation," 118; and Beaton, "A Tale of Three Cities," 101. One woman recalled in 1993: "Most of all, the coloured people went to the African Orthodox Church." (Beryl Braithwaite, "A Woman's View," in *From the Pier, Dear: Images of Multicultural Community* [Sydney: Whitney Pier Historical Society, 1993], 84).

16. Walker, *A History of Blacks in Canada*, 138; and Beaton, "Religious Affiliation," 117.

17. "New Church to be Erected at Whitney Pier," *Sydney Post*, 19 January 1923. The article stated that C. A. Stewart, "presiding Elder of the African Methodist Episcopal Church for the Maritime Provinces," spent 4 months in Sydney during the latter part of 1922 garnering support for the establishment of a church in Whitney Pier.

18. The pastor was Archdeacon Dixon Egbert Philips, who served from 1925-1935 (see A.C. Terry Thompson, *History of the African Orthodox Church* [New York: The African Orthodox Church, 1956], 100; and "Black Culture in Whitney Pier").

19. Charles Sheppard, Untitled manuscript, The Beaton Institute, Toby Morris Collection, file #32; Thompson, *History of the African Orthodox Church*, 100; and "Black Culture in Whitney Pier."

20. Beaton, "A Tale of Three Cities," 91.

21. MacKenzie, "The Irish and the West Indians," 45; Beaton, "Religious Affiliation," 114; and "The Black Settlement in Sydney, Nova Scotia," 1.

22. Braithwaite, "A Woman's View," 83. Braithwaite refers to large numbers of cases of tuberculosis, pneumonia, and pleurisy.

23. Braithwaite, "A Woman's View," 84.

24. Beaton, "Religious Affiliation," 115, 125.

25. "Archbishop's Charge," 69. Also cited in a letter of D. G. Padmore to Elizabeth Planetta, 29 June 1983, Beaton Institute.

26. *Sydney Post*, 19, 20, 28 January 1923.

27. *Sydney Post*, 28 January 1923.

28. MacKenzie, "The Irish and the West Indians," 47.

29. Interview with Archbishop Vincent Waterman in MacNeil, "The AOC," 3, 11; Braithwaite, "A Woman's View," 84; and Beaton, "Religious Affiliation," 121.

Religious Identity, Cultural Difference, and Making a Sacred Place: An Historical Study of Canadian Missions in Korea, 1888-1925

JI-IL TARK

On 17-18 October 1998 the former missionaries of the Presbyterian Church in Canada (hereafter PCC) and the United Church of Canada, their families, and Korean or Korean Canadian Christians gathered at the University of Toronto to celebrate the one-hundred year anniversary of Canadian missions in Korea. At the commemorative service of this centennial celebration they joyfully sang in Korean the hymn, "Anywhere with Jesus I can safely go," in appreciation of God's grace and of all the former Canadian missionaries in Korea who left Canada when they were young and returned when their hairs became gray or who died in Korea. The purpose of this paper is to examine how earlier Canadian missionaries successfully practiced their beliefs/religious identities in Korea where an exclusive cultural heritage had been developed for almost five-thousand years.

First, a general overview of the beliefs of the Canadian missionaries and the Board of mission will be discussed. "The deep commitment and enthusiasm of missionaries," stated in their own applications, references, and letters, and "the thoughtful selection of missionaries and faithful support of the Board of Foreign Mission of PCC," described in its official mission policies and correspondences with missionaries, will be explored along with the growing need of mission in Korea.[1] Second, the Canadian missionaries' religious practices and struggles with cultural

differences in Sorai, a small village in the northwestern part of Korea, will be discussed. The cases of two Canadian missionaries, Malcolm C. Fenwick (1865-1935) and William J. McKenzie (1861-1895), will be examined to understand how they made their missions possible and successful. Third, reflections from Korean Christians on the beliefs and practices of the Canadian missionaries in Korea will be introduced. This essay will examine the period beginning in 1888 when James S. Gale (1863-1937), the first Canadian missionary, began his mission work in Korea. It will also focus on 1898, when the PCC officially began its Korean mission, and also on 1925, when the United Church of Canada was officially established and the missionaries from the PCC were divided into two groups due to the division of their own Church.

Opening a new mission field in Korea was seriously discussed within the PCC shortly after William J. McKenzie, an independent Canadian missionary, died in Sorai, Korea, on 23 June 1895. The Foreign Mission Committee, which met in Halifax on 28 April 1896, confirmed that there was about $2,000 of the late McKenzie's funds still available.[2] They also decided that "this Committee is not in a position to take up the work in Korea; but agrees to report all the circumstances to the Assembly, so that if the Western Division of the Committee can see its way to assume the work, the funds will be handed over to them."[3]

From 1875 to 1915, there were two Divisions, Eastern and Western, in the Foreign Mission Committee within the PCC. These Divisions, subject to the approval of the Committee and the Assembly, may open up, or if necessary withdraw from fields of labour. They appoint, or if necessary recall missionaries and teachers, determine salaries and other expenditures, make arrangements for the cultivation of missionary interest in the home churches, and have supervision of all matters pertaining to the work of their respective fields.[4]

These two Divisions were unified in 1915 under the name, Board of Foreign Missions. The main reason for this amalgamation was that "there were serious staff shortages on the mission fields occasioned by the fact that a number of missionaries felt obligated to join the armed force."[5] The Board continued to follow in the footsteps of the Foreign Mission Committee. They laid out specific regulations on the appointment of missionaries and their responsibilities.

First, according to the pamphlet *Regulations for Foreign Mission Work*, there were specific qualifications needed for the appointment of

missionaries.[6] To be a missionary, "Applicants must satisfy the Committee as to missionary zeal, Biblical knowledge, aptitude to teach, ability to acquire the language of the people to whom they may be sent, and as to their equipment for the department of work for which they seek appointment."[7] Especially after the unification of the two Divisions, "The missionary committee was also continually on the lookout for people with special skills particularly in the field of medicine."[8] Of course, "The medical missionary is expected to teach the Word of God and to seek the salvation of men, devoting his time and energies to this work as far as compatible with the discharge of strictly professional duties."[9]

In addition to these expectations, the psychological and physical condition of applicants was carefully examined to disern whether they were able to adjust into the different culture and climate of their particular mission field. The question, "Is your temperament such as to lead to the belief that you can easily adapt yourself to the new and strange conditions of life in a foreign field?" was asked of all candidates applying for appointment,[10] and the question, "Is the constitution of the applicant in your judgment adapted to the climate of [the mission field]?" was to be answered by the medical examiner.[11]

Second, under the section "Duties of Missionaries" in the pamphlet *Regulations for Foreign Mission Work*, it was noticed that the language requirement was most rigorously insisted upon for all missionaries moving to fields where people speak a language other than English. Learning the language of their mission field was the most significant priority among any other responsibilities of foreign missionaries. The Regulations specifically stated the procedure for learning another language.

> The missionary, on his first arrival at his field of labour, is expected to devote himself to the acquisition of the language of the people, and one year after his arrival, wherever practicable, he undergoes a written and oral examination, testing his ability to understand, speak and write the language. The result of this examination is reported the Committee. At the end of the second year the missionary, where necessary, is required to undergo a second examination in the language. If at that time he is not able to use that language effectively, his further service in the mission may be discontinued . . . A missionary . . . takes no part in the practical administration of the affairs of the mission, until he

has undergone successfully his first examination in the language.[12]

The *Minutes of Foreign Mission Committee* reveal that some amount of money was continually used for tutoring missionaries in Korea.[13]

After the careful selection and education of missionaries, the faithful and financial support for missionaries and their works was an essential responsibility of the Foreign Missionary Committee / Board of Foreign Mission. Even though "Throughout its history the Presbyterian Foreign Missionary Committee suffered through lack of money . . . Efforts were made to raise additional money by inviting larger congregations to sponsor a missionary, smaller congregations to assume responsibility for equipment, and later by a national financial campaign. None of these projects fulfilled the earlier expectations."[14]

William John McKenzie left Canada in October and arrived in Korea on 12 December 1893. He was able to go to Korea through the financial help from his personal friends after the Eastern Division of the Foreign Mission Committee had denied his request to go to Korea. After one and a half years of his mission work, McKenzie died on 23 June 1985 in Sorai, Korea. After his death, the Maritime Synod in the PCC agreed to open a new mission in Korea and in 1898 appointed William R. Foote (1869-1930), Robert Grierson (1868-1965), and Duncan M. MacRae (1868-1949) as missionaries to Korea.[15]

Rev William Foote and Edith Foote, Rev. Robert Grierson and Mrs. Lena Grierson, and Rev. Duncan M. MacRae arrived in Korea on 4 September 1898, and it was then that the PCC's mission in Korea officially began.They then joined the Council of Missions in Korea and were advised to work in the northeastern parts of Korea.[16]

This essay will now turn to the Canadian missionaries' religious practices to Christianize Korea with all their struggles of cultural differences, such as language, heritage, and people. Particularly, the cases of two Canadian missionaries, Malcolm C. Fenwick and William J. McKenzie, will be specifically discussed.

Malcolm C. Fenwick

Malcolm C. Fenwick was born in 1865 in Markham, ON. He was a businessman before becoming a missionary. He was influenced by Robert P. Wilder, one of leaders of the Student Volunteer Movement for

Foreign Mission (hereafter SVM), and decided to be a missionary after attending the annual Bible conference led by the SVM at Niagara-On-The-Lake.[17] He arrived in Korea on 8 December 8 as an independent missionary. He briefly stayed in Seoul and then moved on to Sorai. There he bought land, built a house, and started gardening.[18] His life and mission in Sorai were different than he expected. He wrote, "Of course, I supposed that every country where a missionary went was hot. I never dreamed, therefore, of finding four feet of snow in Corea for three months of year. I thought that all countries missionaries went to had jungles infested with tigers."[19] His book, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, illustrates how much he struggled with all kinds of cultural differences.

Fenwick did not prefer to have only denominational attachments. He stated that "the denominational feature of missions was not strong in my mind."[20] In his book, he explains why his church and the title of his book was named *Church of Christ in Corea*. He wrote, "The work to which God called me being apart from any denomination . . . we selected the simplest church name we could, which in the Corean language is 'Tai Han Kitock Kyowhay,' and being interpreted means 'The Church of Christ in Corea.' As the story is about this church, the book takes that title."[21] However, it is evident that he had continuous connections with denominations in North America: for example, he himself contacted the Board of Foreign Mission Committee in the PCC. He sent a letter in which he advised the Board "to engage in more intense prayer and use more native pastors."[22]

Through his own struggle with Korean "language," "custom" and "people," Fenwick strongly supported the idea that the gospel was to be more effectively proclaimed not by foreign missionaries but by native pastors.[23] He wrote,

> In 1893 . . . I then became fascinated with the popular idea of taking out a lot of white missionaries to Corea, like other missions were doing, and in our Principles and Practice I rather insisted upon inserting a clause which would debar the native believer from employment as a preacher, for fear he would preach false doctrine.[24]

He discovered the power and influence of native Korean Christians' own testimonies in spreading the good news in Korea. For instance, Fenwick once gave a chance to Mr. Kim, a native Korean Christian, to testify what

and why he believed. It was then that Fenwick realized how to deliver the gospel God effectively to Korean people. He wrote, "these Corean sinners listened that day to Mr. Kim, because he too was a Corean sinner like themselves, and God had saved him and comforted him and made him happy. Strange to say, however, I did not then realize that I should have such native Christians to do the preaching, largely, for me."[25]
Fenwick concluded "Not in our Western way, it is true, but in the Eastern way, which is far better for the Easterner."[26] He preferred to have Korean pastors baptize their own people.[27] Not surprisingly, Fenwick described the relationship between himself and Pastor Sen, his closest native Korean co-worker, as follows: "You ask if Pastor Sen himself was not one of my students. I reply, only for a few weeks. He was, providentially, taken away from me before too close contact with the white man spoiled him for further usefulness."[28]

In addition, it was a wonderful experience for Fenwick to see that Mr. Sen's wife and mother, who had refused Christianity, sent Mr. Sen in a letter in which they confessed that "his [Mr. Sen's] Savior should be their Saviour and his God their God."[29] Fenwick died in Wonsan, Korea, on 7 January 1936, but no one knows where he was buried.

William J. McKenzie

William J. McKenzie was born on 15 July 1861, in Cape Breton, NS. He arrived in Korea on 12 December 1893 and went to Sorai to learn Korean in a Korean Christian home.[30] It was in Sorai that McKenzie lived with, died for, and was buried by, the Korean people whom he loved.

Sorai was one of central locations for national and international conflicts, such as the government versus the peasant army called Donghak and Japan versus China and Russia. McKenzie was situated and present among various kinds of crises. He wrote, "Last winter twice my life was in danger and I thought the end had come . . . [However] no Christian or friendly person has suffered from either Donghak or any other source, while seventeen Japanese merchants and three Buddhist priests were murdered near by."[31]

In spite of these crises, it was his joy to see Korean Christians overcome these difficulties by having the hope of the Kingdom of God. He wrote,

> they are willing now to listen to the message of God, even though it be the "western doctrine". . . No one knows what may turn up in a day or two. It is so comforting to see the few Christians here so filled with assurance that God rules and His purposes will be accomplished in the end. All around is confusion and anxiety, but we are all rejoicing . . . So eagerly are they now to have part in the worship of God that in the bitter cold while the snow is falling, when over crowed they will sit outside through the whole service, and the women behind the screen will stand holding their child, as there is no room to sit down . . . What a joy when we see occasionally the hot tears of repentance flowing freely from the dark hardened face. Probably at the dedication of the new Church several will be baptized. In this matter I don't want to be over hasty. "Christ send me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." Another missionary will examine, and I have so small experience.[32]

McKenzie worked in Sorai for one and a half years; he died and was buried there just as he wished on the day he left Canada. The day of his departure from Vancouver, BC he wrote,

> Stepping on board ship, I did not wish it otherwise, leaving my native continent. Have no regret nor do I feel badly about it. Oh, "My grace is sufficient for thee!" It is no sacrifice; would be to stay. Henceforth may Korea be the land of my adoption. May I live and work there many a year for the glory of God, and may my dust mingle with theirs till the great trumpet shall sound, when Death shall be swallowed up in Life![33]

Like Fenwick, McKenzie supported the idea that the Korean church was to be self-supported and self-governed. He helped the Christians in Sorai build their own church by their own means. He wrote, "As a result the people of their own accord have decided to build a Church . . . I told them I'd not give one cash to help but give a stove and pipes when all was complete. They have thus refused foreign aid from Seoul . . . Possibly it will be . . . the finest Church ever built by Koreans unaided."[34]

McKenzie kept a record of all his mission work in his daily journal which had been written from the day of his departure to the day before his death on 23 June 1985.

"Your people shall be my people, and your God my God"

Missionaries faced various difficulties in their mission fields, such mental and physical illness, family-related problems, lack of clear direction, and overwork.[35] Among the many difficulties, the hardest one was loneliness. It was hard for both Fenwick and McKenzie to deal with their loneliness. Fenwick wrote, "I was lonely beyond all expression – the kind of loneliness which only missionaries can understand."[36] However, at the same time, he never lost his hope in God. Fenwick described, "Mrs. Fenwick and I have at times been lonely, but we are looking forward in anticipation of the grace we are to receive at the appearing of Jesus."[37]

The loneliness was caused by almost everything such as "living conditions," "food," "custom," "language" and "people."[38] Firstly, the living conditions in Korea were totally strange to foreign missionaries. McKenzie described the house where Fenwick and he lived as follows: "And now shall I tell you how I am situated? I am sitting on a straw mat, nicely woven, no chair; mud floor, mud walls, and straw roof to my house. I am fortunate just now in having a few panes of glass in my windows, but most of the time I have been with nothing but white paper, and light had to come in through it."[39] Even though the winter in Korea was "nearly as cold as Nova Scotia," the difference was that this house in Korea was not enough to help him keep warm.[40]

Secondly, in addition to their living conditions, Fenwick and McKenzie suffered from loneliness due to the difference in food. McKenzie described his feelings as follows:

> My food, what about it? In Labrador potatoes and milk were something to do without. Here I have no potatoes, milk, or butter. I have been already over two weeks without eating any bread. At every meal is rice. Rice here is like fish in Labrador. One does get tried of it twenty-one times a week with no change. They put in some other things it, but most of them I can't touch. Fortunately, the people have cattle, but chiefly for carrying loads, so that I get occasionally a little beef.[41]

However, his passion as a missionary, through which he enthusiastically practiced his belief, was much greater than the need for western food. McKenzie describes his difficulties as follows: "on two occasions,

once by Dr. and Mrs. Underwood and once by Mr. and Mrs. Gifford, foreign food was sent to him [McKenzie]; but he refused to eat it. He gathered the children of the village around him and distributed the food to them. He said if he began to eat foreign food that it would be an awful trial for him to return to the native diet again."[42]

Thirdly, they suffered from Korean traditions and customs. Fenwick made his own vegetable garden to feel at home. However, this gardening caused much shock to the village people. He wrote, "While the vegetable garden was being made, it shocked the people a bit to see a Western teacher take off his coat and work. According to Eastern ideas, a teacher or gentleman must never on any account labour with his hands."[43] Fenwick described this attitude as "Corean conservatism."[44]

Fenwick experienced this conservative attitude of the Korean people in their understanding and attitudes towards women. In Sorai, Fenwick met two Christian hosts Mr. Ann and Mr. Saw who had never spoken to the other person's wife. Fenwick made an important change as follows:

> The Western teacher was, as yet, very ignorant of the Corean customs, and so insisted that the gentlemen bring their wives to meet the missionary and become acquainted themselves, if they were, as they professed to be, Christians. They acquiesced without much objection, and that night the two women, each about fifty years old, not only spoke to a white man for the first time, but for the first time in their lives spoke to a Corean gentleman other than a member of their individual households.[45]

In spite of these changes among Christians in Sorai, Fenwick confessed that "the custom was more to them than the gospel."[46]

Fourthly, it was language which caused loneliness. The extremely limited use of their mother tongue was one of hardest difficulties. They hardly ever met people who could speak English. McKenzie wrote, "I am now going on the eighth month without speaking a word of English or seeing a white face."[47] He complained in a letter to his friend, in which he said, "I shall be glad to hear from you. Why haven't you written. A letter is a treasure here."[48] To McKenzie in Sorai, "The English language sounds sweet."[49] To overcome this difficulty, he did his best to learn Korean and, by doing so, found some joy. He wrote, "I secured a teacher

who knew just a few words of English, and by the few words I picked up we can get along nicely."[50]

Fenwick called this language-related problem "the first hill" to climb. He wrote, "The Corean hills became symbolical of the hills of missionary service which were just ahead of me. The first hill that loomed before me was the language."[51] His original purpose of going to Sorai was to learn the language among Korean people. To learn Korean, he thought, "I might mingle with Coreans only; he started with some Corean friends for Sorai, a village about one hundred and sixty miles distant."[52] Fenwick described his learning procedure as follows: "Having been banished from English-speaking people, and having lived day and night among the Coreans who spoke no language but their own, in two short months the idiom, which is the backbone of any language, had been indelibly, though unconsciously, fixed in my mind, without cost or effort to myself, except a temporary lack of comfort and fellowship."[53]

In addition, to overcome his loneliness caused by many culture-related problems, McKenzie tried to become more inculturated. For example, McKenzie willingly accepted the cultural differences of the Korean. Notably, he approached the issue of ancestor worship in a reasonable way on the basis of understanding the Korean culture.[54] He wrote, "I had a good talk among a crowd. Showed them that Jesus did not say 'sacrifice not'; and all agreed that sacrificing, or honoring, ancestors while living was good."[55] He also liked to wear the traditional Korean costume. He found that "the Korean dress the best by far and cheapest while living among them"[56]

Fortunately, there was one thing that helped Fenwick and McKenzie get a handle on their loneliness. It was the similar environment of Sorai to Canada. It was "a beautiful grove" for Fenwick and "the shore" for McKenzie which made them feel as if they were at home. Fenwick described, "My loneliness drove me to the solitude of a beautiful grove near by, which was one of the regular groves attached to all villages for the sacrifice to and worship of demons. There I told my Lord all my sorrow, and pleaded that this lovely spot might be taken from Satan and given to Him."[57] It was the same for McKenzie who wrote,

> I took a walk down to the shore, where the waters of the Yellow See . . . There was a long strand, of maybe over two miles, of beautiful white sand and nice shells of different kinds. I have always loved the

> sea. My old home on the Atlantic is near the water. In Labrador I liked it too, and before I knew it, as I stood upon that shore, my eyes filled with tears. Memories of my past and old associations came sweeping in upon me . . . I thought I was at home – I never felt so before – everything seemed natural. I thought the sea at least understand me.[58]

Lastly, but not least, according to Fenwick it was the hardest thing for him to understand Korean people. On the one hand, he found that "The great outstanding characteristics of the Corean are *patience* and *humility* . . . *Generosity* is another prominent quality."[59] On the other hand, he realized that the only way to understand Korean people was to live with them, die for them, and be buried by them. It was the same for McKenzie. Namely, it was sacrificing themselves to understand the Korean people that eventually led them to be free from their own loneliness.

"Where you die, I will die – there will I be buried"

Sacrifice was the way that Fenwick and McKenzie chose to proclaim their belief/religious identity and to overcome their difficulties caused by cultural differences. Fenwick called the spirit of missionaries "the spirit of sacrifice," which began with Jesus. Fenwick described "the spirit of sacrifice" as follows:

> I have told you what this Spirit of sacrifice will do for yellow people, for white people, for black people – in Corea, in Africa, in America. There is a place where we can all get Georgia shoes – a place called Calvary." "Because, a long while ago, a Young Man paid full price for the entire supply, so that all who would, might come there, and get a pair, without money and without price. They enable all wearers to keep step with the Spirit of sacrifice.[60]

McKenzie was someone who had "the spirit of sacrifice." As he wished on the day he left Canada, he lived and worked in Korea for the glory of God and his dust mingled with Koreans.[61] On 22 June 1895, the day before his death, McKenzie wrote,

> Every day vomiting once or twice . . . will not go out, too weak. Find in p.m. that body is cold, as need so much clothing; hot water bottle,

> sweat; easier after. Hope it is not death, for sake of Korea and the many who will say it was my manner of living like Koreans. It was imprudence, on part of myself, traveling under hot sun and sitting out at night till cold.[62]

His journal ends here abruptly. "Mr. McKenzie's self-sacrificing life is its own best testimony."[63] Fenwick described the life of McKenzie as follows:

> His herculean body never rested, the people said. He just went from village to village and was good to everybody. When he fell asleep, the people for many miles around mourned for him, and buried him with the greatest honors. Noble man! He did not live to see his prayers answered or his devotion rewarded, but we who remain have seen God's abundant response to his sacrifice.[64]

Conclusion

At the commemorative service of the centennial celebration of the Canadian Missions in Korea, the Reverend Glen Davis used 1 Corinthians 1:27 as the text of his sermon under the title of "The Foolishness of Mission." He described the Canadian missionaries in Korea as "the foolish and weak" chosen by Jesus Christ to shame the wise and the strong. Their foolishness and weakness made the Canadian missionaries know nothing but Jesus Christ and practice their beliefs/religious identity.

It is evident that foolishness and weakness enabled Fenwick and McKenzie to have the spirit of sacrifice which made them work for, die for, and be buried by, the Korean people. It was this spirit of sacrifice that enabled Fenwick and McKenzie to practice their belief/religious identity in spite of the many difficulties caused by cultural differences. Undoubtedly this spirit of sacrifice was the best means for Fenwick and McKenzie to overcome the cultural difference. This made the village people in Sorai send a letter to Canadian brothers and sisters, in which they asked them to send another teacher just like McKenzie.

> The village of Sorai was always a very wicked place, devoid of blessings. Now there are many who are trying to follow the example of Mr. McKenzie. His body is no longer with us, and we, in prayer,

want to know God's will. We, now waiting before God in prayer, hope that you, our older brothers in Canada, will pray much and send us out a Christian teacher. In the name of the Korean Christians of Sorai, So Kyung Jo. Sorai, Chang-Yun, Hwang-Hai-Do, Korea. 26 December 1895.[65]

Endnotes

1. The primary sources for this essay included the official records of the PCC as well as statements by missionaries, which range from William John McKenzie's letter (1 May 1895) to other Canadian missionaries' letters (up to 1925). These have been excellently preserved at the United Church of Canada/Victoria University Archives. Above all, Young-Sik Yoo's dissertation, "The Impact of Canadian Missionaries in Korea: A Historical Survey of Early Canadian Mission Work, 1888-1898," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1996, is helpful in depicting the early Canadian missions in Korea; it became the starting point for this study.

2. PCC, *Minutes of Foreign Mission Committee* No. 27 (Halifax, 28 April 1896), 2.

3. PCC, *Minutes of Foreign Mission Committee* No. 27 (Halifax, 28 April 1896), 2.

4. PCC, *Regulations for Foreign Mission Work* (Toronto: Presbyterian Printing and Publishing Company Limited, 1891), 3.

5. "Historical Sketch re: Foreign Mission Work and Selection of Missionaries," in Finding Aid 38, *PCC, Board of Foreign Missions, Correspondence with Applicants*, 2.

6. Under the section of Appointment of Missionaries, "Applicants for appointment to the Foreign field should state in writing their age, educational training, ability to acquire languages, religious experience, the work in which they have been engaged, the motives leading them to offer themselves for mission work, and any other facts concerning themselves which may affect their character or work as missionaries. Applicants should furnish testimonials from their pastor and others, as to their history, character, fitness for the work, and any other facts known to them which may have a bearing upon their appointment. When a new language has to be acquired, applicants should, as a rule, be under thirty years of age. Previous to appointment, a medical certificate, testifying to general health

and adaptation to the climate to the country where the applicant is expected to labour, is required of all missionaries and missionaries' wives" (PCC, *Regulations for Foreign Mission Work*, 4).

7. PCC, *Regulations for Foreign Mission Work* (Toronto: The Armac Press, 1911), 5.

8. "Historical Sketch re: Foreign Mission Work and selection of Missionaries," 2.

9. PCC, *Regulations for Foreign Mission Work*, 5.

10. Foreign Mission Committee of the PCC, "Questions for Candidates Applying for Appointment to Foreign Mission Work" (1915).

11. Foreign Mission Committee of the PCC, "Questions to be answered by the Medical Examiner" (1913).

12. PCC, *Regulations for Foreign Mission Work*, 6-8.

13. Canadian missionaries, such as Mr. and Mrs. Foote, Mr. and Mrs. Grierson, and McRae, reported that $60 each was approximately spent for language training (PCC, *Minutes of Foreign Mission Committee* No. 38 [Truro, 6 February 1900], 1; and No. 44 [Halifax, 5 February 1901]). "Missionaries receive all their necessary traveling expenses to their field of labour . . . In addition to the salary a house is usually provided for a missionary, or house rent paid, and such allowance is made as may be necessary for a teacher of the language" (PCC, *Regulations for Foreign Mission Work*, 10). According to the special regulation on the salaries and allowances of missionaries in Korea, "The salary of an ordained or medical missionary if married, is $1,200 per annum, with $100 additional for each child; if unmarried $800 a year. The salary of a single lady is $600" (PCC, *Regulations for Foreign Mission Work* [1911], 15).

14. "Historical Sketch re: Foreign Mission Work and selection of Missionaries," 2. In spite of these difficulties, however, the Board did its best to support them in various ways. For example, in the letter sent to William A. Hunter, an accepted applicant for mission work in Korea, the Foreign Mission Committee tried to do their best to give useful information to him as much as they could. "this morning the Foreign Mission Committee accepted your application and appointed you as a missionary to Korea . . . Moreover, you will have choice companions in Mr. Barker and Mr. Macdonald and Dr. Mansfield . . . I enclose an outfit list for honan and the

Korea missionaries tell us it is practically the same for their field. I can put you in touch with Miss Robb of the Eastern Section of our Church who is at home on furlough. She is the only one in this country from Korea, if there are any points you wanted to discuss with her, you could do so" (Foreign Mission Committee to Mr. William A. Hunter, an applicant for appointment to Foreign Mission Work, 24 April 1918). After sending missionaries they visited them to encourage their works. Malcolm C. Fenwick joyfully described the visitation as follow: "At this time, we had the great pleasure and helpfulness of a visit from an old friend, Dr. R.P. McKay, Secretary of the Canadian Presbyterian Foreign Mission Work" (Malcolm C. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea* [New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1911], 67).

15. The meeting of The Maritime Synod convened in St. John's Church, Moncton, on 5 October 1897 (William Scott, *Canadians in Korea: A Brief Historical Sketch of Canadian Mission Work in Korea* [Toronto: n.p., 1975], 38).

16. Five central mission stations were in Wonsan, Hamheung, Sungjin, Hoiryung and Lungchingtsun. The Canadian mission in Lungchingtsun, Manchuria was for Korean immigrants.

17. Fenwick resisted God's calling by saying, "I am only a business man . . . I have not a classical schooling. I'm not a minister. I have never been to a theological seminary." However, eventually, he accepted God's command saying "Go!" (*The Church of Christ in Corea*, 13). The Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions (hereafter SVM) acted as a recruiting agency which connected missionary societies or churches and the volunteer in colleges or universities. Numerous missionaries went to various mission fields through the SVM. In 1887 the leaders of the SVM came to Canada to recruit missionaries. Many Canadian students from Toronto, Kingston, Montreal, and Halifax were inspired by them and willingly decided to be missionaries and went to all over the world. The Canadian missionaries in Korea were deeply influenced by the SVM and dedicated their lives to foreign missions. One of them was Malcolm Fenwick.

18. See Scott, *Canadians in Korea*, 19-20; and Young Sik Yoo, *Earlier Canadian Missionaries in Korea: A Study in History 1888-1895* (Mississauga: The Society for Korean and Related Studies, 1987), 41-42. It was in Sorai that the first Christians practiced their Christian beliefs, the first Protestant church in Korea was built by Koreans, the first infant was

baptized, and the first Christian wedding took place.

19. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 10-11.
20. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 12.
21. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 2-3.
22. Board of Foreign *Missions in PCC, "Correspondence 1895-1925,"* in Records pertaining to the Korea Mission (Finding Aid 59), 12.
23. In *The Church of Christ in Corea*, Fenwick referred to language, custom, and people as "hills" he had to overcome.
24. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 57.
25. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 54-57.
26. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 72.
27. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 126.
28. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 78.
29. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 59. According to Fenwick, the love of Mr. Sen's family reminded him of his own mother in Canada.
30. William J. McKenzie's letter from Sorai, Korea, 1 May 1895.
31. PCC, *Regulations for Foreign Mission Work*, 6-7. Korea was the last country to open the door to foreign nations among the three far-east Asian countries, China, Japan and Korea. In 1876 Korea was opened by Japanese force. Thereafter Korea became a field of national of international conflicts. Korea had been surrounded by three powerful neighbors, China, Japan, and Russia and controlled by China since the beginning of Choson Dynasty. However, in the late-nineteenth century, the socio-political dynamics completely changed. Japan defeated China (1894-95), and Russia (1904-05) and obtained political power in Korea. Japan officially ruled Korea for 36 years from 1910 to 1945. Korean people were forced to believe and practice Japanese Shintoism instead of Shamanism, Buddhism, or Confucianism. This was the socio-political context of the last decades of the nineteenth-century Korea. It was the time of political, social, economic, and cultural crises. It was during this difficult time period that the earlier Canadian missionaries worked in Korea.

32. PCC, *Regulations for Foreign Mission Work*, 6-7.

33. McKenzie's diary written on the day of his departure in Vancouver; quoted in Elizabeth A. McCully, *A Corn of Wheat: The Life of Rev. W. J. McKenzie of Korea* (Toronto: The Westminster Co., Limited, 1903), 68.

34. William J. McKenzie's letter from Sorai, Korea, 1 May 1895.

35. See the cases of J.M. MacLeod, F. Smith, Mrs. Schofield, D. MacRae, M. Jack, and A.H. Barker, in Board of Foreign Missions in PCC, "Correspondence 1895-1925," in Records, 11, 15, 16, 21, 33, 36, 41, 43, and 52. They also worried about their families and educating their children. See the cases of Mrs. Edith F. MacRae, R. Grierson. Robert Grierson's wife died in childbirth in 1920 (Records 32, 39).

36. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 91.

37. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 112.

38. Missionaries also suffered due to their families. Fenwick wrote, "When I left to go to Corea alone, in 1889, she, though sixty-six years of age, wanted to go with me. In 1899 word came she was failing. The next steamer saw me on my way to her dear side. She recovered, but I was called upon to say good-bye in life, as we both well knew, for the last time . . . 'It's all right, my son,' she now said; 'Jesus will soon be back again, and then we shall see each other, to part no more, forever.' Blessed hope! How it shines in my sorrow! But parting is parting, and I can feel the almost unendurable ache of it yet, as I went to the station and on, out of the city, toward Corea" (*The Church of Christ in Corea*, 98).

39. McCully, *A Corn of Wheat*, 105.

40. McCully, *A Corn of Wheat*, 107.

41. McCully, *A Corn of Wheat*, 105-106.

42. McRae's letter written from Wonsan, Korea, to the students of the Presbyterian Theological College in Halifax, 30 January 1899, in McCully, *A Corn of Wheat,* 245.

43. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 33-34.

44. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 34. The birth of the Choson Dynasty (1392-1910) replaced the Buddhist belief and practice system of Korean people to Confucianism in which they were taught not only to keep

important principles regarding the relationships between king and servant, teacher and student, husband and wife, and father and children but also to obey the authority, such as king, teacher, elderly people, husband, and father . This was was deeply related to ancestor worship.

45. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 20.
46. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 22.
47. William J. McKenzie's letter from Sorai, Korea, dated 1 May 1895.
48. William J. McKenzie's letter from Sorai, Korea, dated 1 May 1895.
49. McCully, *A Corn of Wheat,* 211.
50. See William J. McKenzie to Bobbitt, 6 February 1894; quoted in McCully, *A Corn of Wheat,* 104-109.
51. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 16.
52. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 17.
53. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 25.
54. Many Korean Christians were martyred over the issue of ancestor worship during the nineteenth century.
55. McCully, *A Corn of Wheat,* 202-203.
56. William J. McKenzie's letter from Sorai, Korea, 1 May 1895.
57. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 33.
58. McCully, *A Corn of Wheat,* 107-108.
59. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 118.
60. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 134.
61. McCully, *A Corn of Wheat,* 68.
62. McCully, *A Corn of Wheat,* 224-25. McCully writes, "Everywhere there was sorrow; from the home of the broken-hearted mother in Cape Breton to the far western coast of British Columbia, all the Church of Canada mourned a hero" (226).
63. McCully, *A Corn of Wheat,* 227.

64. Fenwick, *The Church of Christ in Corea*, 37-38.

65. A letter from Sorai, 26 December 1895; in McCully, *A Corn of Wheat,* 254.

Conrad Bröske, *Hofprediger* in Offenbach: The Life and World of a Late-Seventeenth Century German Court Preacher and Eschatologue

DOUGLAS H. SHANTZ

The Role of Protestant Court Preachers in Germany during the Seventeenth Century

This paper considers the role and influence of Conrad Bröske (1660-1713) as First Preacher in Offenbach, and as Court Preacher and Inspector of Schools for the Landeskirche of Graf Johann Philipp of Ysenburg-Offenbach from 1686 to 1713.[1] Bröske may have had radical chiliast ideas but he was not a separatist; he saw his place being to remain in the state church and to work for renewal of church and society. An understanding of Bröske's social, cultural and religious roles and influence on the Graf is basic to appreciating the impact of the man and the context of his eschatological thought.

The nature of Bröske's work as Court Preacher is best understood when seen against the backdrop of broader social trends as they affected German clergy in the seventeenth century. To this end, one can do no better than consult the recent study of German Court Preachers by Luise Schorn-Schütte,[2] one of the first scholarly monographs to investigate this leading middle-class group in the transition from the early modern to the modern period.[3] Schorn-Schütte examines the "political and social position" of this leading new middle-class group in the courtly society of the seventeenth century. Her study focusses on three regions of Germany

in this period: Hessen-Kassel, Hessen-Darmstadt and Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel.

Schorn-Schütte notes that the office of Court Preacher did not exist in Anglo-Saxon Protestantism. The presuppositions for the office include the relative autonomy of German princes and courts and the right they had after the Peace of Augsburg and of Westphalia to determine the religious confession of their realm. Also important was the widespread assumption in early modern Europe that "all the measures and undertakings of a godly prince, not least of which the political, must be done according to the Word of God." These two factors explain the "unusually great significance which the evangelical Court Preacher attained in the sixteenth and seventeenth century not only for ecclesiastical life but also for political life."[4]

Schorn-Schütte formulates the scope of her study regarding the Court Preacher as follows:

> At the close of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century. the Court Preacher assumed (*wahrgenommen hat*) definite political functions and so stood in the very centre of political decision-making in the early modern period, the Court. The loss of this involvement among clergy after the turn of the seventeenth century points to a basic problem in the social and political significance of the class of preacher in the early modern state, *one which will be considered in what follows* . . . In speaking of the office of Court Preacher as well as in speaking of the members of other leading groups among the clergy, one speaks of a social group which in some measure personified the change from Early Modern to Modern.[5]

The great significance which the evangelical Court Preacher attained in the sixteenth and seventeenth century. in political life was grounded in the direct and close relation the Preacher typically had with the prince.[6] The godly prince of the outgoing sixteenth century had needed the Court Preacher as his personal adviser in church-political questions. Not surprisingly, the method of appointment of the Court Preacher was similar in all three territories examined by Schorn-Schütte, with the Court Preacher generally being appointed entirely and directly by the Lord in that region.[7]

However, with the end of the Thirty Years War there came a change with regard to the role and office of Court Preacher. "In the . . . period of

Absolutism the territorial Lord sought, if not confessionally neutral at least tolerant theologians who accepted the territorial Lord's right to interfere in Church matters."[8] The Court Preacher's role changed to an instructional function, concentrating especially on the prince's duty of service to his subjects, and to a modelling function within the Court.[9] There is "a trend in all three of the territories being compared here."[10] Schorn-Schütte asks "how far the withdrawal from a counsellor function [*Berater*] to a *moral* instructor [*Mahner*] is also to be considered a withdrawal from the political sphere."

Two reasons are suggested for the change in social status of the Court Preacher after the mid-seventeenth century: first, the loss of political function lead to the determination of a new social field of action: the political adviser [*Berater*] is replaced by the instructor [*Mahner*] in the background without direct political influence. This process of differentiation in the completion of professionalization is probably not limited to the Court Preachers. Second, the leading social group of Protestant pastors took on the character of a profession in the second half of the seventeenth century. "Social origin, standardized education, standardized social place of business as well as normatively controlled self-understanding are the categories with whose help . . . a social group can be described as a profession."[11]

Schorn-Schütte then addresses the social origin and prestige of Court Preachers in the seventeenth century. She finds that noble origin was rare for clergy. The office of Protestant clergy was not of interest to the nobility. As a reason for this, Wunder points to the reduction in social significance of the class of preacher after the Reformation. This was due to the fact that the majority of territorial preachers were paid extremely poorly.[12] "The economically stressed situation of Protestant clergy was a problem since the Reformation." In the late-sixteenth century the Court Preacher came in at about third place in income after the upper officials of the central administration, and those of the Court. A typical Court Preacher's salary might be: 70 florins of gold; 41 quarter of grain; 6 animals (pigs), 1 Fuder (1,000 litres) of beer. "This seems to have remained unchanged right into the first decades of the seventeenth century." One Court Preacher, however, complained that without a raise in salary he simply could not make ends meet "in the current changing and costly times." He then received as additional salary: free lodging, 2 Ohm (300 l.) Wine, 1 piece of beef, 10 Klafter (30 cubic meters) of wood, and

1 Fuder (1,000 litres) of coal.[13]

Insight into the "ideal self-understanding of the Court Preacher" in the seventeenth century can be gained from the nine rules which Polycarp Leyser formulated in 1605 in his well-known *Hofpredigerspiegel*. He spoke of the Court Preacher's central duty being to keep some distance from Court; otherwise, it would be impossible for him to fulfill his task of admonishing its members to a Christian way of life. "All the rules aimed at an exemplary life in the Court Preacher."[14] Leyser's 9 rules were as follows:

> i) the duty of pure preaching without regard for the person;
> ii) honourable, Christian way of life in the Court Preacher himself;
> iii) modesty with the income that is granted to the Court Preacher;
> iv) obedience and being discreet, truthful and honest in dealing with rulers, so far as humanly possible;
> v) restricting oneself to one's own calling;
> vi) strict observance of church ordinances;
> vii) turning aside all gifts and bestowments, and service to fellow men out of love of neighbour;
> viii) each should receive the honour due him; never denouncing the prince, but being reserved in criticism, excepting the regulations of the 10 commandments, which should be brought to mind;
> ix) patience in facing events and others.[15]

Schorn-Schütte summarizes her investigation of the political and social position of the office of Court Preacher in the seventeenth century. under the following points. First, she observes the existence of two phases of development: the first phase corresponds to "the completely political function of the office . . . as a protector of social norms, while at the same time attaining a low level of professionalization." The second phase was marked by the professionalization of the office as a middle-class profession. "The close of the seventeenth century saw the overcoming of confessional narrowness and this led to the loss of the political, moral functions and the beginning of the loss of the social function of the office of Court Preacher."[16] "The generalizing of worldly values after the 30 Years War and resulting multi-confessionalism meant also the end of an accepted special role for the class of preachers."[17]

Second, the author observes differing degrees of institutionalization of the state church and professionalization of clergy within the three

regions. Institutionalization attained a higher standard in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel in the first half of the seventeenth century than in the two Hessens. As a consequence the political and social position of the leading clergy in Hessen, above all of the Court Preachers, preserved its personal character longer than in Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel. For that reason the political sphere of action of the individual Court Preachers remained in their hands longer.[18]

Schorn-Schütte's study leads one to ask whether Bröske's role was that of a *Berater* or *Mahner*. Was he a personal, social and political counsellor to his Count, or rather an instructor in the background without direct political influence? Did Bröske wield political, moral and social functions in the Court of Johann Philipp II, or not? Did Bröske's role preserve its personal character and political sphere of action as it did in other regions of Hessen?

This paper argues that as Court Preacher, Conrad Bröske did in fact exercize "significant influence in the court." It is clear that Bröske and the Graf enjoyed a close personal relationship of esteem and trust.[19] The paper demonstrates this by investigating and documenting Bröske's many social involvements, including those of adviser and confidante to the Count, Superintendent of Schools, and Publishing overseer and Censor of his Count's printing press. Bröske indeed served as *Berater* or intimate counsellor and adviser to his Graf, not merely as a distant *Mahner* or moral conscience in the background.

Bröske as Favoured Adviser and Confidante to the Count

"The centers of action, the so-called 'residence cities' (*Residenz-städte*) of the princes, grew rapidly during the seventeenth century." "In almost every princedom a substantial proportion of the princely revenues was spent on the court. Magnificent palaces for the princes and stately residences for the court nobility, sumptuous clothes and decorations, elaborate ceremonies and lavish entertainments all were intended to enhance a ruler's 'representation' of himself and his dynasty."'The court, far more than the military, offered opportunities for the industrious and ambitious."[20]

Appointed by Graf Johann Philipp of Ysenburg-Offenbach in 1686, Bröske served as Court Preacher from the young age of 26 years until his death at age 53. Besides being Court Preacher, Bröske also held the office

of First Preacher in the new city residence of Offenbach. Second Preacher from 1687-1698 was his relative Johann Christoph Bröske, and from 1698 until 1706 his own brother Johann Hermann Bröske, a student of Heinrich Horch.[21]

After two years of joint rule, in 1687 Graf Johann Philipp divided his father's inheritance with his brother Wilhelm Moritz. That left him with a territory of mainly agricultural land that included about 50 houses and 600 inhabitants. He made Offenbach his official residence. "In order to stimulate the economy of the region, repopulate the land, build up his residence city and promote trade, from 1698 on the Graf welcomed Huguenot refugees from France and the southern Netherlands. As well he granted to German refugees protection and residence without regard to their confession or religious opinions."[22]

Besides these political and economic reasons, the Graf's personal religious convictions, developed under the influence of his Court Preacher Conrad Bröske, help to account for the guarantee of toleration that he extended to these migrating groups.[23] The Graf evidently shared a lively interest in Bröske's eschatological speculations, as well as sharing his Philadelphian tolerance for a spectrum of theological persuasions. Bröske was obviously a key figure in the inter-play of political, economic and religious factors which made Offenbach an early centre of religious toleration in Germany and a refuge for persecuted radicals.

Clearly Bröske and the Count enjoyed a close and trusting relationship. "How close this trust relationship was is evident in that in 1692 the Count gave his own half sister Luise as wife to Bröske his Court Preacher, going against every convention of his class."[24] Their close relation is further illustrated in a letter Bröske wrote on 24 February 1705:

> As long as by God's providence I have been in this land, to my great comfort and pleasure I have found Your worship to be well-disposed towards me, with so much favour, that not only was Your Worship the first who, informing my blessed father, recommended me and gave me the gracious opportunity to come to Offenbach and to preach; but even to the present time you are among those who . . . encourage me for all sorts of reasons not to move from here . . .[25]

Written some twenty years after taking up his post, one cannot imagine a more positive working relationship between Lord and Pastor.

Further evidence of the favour Bröske found with the Count can be seen in the grant of land that he received from the Count. The extent of Bröske's goods and land can be estimated from the statement he prepared shortly after receiving a call to serve as Second Preacher at the Reformed Church in Elberfeld, near Düsseldorf. Dated 10 December 1704, the document provided "a list of Court Preacher Conrad Bröske's property in Ysenburg . . . as follows": it then listed 33 Morgen of arable land, and 25 Morgen of meadow land.[26] In all, this grant of 58 Morgen of land would amount to about 50 acres.[27]

This land grant is confirmed by a document from the hand of the Graf Johann Philipp, dated 30 December 1704:

> We, Johann Philipp Count of Ysenburg and Büdingen, testify and hereby confess for myself and my heirs in the County of Ysenburg, that . . . in recognition of our Court Preacher, our beloved and honourable Conrad Bröske . . . and of his office, which he has managed so well among us . . . with care and untiring effort, zeal, profit and devotion till now, and God willing will do so in future . . . that he may have, possess and enjoy the below noted cultivated land and meadows within this region . . . most assuredly from now and for futurity . . . and be in all respects free and exempt from me and my heirs . . . and from all customary privileges, terms and ordinances.[28]

Two months later, in a letter dated 24 February 1705, Bröske acknowledged the generous property provision he had received:

> I am assured by others that Your gracious Lordship would be pleased should I remain here [in Offenbach] . . . As well, your Grace has consented, with graciously-provided clarification, to confirm and empower with his own signature and imprinted Count's seal the freedom of my few properties given to me by my glorious Lord at his pleasure some years ago and now also confirmed in writing. A few days ago he provided for me a *Freyheitsbrieff* for my own and my family's use . . . Although in my own person no proper reciprocation can be offered, much less given, nevertheless I may dare to offer for your person and whole house my continued and zealous prayers to God, the true recompenser, for both your bodily and your spiritual well-being.[29]

The Count's actions obviously pleased Bröske greatly, giving him clear title to the land, and the ability to pass on his estate to his children.

Bröske as Superintendent of Schools

Bröske probably found his most demanding calling to be the establishment of schools in the region. In his brief autobiography Bröske noted:

> Despite various calls to other places, being invited to be Pastor both in Elberfeld in the ducal region of Bergen and also in Frankfurt am Main, [I] have not forsaken the good establishments undertaken in the churches and schools in Offenbach . . . but would rather help with their advancement than take up another calling.[30]

These establishments were a long time in coming, given the frail economic basis on which to build in this part of Germany in the post-Thirty Years War period.

A recent study provides a fine portrait of the state of education throughout the German Empire at this time. In the period of reconstruction after the Thirty Years War it was generally recognized that "improved education for all strata of the population was an important key to economic growth, greater general prosperity and enhanced fiscal yields." "Initially . . . it was in the smaller states, and especially those of central Germany, where the first significant attention was given to school improvement; here, the traditions of pious, patriarchal rulership combined with the absence of expensive and distracting foreign policy and military concerns . . ." to allow princes to focus on school improvement. This is evident in the regions of Gotha, Brunswick, *Hesse*, Hanau and Magdeburg. Here "princes promulgated comprehensive school ordinances and provided for supervisory inspections and other means to insure the physical establishment of schools as well as adequate standards of curriculum and instruction."[31]

Typically, religion was the most important subject of instruction, from the beginning right through to the intermediate stages of education.

> In the rural or village parish schools, the education of peasant children consisted almost entirely of reading and reciting the catechism and other simple religious texts . . . In the urban Latin grammar schools,

> religion still remained the substantively most important subject and it was not until students entered the universities that it was possible to choose a curriculum not primarily oriented towards religion.[32]

The school facilities and resources were often minimal.

> While every parish had a school, that did not necessarily mean a separate structure or one in an even reasonable state of repair. Often enough, school convened in a rented room or in the home of the pastor, sexton or artisan to whom the unrewarding task of playing teacher fell . . . Schools often had no books and frequently neither did the children, whose parents resented . . . the expense of books and of *Schulgeld* – the pittance paid to the schoolmaster – but also the absence of their children from working farms where every hand was needed for the survival of the family.[33]

Urban schools were generally better than those in the country. In the cities there were typically two levels of formal instruction: the "German" schools (primary schools) where the youngest children were sent to learn reading, writing and perhaps some arithmetic, along with Bible and catechism; and "Latin" schools, where emphasis on religion was combined with teaching a command of Latin whereby students could gain admission to a university at the end of instruction, usually at about age sixteen. Here the teachers were often "theology graduates waiting for parish livings . . ."[34]

Sommerlad describes Offenbach in the 1690s and the situation that Conrad Bröske faced:

> The region was at that time small and insignificant. But in its favourable location for business and trade, as well as in the great privileges which Count Johann Philipp granted to all new foreign immigrants, were to be found the essential conditions for it to flourish. Soon the population multiplied . . . and new streets had to be laid out, and various new professions and vocations were required. And a good school for up to date higher education, alongside the already existing common school, could no longer be put off. This was recognized by the Court Preacher at the time, Conrad Bröske, a man who deserves a prominent place in the history of Offenbach schools . . .[35]

Hans-Jürgen Schrader speaks of Bröske's "significant influence in the court and position of unlimited power in directing the region's churches and schools." It was Bröske's efforts that "essentially produced the cultural establishment of the region" (*dessen Aktivitäten den kulturellen Aufbau des Landes wesentlich gefördert haben).*[36] This is especially evident in Bröske's efforts to establish a Latin School.

When Bröske came to Offenbach in 1686 and assumed the office of Court Preacher, he made it his main concern to establish a respectable educational institution for the region. "Graf Johann Philipp supported him in these efforts most enthusiastically, but due to the difficult circumstances with which his land had been afflicted by the Thirty Years War and which were still evident, he was unable to provide the means in sufficient measure for establishing and maintaining the planned-for school . . ." As Adviser and Inspector of schools in the small Landeskirche of Ysenburg-Offenbach county, Bröske took up the task of personally raising the financial resources for the establishing of a Latin school in Offenbach. To that end he made fund-raising trips on two different occasions on behalf of the Graf.[37]

In September 1690 Bröske went on a fund-raising mission to Holland and England, equipped with an official letter of commission from the Graf. Count Johann Philipp's letter reflected on the importance of good schools to the life of a nation:

> Schools and gymnasia are like . . . a nursery garden which serves the Church and the State to such a degree that everything blossoms and flourishes in the State when the schools are in good condition. For the hope for everything in later life depends upon a good education, which forms the foundation of the State.[38]

Philipp then noted the destructive results of the Thirty Years' War throughout his region, and the lack of available funds for projects such as schools. "In this local area many Reformed churches and schools have fallen into disuse on account of the war."[39]

Bröske hoped to find support for the school among friends he had made on academic visits to these countries some five years earlier. Unfortunately Bröske's efforts in England met with limited success. Bröske was denied permission by the Bishop of London even to pursue public fundraising, because England was already facing requests from so many

sides. With the lifting of the Edict of Nantes, French Reformed refugees had arrived on England's shores requiring a great amount of support. Bröske did obtain one private gift of some 2 1/2 pounds sterling from a London merchant named Cook.[40] In addition, Bröske was pleasantly surprised when informed that due to the same Bishop's mediation, Queen Mary, wife of King William III, agreed to a grant of 30 pounds sterling annually from her own private charitable fund in support of the project, a grant that was paid out regularly up to the year 1716.[41]

At home, the Offenbach city councillor Matthew Stock designated the following annual revenues to the school: 12 cords of wood; all funds from marriage and baptism licenses; a portion of the registration fees for apprenticeship papers; all taxes arising from dance and game concessions; half of the 10 taler penalties for fornicators (if they preferred not to spend two weeks in jail); 2 taler payments from all Jews who were allowed to set up businesses in Offenbach; in addition, 18 florins annual payments by Jewish synagogues in Offenbach for permission to hold synagogue worship.[42]

With this support in place, the school was opened in May 1691 shortly after Bröske's return from England. It was evidently a very modest enterprise, for it was accommodated in what had been the Preacher's home, Schloβstraβe 56, refurnished for purposes of instruction. On 26 May 1691 Graf Johann Philipp appointed Heinrich Kuhaupt, a theologian from Ehringen in Niederhessen, as the first school Rector. He was granted an annual salary of 150 florins, as well as free lodging in the school house and the right to gather free fire wood in his ruler's forests. The school was established as a "free school," so the Rector could not collect payment from students, although honoraria for additional private instruction or tutoring would be allowed.[43]

Because the school had taken over the Preacher's house in 1691, a new residence was built for the Court Preacher Bröske in Herrnstraβe number 41. In 1708 a factory on Herrngasse, built by a Frenchman Simony de Tournay, was purchased for 800 florins to serve as new premises for the school. It was remodelled and named the Latin School.[44]

The school, however, continued to face financial pressures. In 1691 only ten pounds Sterling were received from England instead of the thirty that had been promised, and in 1692 only fifteen pounds arrived. To address this situation, Bröske made yet another trip to England in 1693. This trip occasioned some illness on Bröske's part so that upon his return

he was unable to report immediately to the Graf about its success.

> After I returned I should have provided a complete account of my accomplishments. However, I came down with a particularly severe illness on the return trip . . . so that I had to be helped from wagon to wagon, and from ship to ship . . . The illness still bothers me, so that I dare not as yet get properly dressed and get up, much less write a proper letter [to you]. Which brings me to the question: how might I in some way be able to present my report, which demands both necessity and haste, through someone else in a suitable place? But because there is something important concerning our *Schulgeld*, I would respectfully request a face to face meeting. As I would not be able to come into the castle in my nightgown [*Schlaffrock*], which serves me best in my illness, I would humbly suggest the Church as the place where this discussion could take place. I put all this to the disposal of my honourable Lord, your servant Conrad Bröske. Offenbach, 18 September 1693.[45]

Evidently Bröske's second trip to England was successful, for upon his return a total of forty-five pounds sterling were received from England for the school, with fifteen pounds as back payment.[46]

Under Kuhaupt's rectorship the school thrived, and already in 1696 various pupils were promoted to "students." The Court Preacher Bröske held various scholarly lectures for these students over the course of a year, after which they went to University.[47] One scholar suggests that "Bröske established the reputation of the school by the scholarly lectures he held for students of more mature age."[48]

In 1700 Bröske reflected some pride regarding his work in the schools in Offenbach: "through my efforts and care they have been so greatly improved from [the days of having just] one bad German schoolmaster, so that they now have a Rector and two additional teachers, and the young people graduate with honour, going on to public [university] lectures."[49]

Bröske as Overseer and Censor of his Count's Printing Press

Bröske felt great pride in doing whatever he could to promote the intellectual attainments of his beloved Hessen, and to advance the region's reputation as a place of scholarship. In April 1700 Bröske wrote Johann

Christoff Kalckhoff in praise of the latter's book in honour of "Hessen Gelehrte": "Your noble, devoted efforts in behalf of [Hessen] are greatly to be honoured. If I am indeed the least among those who in Hessen bear the name of scholar, I have nevertheless sought ever to work in such a way that my land at least might have no shame in me."[50]

Seemingly at cross-purposes with Bröske's efforts in behalf of "Hessen Gelehrte" were his even more vigorous efforts to promote the writings and careers of various Philadelphian writers, individuals generally regarded by Orthodox Protestants as unbalanced heretics. Under Bröske's oversight as Censor, Offenbach became the publishing capital of the growing Philadelphian movement within Germany. The list of authors published by Bröske's press reads like a who's who of German radical Pietists and separatists: Johann Heinrich Horch (1652-1729), dismissed from his post as theology Professor in Herborn in February 1698; Johann Heinrich Reitz (1655-1720), deprived of his position as Court Preacher and Inspector of churches and schools for the County of Solms-Braunfels in 1697; Samuel König (1671-1750), dismissed from preaching in Bern, Switzerland on account of his chiliastic messages.[51] In addition, the works of Johann Konrad Dippel, Johann Wilhelm Petersen, and Gottfried Arnold also appeared with the Offenbach imprint.[52]

Schrader summarizes the significance of the Offenbach press: "The intellectual historical significance of the . . . press of de Launoy lies in that it made possible the continuous publication of heterodox and openly separatist writings, when such activity was not yet possible in other German states."[53]

> All this was . . . in the 1690s, a time when everywhere in Protestant Germany there was violent guerilla-warfare going on over the issue of Pietism . . . But most astounding was that here [in Offenbach] writings, which in such controversies normally would have appeared anonymously, here for the most part were brought to the market with the imprint of the territorial Court printer. Indeed, a rugged Separatist such as Heinrich Horch, recently dismissed from office, could here with a properly published tract including the author's name, publisher and place of publication accuse his Orthodox opponent of illegal intrigue, for the latter had published an anonymous pamphlet against him with falsified publication information.[54]

Clearly the precondition for all this was "the certainty that the Offenbach

Court Preacher responsible for censorship . . . was Conrad Bröske, who himself . . . was a prolific propagandist and zealous organizer for the Philadelphian movement."[55] The freedom Bröske enjoyed to promote such literature can be attributed in part to favourable political and economic conditions in the region. "In order to stimulate the economy of the region, repopulate the land, build up his residence city and promote trade, the Graf welcomed Huguenot refugees from France and the southern Netherlands. As well he granted to German refugees protection and residence without regard to their confession or religious opinions."[56]

The printer, Bonvaventura de Launoy, of Huguenot extraction, first set up his press in Offenbach in 1685, having come from Frankfurt. An official document dated in Birstein,19 March 1686, honoured de Launoy with the title, "Book printer to the Court of the Count of Ysenburg." Because official printing work would hardly have supported de Launoy's business, he was assured of additional revenues through exclusive rights to printing and selling the customary song and school books, "which he must give to the Censor on every occasion before printing along with the Ysenburg calendar."[57] De Launoy operated the Offenbach printing press until his death in 1723.

De Launoy was a colourful figure. It is not clear whether he himself came to Offenbach as a result of persecution, or simply joined the Philadelphian circle upon his arrival. It clearly was by conviction that in the decade of the 1690s he printed almost exclusively books by radical Pietist groups in Offenbach, and even sought to sell them, at his own cost, outside of the County. His business competitors accused him of "enthusiastic Pietist radicalism in the highest degree" ("Quakerischen, Enthusiastischen und Pietistischen Schwermerey, im höchsten Grad . . .")[58] Besides the accusation of illegally publishing heretical material, they also accused him of improper business practices, including trying to break into the Frankfurt market "by c harging ruinously low prices, and benefitting from the protection of Pietist minded people in high places." And although he put his own name and publishing house on the title-page of books like Reitz's *Historie*, "careful examination reveals throughout the book the use of differing kinds of paper, vignettes, and even the re-beginning of pagination part way through the book, so that in fact only a small part of such books was actually printed in Offenbach." Competitors portrayed the Offenbach printing house as, "an inefficient *Winkelpresse* (hick press), whose owner not only brought in all kinds of senseless, obscure and illegal works, but

also continually sought with aggressive business methods to break into the privileged and protected market of his out-of-town colleagues."[59]

In examining Bröske's work as "censor," at least three things are clear: first, most of these Offenbach publications dealt with such matters as mystical, spiritualist, chiliastic and speculative eschatological themes; second, these themes were typically addressed above all by Bröske and his brother Johann Hermann, and by his Reformed radical Pietist friends and acquaintances such as Heinrich Horch, Johann Henrich Reitz and Samuel König along with Gottfried Arnold, Johann Conrad Dippel, Johann Wilhelm Petersen and Jodocus van Lodenstein; and third, there is a clear focussing of publication activity in the years 1697 to 1704 precisely when "the Philadelphian strivings in Offenbach attained their greatest radiating power."[60] Sixteen of Bröske's twenty-five publications appeared between 1698 and 1703. About tweenty-five out of 104 publications were produced directly by Bröske himself, and another six by his Second Preachers Johann Hermann and Johann Christoph Bröske. Six came from the pen of Heinrich Horch and six more from Johann Heinrich Reitz. The latter's work, *Historie Der Wiedergebohrnen* in three parts (1698-1701), was by far the best-selling book put out by the Offenbach press.

Conclusion

Bröske exercised "significant influence in the court and a position of unlimited power in directing the region's churches and schools." It was Bröske's efforts that "essentially produced the cultural establishment of the region" (*dessen Aktivitäten den kulturellen Aufbau des Landes wesentlich gefördert haben).*[61] It is clear that Bröske and the Graf enjoyed a close personal relationship of esteem and trust.[62] Bröske indeed served as *Berater* or intimate counsellor and adviser to his Graf, not merely as a distant *Mahner* or moral conscience in the background.

Endnotes

1. I wish to thank both Hans Schneider for his help in obtaining crucial documents during a memorable visit to the Grafresidenz in Birstein, Hessen, and Jens Zimmerman, my colleague at Trinity Western University, for his help in reading Bröske's letters.

2. Luise Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," *Bürgerliche Eliten in den Niederlanden und in Nordwestdeutschland*, ed. H. Schilling and H. Diederiks (Köln/Wien: Boehlau, 1985), 275-336.

3. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 282.

4. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 289.

5. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 279-281.

6. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 290; and Hartmut Lehmann, *Das Zeitalter des Absolutismus* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980), 31.

7. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 290.

8. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 300.

9. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 301.

10. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 303.

11. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 306ff.

12. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 316.

13. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 321ff.

14. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 324.

15. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 324 n. 200.

16. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 326ff.

17. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 326ff.

18. Schorn-Schütte, "Prediger an Protestantischen Höfen der Frühneuzeit," 326ff. The precondition for this was the confessional opposition between the nobility and the *Landgraf*. The vacuum could be filled by the higher clergy as well as by the properly appointed officials of the Burger class.

19. Hans Jürgen Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 133. Schrader speaks of the "close trust relationship" between the two men, evidence by the fact that in 1692 the Graf gave his own half-sister to Bröske as his wife, going against all conventions of class. Schrader has, with good reason, described Bröske as having "exercised significant influence in the Court and through a position of unlimited power in guiding Church and School in the region was able to exercise far-reaching control of its religious political life."

20. Richard L. Gawthrop, "The Social Role of Seventeenth-Century German Territorial States," *Germania Illustrata*, ed. Andrew C. Fix and Susan C. Karant-Nunn (Kirksville: Sixteenth Century Journal, 1992), 254.

21. Wilhelm Diehl, Pfarrer- und Schulmeisterbuch für die hessen-darmstädtischen Souveränitätslande: Hessia Sacra (Darmstadt, 1930), IV: 394.

22. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 133.

23. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 133.

24. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 133.

25. Bröske letter, 24 February 1705, located in the private archive of the Graf in the Birstein Schloβ, Offenbach N 11621, 1704-1795.

26. Manuscript located in the private archive of the Graf in the Birstein Schloβ, Offenbach N 11621, 1704-1795.

27. According to Langenscheidt, one Morgen represents a "measure of land varying from 0.6 to 0.9 acres." Dr. Otto Springer, her., *Langenscheidts Enzyklopädisches Wörterbuch der Englischen und Detuschen Sprache, Teil II Deutsch-Englisch, 2. Band, 6. Auflage* (Berlin: Langenscheidt, 1992), 1100. According to Grimm: 1) "Ein Morgen sei so viel, als ein mann an einem morgen bearbeiten könne . . . Der Pflüger theilt nach seinen morgenwerken die erdfläche in festbegränzte morgen." 2) "ein morgen lands ist in der mark 10 ruthen breit, 30 ruthen lang" (*Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm, Bd. 6,* Bearb. von Dr. Moriz Heyne [Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel, 1885], col. 2563).

28. Manuscript located in the private archive of the Graf in the Birstein Schloβ under: Offenbach N 11621, 1704-1795. "Wir Johann Philipp Graff zu Ysenburg und Büdingen, uhrkunden und bekennen hiermit für uns, unsere Erben und Nachkommen an der Graffschaft Ysenburg, daβ wir unseren Hofprediger und lieben getrauen, Ehre Conrad Brüβken, Louysen, gebohrner von Eysenberg, dessen Ehelicher Hausfraues, und Ihren Leibs descendenten Mann und weiblichen Geschlechts in Ansehung seines Ambts, das er so wohl bey unsers in Gott ruhenden Herrn Vatters, dann auch unsere Regierung mit rühmlicher . . . und Sorgfalt, auch unverdrossenem grosem Fleiβ, Eiffer, Nutzen und Erbauung, biβ hieher verwaltet, und künfftighin, ob Gott will! also verwalten kann und will, die besonders gnad gethen, und diejenige Äcker und Wiesen in hieβiger Termineу, welche er auff seinen eigenen Kosten von . . . gerettet und umgemacht . . . Wiesen und Äcker, samtt . . . von nun an und zu ewigen Tagen, allerdings frey haben, besitzen und genieβen . . . sondern von solchem allem und absolute frey und exempt seyen, und hier wieder, weder von uns selbst noch von den Unserigen, über kurz oder lang auff keinerley weiβ oder . . . gekrämelet werden sollen . . . Wir verzeihen und begeben uns auch aller Exemptionen, Privilegien, Pacten . . . Satz und Ordnungen, gewonheit und gebräuchen, die sonsten insgemeine oder bey Unserm Gräffl. Hauβ und besonder, bereits eingeführt seyen, oder hiernachs eingeführet und zu . . . diesem unserer freywilligen concession allegiret und angezogen werden mögten."

29. Bröske letter, 24 February 1705: "so bin ich doch durch andere versichert worden, daβ es Ew. Hochgräfl. Gnad. wohl gerne sehen möchten, wannn ich hier bleib . . . worauβ ich dann an meinem unterthänigsten Orte fliessen muβ, daβ Ew. Hochgräfl. Gnad., die hier gebrauchte und beigebrachte argumenta vor guth halten, Und zu dem . . . auch die, von meines Gnädigst Herrn Hochgräfl. Gnaden, nun einige Jahre her, mir

bereits in genuβ-gegebene, und nunmehr auch schrifftlich bestätigte Freyheit meiner wenigen Güter, mit dero Gnädigst.-beygefügten Erklärung, eigener Hand-Unterschrifft und beygedrückten Hochgräfl. Siegel in allem Gnaden haben mit bestätigen und bekräfftigen wollen; Allermaβen mir ein solcher Freyheitsbrieff vor wenig Tagen ungehändiget und zu meinem und der meinigem Gebrauch übergeben worden ist . . . obgleich durch meine Person keine Vergeltung kaum angebothen, vielweniger gegeben worden, demnoch Ew. Hochgräffl. Gnaden, vor dero eigenem Person und ganzen Hochgräffl. Hauses so wol leibl. als geistl. Wolforts, einen beständigen und eifferigem Bether zu Gott, dann rechten Vergelter, haben werden an dem, der sichs vor eine Hohe Gnad. sitzt."

30. Conrad Bröske, "Brief, 10te April, 1700" (mit einer Selbstbiographie für ein Büch über die Gelehrten in Hessen). Ms Hass 103, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel.

31. John Gagliardo, *Germany under the Old Regime: 1600-1790* (London: Longman, 1991), 188.

32. Gagliardo, *Germany under the Old Regime*, 188.

33. Gagliardo, *Germany under the Old Regime*,189.

34. Gagliardo, *Germany under the Old Regime*, 190.

35. Sommerlad, *Geschichte des öffentlichen Schulwesens zu Offenbach* (Offenbach: 1892), 18.

36. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 133ff.

37. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 134.

38. Direktor Dr. Buchhold, *Zur Geschichte der Offenbacher Lateinschule* (Offenbach, 1912), 9.

39. Buchhold, *Zur Geschichte der Offenbacher Lateinschule*, 10-11.

40. Buchhold, *Zur Geschichte der Offenbacher Lateinschule*, 15ff.

41. P. Heber, *Geschichte der Stadt Offenbach* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag von Siegmund Schmerber, 1838), 176ff; Sommerlad, *Geschichte des öffentlichen Schulwesens zu Offenbach*, 19; and Buchhold, *Zur Geschichte der Offenbacher Lateinschule*, 17.

42. Heber, *Geschichte der Stadt Offenbach*, 176ff; Sommerlad, *Geschichte des öffentlichen Schulwesens zu Offenbach*, 19; and Buchhold, *Zur Geschichte der Offenbacher Lateinschule*, 12-14.

43. Heber, *Geschichte der Stadt Offenbach*, 177; Sommerlad, *Geschichte des öffentlichen Schulwesens zu Offenbach*, 20ff; and Buchhold, *Zur Geschichte der Offenbacher Lateinschule*, 16.

44. Buchhold, *Zur Geschichte der Offenbacher Lateinschule*, 24ff. See also Heber, *Geschichte der Stadt Offenbach*, 177; and Sommerlad, *Geschichte des öffentlichen Schulwesens zu Offenbach*, 20ff.

45. Buchhold, *Zur Geschichte der Offenbacher Lateinschule*, 17.

46. Buchhold, *Zur Geschichte der Offenbacher Lateinschule*, 17.

47. Sommerlad, *Geschichte des öffentlichen Schulwesens zu Offenbach*, 22.

48. Heber, *Geschichte der Stadt Offenbach*, 177.

49. Conrad Bröske, 10 April 1700, Selbstbiographie für ein Büch über die Gelehrten in Hessen. Ms Hass 103, Landesbibliothek und Murhardsche Bibliothek der Stadt Kassel.

50. Bröske letter, 10 April 1700, located in the private archive of the Graf in the Birstein Schloβ, Offenbach N 11621, 1704-1795.

51. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 132; and Johannes Wallmann, *Der Pietismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 102.

52. Hans Schneider, "Der Radikale Pietismus," *Geschichte des Pietismus, Bd. 1, Der Pietismus vom siebzehnten bis zum früühen achtzehnten Jahrhundert*, ed. Martin Brecht (Göottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 410.

53. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 140.

54. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 131.

55. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 131ff.

56. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 133.

57. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 135.

58. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 135, 138.

59. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 136-138.

60. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 158ff.

61. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 133ff.

62. Schrader, *Literaturproduktion und Büchermarkt des radikalen Pietismus*, 133. Schrader speaks of the "close trust relationship" between the two men, evidence by the fact that in 1692 the Graf gave his own half-sister to Bröske as his wife, going against all conventions of class. Schrader has, with good reason, described Bröske as having "exercised significant influence in the Court and through a position of unlimited power in guiding Church and School in the region was able to exercise far-reaching control of its religious political life."

Making Religion Real: Historians' Constructions of American Catholicism in the Nineteenth-Century West

PATRICIA O'CONNELL KILLEN

Working with my colleague, Roberta Brown, on the Blanchet letter press books has intensified both my frustration and my fascination with the task of trying to construct and interpret the history of the Catholic Church in the Pacific Northwest as part of a larger project of writing a history of religiousness in the region. The Blanchet project is significant in its own right as a valuable resource for historians of ecclesiastical institutions and missions. The project's value extends far beyond this however. Blanchet's letters make abundantly clear how much more complex the story of Catholicism in the region is than the dominant narratives of the Church's expansion in what will be the Western United States indicate.

In this brief essay I will first discuss the omission of the story of the development of the Catholic Church in the Oregon Country from most US historical narratives and how its absence is connected to the structural characteristics of the dominant US narratives of secular and religious history.I am limited to US sources because of difficulty getting Canadian sources.(It is amazing that the US-Canadian border is so permeable for some things and so impermeable for others, including scholarly texts!) Second, by using the Blanchet correspondence I will discuss problems with the dominant narratives and what a history beginning with the French-Canadian experience in the Oregon Country can contribute to our understanding of Catholicism in the United States. Finally, I will close with some comments on the significance of borderland studies for religious

history.

Three themes dominate US narratives of Roman Catholicism in the West: 1) absence; 2) a relentless east to west trajectory that is coupled with an entrenched English/US master story; and, 3) in those narratives that do address the Pacific Northwest, a single organizing metaphor–the battle to establish and maintain ecclesiastical presence.

General Absence of the Pacific Northwest and of Religion in Narratives of the West

Total absence or cursory mention characterizes treatments of the Roman Catholic Church in the Far West and especially the Pacific Northwest in secular histories of the United States. This absence has persisted in what is referred to as the "new Western History"represented in the works of scholars such as Patricia Nelson Limerick, Richard White, and Clyde A. Milner.[1] D. Michael Quinn's "Religion in the American West" stands out for addressing religion as a topic in its own right and not as an intrusive but necessary tangential addition to ethnic or community studies.[2]

Catholicism in the Pacific Northwest is absent in religious histories of the United States as well. The only reference to the early history of Catholicism in the Oregon Country that I could find in any general history of US religion was in Sydney Ahlstrom's *A Religious History of the American People*. Ahlstrom notes:"In 1846, at a time when the Oregon question was still unsettled, a new stage in American hierarchical history was reached. A second metropolitan see was erected with the French-Canadian Francis N. Blanchet as archbishop, his brother as suffragan in Walla Walla, and another French-Canadian as bishop of Vancouver. In both fact and theory this province was at first an extension of the Canadian Church."[3]

Save for Ahlstrom's brief mention, why the absence? The answer falls into two parts. First, historical fate. Second, the standard or consensus narrative structure used for the religious and social/political history of the United States. Historical fate, first.

The Apostolic Vicariate and later Ecclesiastical Province that included the Oregon Country, or Columbia District as it was called by the Hudson's Bay Company, came into being during a fluid time on the North American and world scene. It was carved out of the Ecclesial Province of

Quebec which covered three million square miles, an area larger than all of Europe with a Catholic population of a little over 200,000. Francois Norbert Blanchet and Modeste Demers were sent to the mission of the Columbia in 1837. In December 1843 the mission was made an Apostolic Vicariate that included the area between the Rocky Mountains to the East, the Mexican and later US border to the south, the Pacific Ocean to the West, and the Arctic Pole to the north. Francois Norbert Blanchet did not find out about the action or that he had been made bishop of the area for a year.[4]

Blanchet's Apostolic Vicariate was made into the Ecclesiastical Province of Oregon in 1846 with Blanchet appointed to the archiepiscopal see of Oregon City. Modeste Demers was assigned the diocese of Vancouver Island and Francois Norbert's brother, Augustin Magliore Alexandre Blanchet was assigned to the diocese of Walla Walla. Five other districts, potential dioceses, were named: Nesqually, Fort Hall, Colville, Princess Charlotte, and New Caledonia. Oregon was the second Ecclesiastical Province established in what is now the United States. All this for an area that, by F.N. Blanchet's own reckoning, included only 6,000 Catholics, the majority of whom were Native Americans.[5] While this number of souls was significant for the Blanchets and their compatriots it was not so for English and Yankees.

What then leads to the historical oblivion of the early story of the Catholic Church in this region? For one thing, the area was sparsely populated, difficult to reach, and without obvious value. The story of the church here has been deemed insignificant in comparison to other political, social and ecclesial locations and events of the same time.

Perhaps the most significant act that fated the early history of the Catholic Church in the Oregon Country to oblivion was the settlement of the boundary dispute between Great Britain and the United States over the Columbia District or Oregon Country. The Province of Oregon came into existence coterminously with this settlement. The treaty of June 1846 (ratified by the US Senate in July 1846) established the boundary between the United States and Great Britain at the 49th parallel. That treaty, coupled with the Hudson's Bay Company decision of the previous year to move its headquarters to Vancouver Island from Fort Vancouver, left the struggling, young, largely French Catholic Church without the political and economic tolerance that it had enjoyed for its first nine years.

The boundary settlement created difficulties for the Catholic Church

in the Pacific Northwest, a church primarily Native America, French-Canadian, Metis, and missionary in character. For one thing, the Ecclesiastical Province crossed international boundaries and so had to contend with different relationships between church and state. For another, the bishops now had to deal with the Oregon Provisional Government, adamantly US Protestant and rabidly anti-Catholic in orientation. This body, which governed Oregon from 1843-1848, gladly conspired with increasing numbers of US immigrants coming over the Oregon Trail to push aside the French-Canadian, Metis, and Indian populations and to violate their land claims and their rights.

England's motivation for pressing its claim to the Columbia District between the Columbia River and the 49th parallel was significantly lessened by the Hudson's Bay Company move of its headquarters. Other issues and events in North America and Europe during this time were, perhaps, more important in shoving the story of the Catholic Church's development to the margins of history. England was contending with problems generated by the potato famine in Ireland. As well, English Prime Minister Robert Peel was concerned to push through domestic reforms, notably the repeal of the Corn Laws, in order to place England on the side of free trade. On the North American continent, Great Britain also had to contend with French-English tensions that continued to simmer and at times boil over in Lower Canada.

Continuing with a North American lens, the United States sacrificed the territory between the 49th parallel and President Polk's original claim to a boundary of fifty-four forty for the greater prize of northern Mexico, territory it took through the Mexican-American War of 1846-1847.[6] Even Polk did not want wars with Great Britain and Mexico at the same time. Besides the massive internal migration of people from the eastern United States to the West over the Oregon Trail, both the United States and Canada had to contend with the arrival of millions of Irish and hundreds of thousands of Germans. Ecclesially in the United States the difficulties of Catholics in the Oregon Territory counted for little against the drastic implications of incorporating Northern Mexico into the United States and providing services to the Catholics among the Irish and Germans arriving in the United States during this period.

On an international scene, the Revolutions of 1848 in Europe, the Irish Potato Famine, and the emigration of Irish, Germans, and others to the United States deeply concerned and put severe strain on the Roman

Catholic Church.

During the short five-year span between 1843, when the Apostolic Vicariate was erected, and 1848 when the land below the 49th parallel officially became the Oregon Territory of the United States, massive change and disruption characterized not only the Oregon Country but all of North America and Europe. The change and disruption eclipsed the French-Canadian, Catholic story in the Oregon Country.

Relentless East to West Trajectory Coupled With an Entrenched English/US Master Story

A second reason for the absence of the French-Canadian and Catholic story of the Pacific Northwest rests with US Catholic historiography. This historiography shares the relentless east to west trajectory and entrenched English/US master story that is part of secular and religious history in the USCatholic historians bought into the master story in their effort to construct an"American" Catholicism.For reasons of ecclesiastical survival and ministerial effectiveness both the majority of bishops in the US and Catholic historians have constructed a story of a genuinely American (hear US) Catholicism understood as rooted in the English Genteel Maryland Catholic tradition and appropriated by all right thinking immigrants to the United States. Thomas T. McAvoy's *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States* is explicitly structured in this way.[7]

Even as the historiography of Catholicism in the United States has come to recognize ethnic communities far more readily, it still presents them as coming from Europe to the United States and only then moving further west.[8] James Hennessey's *work* stands out from recent histories of Catholicism in the United States for its nearly two-page treatment of the French-Canadian Catholic presence in the Pacific Northwest, in which he briefly alludes to the political and ecclesiastical complexities that accompanied the formation of the Archdiocese of Oregon.[9]

When histories of Catholicism address the West, it is Pierre DeSmet who receives attention and later Archbishop Lamay of Santa Fe.Both are men who go from the east in the United States to the West,DeSmet to missionize the Flathead/Salish Indians and Lamay to lead a diocese largely Mexican in population that needs to be brought into the US Catholic orbit.

This east to west trajectory does two things to the story of Catholi-

cism in the West. First, it remakes Catholics in the west into Anglos from the United States. This renders invisible Native American Catholics, French, Metis, and Hispanic Catholics or makes them merely ancillary to the narrative. Second, the east to west trajectory, coupled with the English/US master story, renders invisible Catholic immigrants from other parts of the world who have arrived from the north, from the west, and from the south. By the time A.M.A. Blanchet arrives in Walla Walla in 1847, the population of his diocese and the larger Oregon Province includes not only Native Americans, French-Canadian, Metis, and Anglo-Americans, but people from Hawaii, Samoa, and various European and Asian countries.

A central element in the English master story is its Protestant character. While Catholic bishops and historians work to explain why European Catholic immigrants should be allowed into the English master story without becoming Protestant, for Protestants the English master story in the nineteenth-century and to some extent even today justifies intense anti-Catholicism. Such sentiment certainly contributed to A.M.A. Blanchet being blamed for the massacre of Marcus and Narcissa Whitman at their ABCFM Waiilatpu mission in November of 1847, less than three months after Blanchet's arrival in Walla Walla.

The east-to-west trajectory and the Anglo-US master story serve to minimize attention to the history of the Catholic Church in the Oregon Country. The effort of explicitly Catholic historiographers to fit the story of US Catholicism into this consensus history further minimizes attention to people and events that do not fit that mold.[10]

The Battle to Establish Ecclesiastical Presence

So influential are the characteristics of the dominant secular and religious historical narratives that even the three accounts that focus on Catholicism in the Pacific Northwest – Edwin Vincent O'Hara, Alfred P. Schoenberg, and Jeffrey Burns[11] miss the full significance of the fact that the A.M.A. Blanchet, first bishop of Walla Walla and later Nesqually (1847-1879) is French-speaking. Nor do they consider the fact that A.M.A. Blanchet, as well as his brother F.N. and Modeste Demers, go to Europe, Mexico, Quebec, and countries of South America seeking funds for support, not to the Catholic Church in the United States. In other words, these narratives are not sure how to handle a church whose self-conception

is first French-Canadian, then international, and not US. None addresses the fact that the early founders of the church in the region, as French-Canadians, did not share in the myth of Manifest Destiny that is inherent in the dominant historical narratives with their east to west trajectory.

These three texts present their stories primarily as a battle to establish ecclesiastical institutions against great odds, which is true. But in focussing on ecclesiastical structures they also miss the regional influence on religiousness. Burns' title aptly conveys his organizing metaphor. His story presents heroic clergy working at, as Burns puts it, "the difficult task of inspiring an indifferent people to devotion."[12] Burns is correct to assert that there is something about the region that tends to leach religiousness, at least institutional religiousness, out of people. If Roberta Brown's and my research is on target, one must ask whether this leaching occurs in the same way for French-Canadian and Metis as for those who come from the Eastern United States.

One of the major obstacles to establishing ecclesiastical institutions that all the narratives recognize is geography. There is too much space and people are spread too far apart. A.M.A. Blanchet noticed the problems of geography early on and requested a bishop for the eastern reaches of his diocese because he could not cross mountains in winter and considered it unreasonable to expect the Indians to leave their hunting grounds in summer to receive the sacrament of confirmation.[13]

A second major problem all three authors identify is lack of resources, something that led to intense conflict between religious orders and bishops that continued well into the twentieth century. Blanchet's correspondence is full of references to staffing, supplies, and money. Fr. Peter Hylebos, pastor of St. Leo Parish, Tacoma, Washington, wrote to Bishop O'Dea shortly after the turn of the century that he could not provide his annual diocesan assessment because the Franciscan Sisters were begging on the streets for funds for their hospital and he had been unsuccessful canvassing the same people (Archives of the Archdiocese of Seattle).Lack of resources made bishops, clergy, religious, and actively involved laity keenly aware of the fragility of the institutional church in the region.

While O'Hara, Burns, and Schoenberg address lack of resources, none considers how this might shape the religiousness of the people. In fact, long stretches of separation from locations where Catholic ritual life was readily available shaped the laity. Their spirituality became more

episodic. Life-cycle sacraments carried increasing weight. And until after the railroads brought a sufficient population of Catholic immigrants to construct pockets of Catholic communities in the region, laity exercised a marked independence from clerical influence and control. The circumstances in the region shaped the religiousness of Catholics. Many laity renegotiated their relationship to their religious denominations, and reconstructed their moral and religious worlds to better fit the circumstances of the frontier.

Value of a Regional/Borderland Perspective: Blanchet Correspondence

If one begins the story of the Catholic Church in the Pacific Northwest with the records of that church, in this case the letter press books of A.M.A. Blanchet, a number of themes emerge that require the history of Catholicism in the United States, at least in this region of the United States, to be written quite differently. If one starts the story with the Blanchet correspondence, eight significant points emerge that must be incorporated into or shape the narrative.

1.The Catholic Church in the United States can be fully understood only when a comparative approach is used that looks at the church in terms of the distinctiveness of its multiple regional contexts. The single master narrative of incorporating Catholics into the expansion of the Maryland English, Genteel Catholic tradition, misses too much.[14]

2.The Church was from the beginning multicultural in nature. A French-Canadian bishop in the wilderness, A.M.A. Blanchet had to negotiate Native American, French-Canadian, Metis, Asian, European, and Yankee Protestant cultures. A look at the patient ledger of the Providence Sisters Hospital in Vancouver for one day of 1856 shows among others, patients who are Native American, Armenian, Polish, German, Irish, and assorted forms of US.

3.Clergy entered a religious world already constructed. In the eastern part of A.M.A.'s diocese initial evangelization had been done by Canadian Iroquois who had migrated West. The French-Canadian and Metis employees of the Hudson's Bay Company who upon settling built a church and requested priests from Quebec had, during their years in the fur trade and marrying into Indian tribes, organized their own moral and religious worlds before the priests arrived.[15]This included, for some, having the Methodist and Anglican ministers who preceded the arrival of Catholic

priests bless their unions with indigenous women, something that distressed both Blanchets and other early bishops.

4. Attending to the Blanchet correspondence highlights the significance of explicit chronological phases in the history of the church in the Pacific Northwest and any region. A distinctly French-Canadian, Metis, Indian phase of the Catholic Church in the region ends by 1855, brought down by the massive immigration from the United States, the California Gold Rush, Indian treaties, and a flu epidemic. It was superseded by a mainly Irish and German Catholic population, spurred by US cavalry soldiers mustering out from Fort Vancouver and Fort Steilacoom, and later by mixed European immigrations that came via the railroad.

5. One striking fact conveyed by Blanchet's letter press books is the overwhelming task in the west of making religion real to oneself and to one's surrounding society. Blanchet's letters contain scenes of intense discouragement and great optimism. Focus on the equipment of Catholic ritual life is one way the deliberate construction of an ecclesiastical religious world comes through.

6. Blanchet's disputes with the Oregon provisional and later territorial governments over land claims was unresolved during his lifetime. Church-state conflict is a significant part of the story of Catholicism in the Pacific Northwest, a story that ends not just with the settlement of the land claims but goes on to the infamous Oregon School Law aimed against Catholics that make attendance at public schools compulsory. This part of the Catholic story continues to be minimized in US Catholic historiography in an effort to make Catholics good Americans.

7. A.M.A. Blanchet had to adapt to his new context. A careful comparison of A.M.A. Blanchet's comments on the Catholic Church in the United States during his initial trip to the Diocese of Walla Walla with comments made in letters toward the end of his tenure as bishop is one way to begin to understand how Catholic institutional leaders adapted to the US context other than by embracing the English/US master story of manifest destiny.

8. A.M.A. Blanchet brings the outsider's perspective to our understanding of the development of the Catholic Church in the United States. He viewed the social, political, and cultural dynamics of the Oregon Country – from Indian Wars to wagon trains to the deceit of the Provisional Government through his French-Canadian eyes. He was not interested in conquering the West as were the Louispoli (the Indian

referent for people from the United States). Nor was he interested in turning Indians into middle-class Protestants as were the Whitmans, Jason Lee, and other Protestant missionaries. Hence A.M.A. Blanchet's letter press books offer a distinctive and alternative perspective from which to view the tumultuous events that shaped the Oregon Country.

Conclusion

The letter press books of A.M.A. Blanchet complicate the history of Catholicism in the United States. Written by an outsider – Catholic and French-Canadian – the letters operate from different assumptions than do the writings of US-born clergy or clergy of Irish descent. Blanchet's letters tell the story of a Pacific Rim Church, international, multi-cultural, and indigenous in character, a Church that survived despite anti-Catholic prejudice and the arrival of waves of immigrants from the eastern United States that literally swamp the original French-Canadian, Metis, and indigenous population. Taking a closer look at the construction of the Catholic Church in this borderland region, then, reveals significant subcurrents in a complex US Catholic history. Revealing such subcurrents is one significant contribution of a borderland focus to US Catholic history.

Endnotes

1. See Patricia Nelson Limerick, Clyde A. Milner II, and Charles E. Rankin, eds., *Trails: Toward a New Western History* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1991).

2. D. Michael Quinn, "Religion in the American West," in *Under An Open Sky: Rethinking America's Western Past,* eds., William Cronon, George Miles, and Jay Gitlin (New York: W.W. Norton, 1992). In *The American West: A Twentieth-Century History* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1989), Michael Malone and Richard Etulain provide a brief overview of religion as a category of culture (193-205).

3. Sydney Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972), 544. Mark Noll acknowledges the pluralism of religion in the West from the beginning but ends his discussion there (*A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992], 325-326). Edwin Scott Gaustad devotes a four and one-half

page section to Catholicism on the frontier without managing to say anything about Catholics in the Oregon country (*A Religious History of America* [San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1990], 151-156).

4. Blanchet had been appointed bishop, despite the fact that the majority of bishops at the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore had favored a Jesuit from the St. Louis Province. Both the bishop of Quebec, Signay, and the Bishop of Baltimore agreed and jointly requested that the mission be made an Apostolic Vicariate.

5. See Wilfred P. Schoenberg, *A History of the Catholic Church in the Pacific Northwest, 1743-1983* (Washington: Pastoral Press, 1987), 77-97; Edwin Vincent O'Hara, *A Pioneer Catholic History of Oregon* (Portland, Oregon: n.p.,1911): 97-100; and Vincent J. McNally, "Victoria: An American Diocese in Canada," *Canadian Catholic Historical Association Historical Studies* 57 (1990): 8-9.

6. Robert Hine, *The American West: An Interpretive History* (Boston: Little Brown, 1973): 94-95.

7. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1969.

8. See Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience: A History From Colonial Times to the Present* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1985); and Patrick W. Carey, *The Roman Catholics in America* (Westport: Praeger, 1996).

9. *American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 133-134.

10. See Thomas A. Tweed's "Introduction: Narrating US Religious History" in *Retelling US Religious History*, ed. Thomas A. Tweed (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997): 1-23.

11. O'Hara, *Pioneer Catholic History of Oregon;* Schoenberg, *A History of the Catholic Church in the Pacific Northwest;* and Jeffrey M. Burns, "Building the Best: A History of Catholic Parish Life in the Pacific States," *The American Catholic Parish; A History from 1850 to the Present*, ed. Jay P. Dolan (New York: Paulist Press, 1987).

12. "Building the Best," 15.

13. Blanchet to Fr. Joset, 18 February 1854, AA, Register, series A, Vol. 2.

14. Helpful is William Westfall, "Voices from the Attic: The Canadian Border and the Writing of American Religious History," in *Retelling US Religious History,* 181-199. See also Herbert Bolton's 1933 classic "The Epic of

Greater America" in *Bolton and the Spanish Borderlands*, ed. John Francis Bannon (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954), 301-332.

15. See Laurie Maffley-Kipp, "The Moral World of a Mining Camp," in *Religion and Society in Frontier California* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 110-147.

Catholic Ecclesial Presence and Growth in the Columbia Region

ROBERTA STRINGHAM BROWN

The letterbooks of the first bishop of the Archdiocese of Seattle, Augustin Magliore Alexandre Blanchet (1797-1887), have lain virtually untouched in archival vaults for the last century. One reason for this long neglect is that, like many other Catholic ecclesial records of America's Pacific Northwest, they are written in French, the bishop as well as a great number of early White and Metis settlers including engagés of the Hudson's Bay Company having been French Canadian in origin. During the last eighteen months, it has been my task to begin translating into English the eleven hundred pages of copied and signed letters that comprise the letterbooks of A.M.A. Blanchet, and in this way bring to light a neglected foundation in the historical strata and heritage of the Catholic Church in this borderland region. Anxious to have a more complete picture, I have also collected letters addressed to the bishop.[1]

Translation itself is a reconstruction of the voice and the personal identity of the writer; and when considered as a literary genre, correspondence is an unusually intimate form of written expression. Thus, the process of translating correspondence, particularly that of a central historical figure, engages one in the privilege of directly witnessing the making of history. My task is far from complete, but each letter that I come to know comprises one more interlocking piece in the complex puzzle of the role of Catholic ecclesial presence in the shifting borderlands and upheavals of the Pacific Northwest during the mid-nineteenth century. Although there are still many stray pieces to the puzzle, an image both of A.M.A. Blanchet and of the role of the Catholic Church in the Pacific

Northwest is beginning to emerge.

This paper will focus on what Blanchet understood to be his role as French Canadian bishop in his new diocese, arriving at a time when the region was in a state of secular and ecclesial fluidity and transition. I will propose that it was the bishop's profound conviction of the significance of his role that provided him the strength for overcoming the endless obstacles and difficulties he would encounter, setbacks that would easily have broken a less determined and inspired spirit.

A consideration of the bishop's background prior to his appointment on 24 July 1846 is an important factor in constructing our picture of his role. Member of a large *Canadien* farming family of St-Pierre de Montmagny with a proud line of priests and nuns, Augustin was educated at the *Petit* and *Grand Séminaries* of Quebec City. After missionary work on the islands "de la Madeleine" and on Cape Breton, he served as parish priest in the area of Montreal and eventually as titular canon of the Cathedral of Montreal. It is not insignificant that in 1837 he was serving as pastor of St-Charles on the Richelieu, a parish in the heart of the Patriote Rebellions. Of particular interest are some letters of the period suggesting that, contrary to the official Church position in Lower Canada, the priest may have had Patriote sympathies himself, if not at least a certain feeling of solidarity with the plight of the farmers. Such letters in fact indicate that the British accused him of having favoured the insurrection of his parishioners, of appearing in the camp of the insurgents to give them general absolution, and of having written some private notes designed to prove that the revolt was not against divine right.[2] Claiming these implications to be exaggerated on account of the strong anti-Catholic sentiment of the British, Blanchet nevertheless admitted that he had felt isolated by the surrounding sea of insurgents, that his life had even been threatened by an anonymous Patriote,[3] and for such reasons he had been forced to house from 100 to 150 insurgents in the presbytery of his church during the final days before the battle – a presence which could explain why Patriote medals were later found there (which were used as evidence for his political sympathies).[4] For such assumed actions, the British imprisoned Blanchet for high treason and did not release him until three months later, on a bail of 1000 pounds, which was collected through the intermediary work of the *Grand Séminaire* of Quebec, with ecclesial figures including Ignace Bourget, Bishop of Montreal, working discretely behind the scenes.[5]

From that point onward, it seems that Abbé Blanchet and Bishop

Bourget, former classmates at the *Grand Séminaire,* maintained a constant and fairly deep friendship that extended well beyond formality. Their frequent letters are among the most personal and confidential that I have come across. It is in these letters that one catches a glimpse of how Blanchet understood his role as missionary bishop and how he justified his emigration to a land that had just become a US possession. This understanding is related to the longings and idealizations of many French Canadian clergy of the time as well as to their general adaptation of Ultramontane perspectives.

To summarize these clerical ideals, one could say that they grew out of the long nostalgic quest for a French America that was to be gloriously heroic, edenic, and Catholic in the larger, universal sense. Though vanquished by the fatality of history, there was a sense among the clergy that this promise still remained.[6] In the minds of French Canadian ecclesial figures, this mythology in fact became the reality of maintaining Catholicism and fidelity to the land. Indeed for them, the survival of the civilizing Catholic mission, initially granted to France but abandoned by this country in her progress toward secularization, now depended on the French *Canadiens* who needed only remain faithful to their religion, their language, and – having no more state – to the native soil.[7] In short, the great French mission on earth had fallen into the hands of the clergy of Lower Canada. The resulting agrarian stance of many clerics reinforced not only sentiment against British settlers' claims to *Canadien*-held lands, but also to a collective anti-American attitude, where the eastern US seaboard was often portrayed as an economic and moral vulture, grabbing innocent Catholic worker souls of Lower Canada into its Anglo-Saxon capitalistic claws. One spoke of the great French Canadian bleeding to the south, and of the betrayal of those *Canadiens* who emigrated.[8]

A letter from Bishop Bourget suggests this mindset of the time. In December of 1846, he writes elatedly from Europe where he has just met with the founders of the new *Société d'Océanie*. What immediately struck him in meeting with these potential benefactors, he tells Blanchet, was the possibility of colonizing the Columbia "with the thousands of *Canadiens* who are going to lose themselves to the United States all the while making the fortunes of the Americans . . . Bourget goes on to write in the same letter,

> I thus suggested . . . favoring the emigration of all the good *Canadien* families who would like to inhabit the immense Territory of Oregon,

> by paying a part of the cost of the voyage, and by providing a means for procuring land and survival needs for these newly arrived families . . . Who knows if in this way God will not provide a place for our poor and good *Canadiens* for whom Canada will no longer be their patrimony.[9]

These utopian comments suggest that, at least in the wildest dreams of one of Lower Canada's bishops, the Oregon Country may have represented a final outpost for the preservation of the French mission, given that even Lower Canada herself was threatened by English and American hegemony.

Such inspiring words of encouragement from the man who had become his mentor, combined with thoughts of saving the souls of thousands of Native Americans, seem to have helped justify Blanchet, who, after initial epistolary expressions of inadequacy, discerned the new appointment to be the will of God. Henceforth in his correspondence, Blanchet makes it clear that the American government and its people would only be stepping stones – and often obstacles – for seeking these idealistic goals. In September 1846 Bourget consecrated the new bishop with typical Gallican pomp in the Cathedral of Montreal. Thereupon, Blanchet spent several months successfully seeking clerics to join him and scouring the countryside of Lower Canada for funds to pay for travel and initial subsistence. He departed on the Tuesday after Easter 1847 with three other secular clerics, Father Jean Baptiste Brouillet, Deacon Louis P.G. Rousseau, and Subdeacon Guillaume Leclaire, as well as two nieces who, "were going to Oregon to teach the *sauvagesses* crafts specific to their gender."[10] While in Europe, Bishop Bourget had arranged for five Oblates of Mary Immaculate to depart from France and join the new bishop en route to his diocese: Father Pascal Ricard; Brothers Charles Pandosy, Eugene Casimir Chirouse, Georges Blanchet; and lay Brother, Celestin Verney. As it turned out, this little band of clerics would be solely responsible for carrying out the great French mission north of the Columbia River for a number of years to come.

The waters of the St. Lawrence having not yet thawed, Blanchet and his French Canadian companions worked their way down the dangerous icy roads of New England before embarking on the inland waterways to the head of the Oregon Trail at Westport, near St. Louis, where the Oblates joined him. The account of his voyage written in a journal and eventually in a series of detailed letters addressed to a friend from former seminary days, are testimony to the bishop's anti-US sentiments. He does not spare

words in describing the squalor of Albany, the soot of Pittsburgh, or the habit of men to lift their feet almost to their heads. "Wherever they are seated," he relates, "they find something on which to prop them. That seems an epidemic maladie."[11] Blanchet was no less critical of the ability of the US Catholic church to provide support for its members. In Pittsburgh, the travel party had trouble even finding the church or its pastor; in Cincinnati, the bishop had become overly indebted in building his cathedral; in Louisville, there was not a single choirboy.[12] As for American priests, even in St. Louis where Catholicism was the majority religion, they did not find it appropriate to wear their cassock in the streets. Finally, Catholics in the public schools were ashamed of professing their religion, and emigrants were angered at the lack of priests to serve their spiritual needs, factors that Blanchet suggests may be lending to the general decline in the US of the Catholic population.[13] In spite of these observations, Blanchet went out of his way to make the acquaintance of American bishops and priests along the way who would serve him in times of difficulty during later years particularly with regard to the eventual race for and conflict over land claims. It was not, however, until he reached the open prairies, the Rockies, and the plains beyond, that the bishop's awe before the beauty of the land suggests his excitement about the potential Eden that lay beyond.

Upon his arrival in the new see of Walla Walla, near where the Snake River flows into the Columbia, Blanchet was as prepared as any individual might expect to be for the overwhelming series of setbacks he would immediately encounter caused by economic woes, political chaos, and the effects of the local Provisional Government's Protestantism and resulting prejudice against Catholicism. Turning now to these difficulties, I will mention three: first, his immediate financial straits; second, the Whitman Massacre and ensuing Indian Wars; and third, the thrust for land claims. For each, it seems to have been the rugged, unflinching devotion to his ultimate mission and his related unwillingness ever to take "no" for an answer, that led to Blanchet's ultimate success in helping establish a permanent Catholic Church in today's state of Washington.

One can only imagine the initial relief of the bishop upon pulling up to the post of Walla Walla on the afternoon of 5 September after the many mishaps of his six-month voyage. Having joined a Hudson's Bay Company party a month earlier at Fort Hall, he and three other clerics from his group had ridden ahead of their wagon train in order to find living quarters and make arrangements for missionary establishments of the

Oblates before winter fully closed in. Walla Walla had been initially selected as the site for this episcopal seat because it was anticipated that the surrounding area would be the center of population growth in the region north of the Columbia River. Tacoma, Seattle, Spokane, and other metropolitan areas in today's state of Washington were still largely untouched by white settlers. But at the time of his arrival, this potential metropolitan area was comprised of a lonely Hudson's Bay post run by chief factor William McBean, an affable, kind-hearted compatriot, who along with his Metis wife and children, was a practicing Catholic.[14]

The bishop's momentary bliss came to a quick halt, however, upon his survey of the surrounding area. Much building had to be done, and building requires funds. The primary source of funding for French Canadian missionary outposts was the private benevolent Society for the Propagation of Faith, administered through Lyons and Paris, France. Blanchet had written personally to the presidents of the Societies in Paris and Lyons, requested that funds be deposited through the HBC in London and credited to him through the main HBC post in Vancouver.[15] As this was the only source for food staples and supplies in the territory, it made sense that credit be handled in such a fashion. However, this anticipated funding had not arrived and none would be made available for some time, due at least in part to the 1848 Revolution taking place in France.

In addition, funding Blanchet had expected through collections in Quebec and particularly through the efforts of Bishop Bourget, was also not forthcoming. Interestingly, in spite of seeming to live largely on promissory notes to the Hudson's Bay Company, Blanchet does not appeal to American clergy for funding. Instead, in a state of desperation, he sends his most trusted vicar general, J.B.A. Brouillet, to California in search for gold. This financial mission appears to have provided some revenue as well as further important clerical connections; and the bishop's own voyage in 1852 to Mexico for purposes of scrounging up funds from collections as well as mines, also appears to have resulted in limited financial success. In fact, a letter Bourget addresses to Blanchet in Mexico reveals a curious reversal of roles in terms of financial support. The Montreal bishop suggests that he send by way of Mexico some French Canadian Sisters and a priest he had designated for service in Oregon in the hope that they might help make a collection not just for Oregon but for "les pauvres incendiés de Montréal."[16] The tone of the Montreal bishop's letter is not only one of continuing ideological dreams for the Oregon mission, but also one of financial desperation with regard to his own flock.

Local support was equally difficult to obtain. The closest Protestant missionaries, Dr. Marcus and Narcissus Whitman, claimed that they would sell provisions to the Catholic clerics only if they were reduced to starvation.[17] And, as it turned out, the chief officer of the Hudson's Bay Company in Vancouver was Peter Skene Ogden (1794-1854), coincidentally brother of the Attorney General at the time of the Patriote Rebellions, the very man who had summoned the pastor of St. Charles on the Richelieu for imprisonment: Charles-Richard Ogden (1791-1886).[18] In spite of the chief officer's apparent civility during their initial encounters, this relationship became increasingly strained.

Such thick religious prejudice and political baggage lent not only to economic woes, but also complicated the missionary bishop's first immediate crisis in his new diocese. Less than three months after his arrival, Dr. Whitman, his wife, and several other adults living at the neighboring ABCFM mission of Waïlatpu (American Board of Commissioners for foreign missions) were brutally massacred by a small and unofficial band of Cayuse Indians. Anger against the Whitmans had been simmering for a number of years, due in part to what appears to have been a well-intended but patronizing attitude toward the Native Americans. At the time of Blanchet's arrival, this antagonism had reached a crisis as the result of the recent loss of additional children to the measles – in particular the two children of a chief – and suspicions of the "poison" that the doctor was distributing in his attempt to save them. It was Blanchet's Vicar General, J.B.A. Brouillet, who first came upon the victims of the massacre during his round of baptizing children afflicted with the measles. With Cayuse tomahawks menacing him over his shoulder, Brouillet performed the rites and buried the victims, then rushed on to warn a second Protestant missionary. As an army of volunteers from the Willamette Valley was making its way north to seek revenge upon all the Cayuse for the murders, Blanchet convoked an assembly of Cayuse chiefs and negotiated for the safe return of several surviving Americans who had been living at the HBCM mission at the time of the attack and who were taken as hostages. With the assistance of his interpreter, he also negotiated a settlement that spared the Cayuse as a whole from being decimated by the volunteer army. Ogden, who arrived later from Fort Vancouver to make further negotiations and to finance and arrange for rescue boats, is credited by Northwest historians for the rescue. Few historical accounts of this disastrous event in the Pacific Northwest even mention the presence or the practical, level-headed work of the resident Catholic clergy. Indeed, within a few months,

journals in the Willamette Valley were openly accusing the newly arrived bishop and his associates for having incited the massacre. In a sense, Blanchet was replaying his days as Pastor of St. Charles, again finding himself in the compromising situation of sympathizing with the losers – this time the Native Americans – and for this reason, becoming scapegoat for the anti-Catholic fervor of the winners, as well in this case, as for the winner's prejudice against Native Americans.

A third, closely related setback was land claims. When Blanchet arrived, Oregon was governed by a free-standing Provisional government comprised primarily of American Protestants eager to wrestle choice lands from resident French Canadians and Metis – most of whom had been engagés of the Hudson's Bay Company – at a pittance. Yet, according to the Organic Act of Iowa, which was in force in the Provisional lands, all American males had a right to 640 acres of land on which they had settled; this included any established mission. Having wisely become a citizen himself on paper if not in heart, Blanchet set out to establish a land base for Catholicism through application of this law. As it turns out, Protestant missionaries had fled the Walla Walla region and surrounding missions following the Whitman massacre and the ensuing Indian Wars. Claiming safety issues, the Provisional government had prohibited Blanchet himself from returning to the Walla Walla post after his initial departure with the hostages early in 1848. But O.M.I. missionaries as well as J.B.A. Brouillet had quietly resumed varying missions in the region while their itinerant bishop had managed at least to get within his original diocese by establishing himself at its western-most border, at the Dalles on the Columbia River. As a result of these events, there were no claims for American Protestant missions north of the Columbia, but the Catholic Church was in a position to make several. Close to a third of the letters Blanchet writes at this time are related to his unflinching insistence upon the Church's right to established mission lands.

The process of land claims was one of endless conflict and confrontation however. At one point local government officials attempted to limit the number of such claims to two, one in the area north of the Columbia and thus in the see of A.M.A. Blanchet, and the other to the south, which was the archdiocese of Oregon City. The bishop used the connections he had made earlier in St. Louis and Baltimore, however, to win favor from the US Congress for his right to all claims.[19] But preoccupation in Washington DC with the Civil War stalled progress for a number of years. By the end of the War, the American government was beginning

to uproot and resettle Native Americans onto reservations, while the recently established Washington Territorial Government, established in 1853, was gaining control over the decision as to what religious denominations might be allowed to "civilize" the Indians on these reservations.

These momentous events on the American landscape seemed to be sweeping away any hopes for carrying out missionary ideologies shared by the French Oblates, resident Jesuits, and the French Canadian secular clergy; and the population of Native Americans whom they had largely come to evangelize was dropping off precipitously. Through an unanticipated course of events, claims of the Catholic Church thus came to overlap with and in many ways, to defend Native American interests; one might suggest that Blanchet again found himself on the side of the losers – a situation very likely instensified in the eyes of Protestant Americans by the tendency of Catholic missionaries to live among the tribes and to accept Native American customs (with the important exceptions of polygamy and shamanism). Had Blanchet not persevered and gone to every imaginative length, including his request that the Oblates consider purchasing land as lay citizens, it is quite likely that he and his successor would not have been granted even the scant peppering of acreage they ended up with – primarily sites of established churches or institutions – and would have lost all to individual American settlers.

Perhaps the most difficult of all land claims was the site of the original HBC post in Vancouver, known then as Columbia City. It was here that the Columbia Mission had been founded and settled in 1837 by François Norbert Blanchet, brother of Augustin. At the time, the chief factor of the post was Dr. John McLaughlin, an Anglican who had been schooled in French Canada, had become all but Catholic in practice and sympathies, and who encouraged devotion among his engagés living on or near the Vancouver post. In 1850, Vancouver (Columbia City) had become the see of the diocese of Nesqually to which Blanchet himself had been transferred from the diocese of Walla Walla, the latter remaining too sparsely settled to warrant his continued residence.[20] At the time of the claim, Peter Skene Ogden, who had since moved his post to Vancouver Island on British lands, was arranging for selling these American HBC lands to the US government, and therefore wanted to have full claim to them. In their battle for this piece of land, the animosity between the two men reached a high pitch, Ogden claiming that a mission had never existed at Ft. Vancouver.[21] Blanchet never completely backed down, however; the church's claim remained viable; and it was finally settled some thirty years

later by his successor. By this time, however, it had been reduced to a small piece of property that included the church itself and the convent of the Sisters of Providence. Echoes of the British-French antagonism Blanchet had known in his earlier days in Lower Canada were thus still ringing in this battle between the British Hudson's Bay Company and the local *Canadien* Catholic bishop.

At times these many struggles occasioned letters of deep discouragement and confessions of failure on the part of the bishop. They often concluded, nonetheless, with recognition that success does not come without bearing the cross. Willing to shoulder the bittersweet burden of the cross – a carbine undoubtedly in one hand and a rosary in the other – Blanchet kept his piercing gaze ahead, fixed on his ultimate mission. He travelled to Europe and again to Mexico, gathering further funds and making important connections with other benevolent societies.

In 1856 Blanchet returned to Montreal to arrange for the eventual settlement of the Sisters of Providence, the first group of 1852 having ended up in Chile rather than on the Pacific Coast, primarily as the result of miscommunication. Through sacrifice and tireless efforts this second group of Sisters solidly anchored themselves, established the first academies for girls north of the Columbia, as well as orphanages, hospitals, and asylums. Their services were called upon by new white settlers, Protestant as well as Catholic, as well as by remaining Native American tribes. Blanchet's correspondence suggests that their works were only limited by the number of Sisters whom the Mother House in Montreal could provide. To this day, these initial Sisters of Providence are considered the founders of Washington State's Department of Social and Health Services, an organization that continues to operate as an umbrella agency along the pattern set by the Sisters. Recognizing that there were no Protestant schools north of the Columbia – and rushing to beat the Protestants to state tax funds for education – Blanchet also sought clerics from colleges as far flung as St. Hyacinth in Quebec to the American College in Louvain and the College of All Hallows in Ireland. As late as 1870, he was insisting that these teachers be fluent in French as well as English in order to meet the needs of the *Canadien* settlers.

As a result of these accomplishments there is a deepening sense of accomplishment in the letters of the bishop. A letter of 1867 addressed to Bourget describes a recent episcopal visit to Native American, *Canadien*, and American missionary settlements throughout the diocese. While still pointing out the many problems and repeating his perpetual request for

additional priests, Blanchet nevertheless provides ample reasons for rejoicing, particularly with regard to the devotional practices of Native Americans such as the Lummi Tribe in the northernmost corner of the diocese.[22] By the time of his resignation in 1879 for reasons of age and health, it seems that Blanchet was at peace with what he had managed to accomplish in this largely Protestant and unchurched land.

In 1907 the See of Nesqually was moved to Seattle, and in 1911 it was renamed the Diocese of Seattle. In 1950 it was elevated to the Archdiocese of Seattle. A.M.A. Blanchet is celebrated as its first bishop. The Archdiocese of Seattle, which today encompasses all of western Washington from the summit of the Cascade Mountains to the Pacific, is frequently noted for its independence from ecclesial opinions that dominate other parts of the US. As its founding roots begin to emerge from the interlocking pieces of the Blanchet correspondence, one cannot help but wonder if this independence might have something to do with Bishop A.M.A. Blanchet's modest success – in spite of endless setbacks – in preserving some embers of the great French missionary ideology and the dreams of his friend and mentor, Ignace Bourget. Whatever the case may be, the modest success of this story continues to be shrouded by layers of American nationalist assumptions as well as by the anti-Catholic and anti-foreigner prejudices of earlier historians who shaped the Pacific Northwest legacy, and who did not take into account the ambiguities of borderland history.

Endnotes

1. I am grateful to French Canadian researcher, Georges Aubin of l'Assomption, for generously lending me his transcription of correspondence of A.M.A. Blanchet and related documents, several which I have used in particular for information not found in the Letterbooks of the Archdiocese of Seattle or in the Archives of the Chancellery of the Archdiocese of Montreal.

2. Bourget to Blanchet, 5 December 1837, Registre de Lettres, 1:89, Archives de la Chancellerie de l'Archdiocèse de Montréal [hereafter ACAM].

3. Archbishop Lartigue had also received an anonymous letter announcing this threat, and writes to warn Blanchet of his dangerous position (Lartigue to Blanchet, 12 July 1837, Registre de Lettres, 8:406, ACAM).

4. Blanchet to Bourget, 7 December 1837, 420.041, ACAM.

5. Lartigue to Blanchet (in prison), 9 March 1838, Registre de Lettres, 9:27, ACAM.

6. Guildo Rousseau, *L'image des Etats-Unis dans la littérature québecoise, 1775-1930* (Sherbrooke: Éditions Naaman, 1981), 11.

7. Constance Gosselin Schick, "Jeanne la fileuse et le repatriement des émigrés," *The French Review* 71, No. 6 (1998): 1007.

8. Rousseau, *L'image des Etats-Unis dans la littérature québecoise*. See in particular Chapter 7, "La lutte contre l'emprise économique" for a description of anti-American sentiment in nineteenth-century French Canadian literature.

9. Bourget to Blanchet, December 1846, Registre de Lettres, 901.055: 846-11, ACAM.

10. Blanchet to Gavreau, 20 November 1848, Registre de Letters, Series A, Vol. III, Archives of the Archdiocese of Seattle [hereafter AAS].

11. Blanchet to Gavreau, 27 November 1847, Registre de Lettres, Series A, Vol. III, AAS.

12. Blanchet to Gavreau, 27 November 1847.

13. Blanchet to Gavreau, 2 December 1847, Registre de Lettres, Series A, Vol. III, AAS.

14. Blanchet to Gavreau, 20 January 1847, Registre de Lettres, Series A, Vol. III, AAS.

15. Document entitled "Instructions à Messieurs Truteau et Paré," Registre de Lettres, Series A, Vol. II, AAS.

16. Bourget to Blanchet, 2 August 1852, Registre de Lettres, 7:361, ACAM. This was the epoch of the Montreal fire of 1852 which destroyed the cathedral of Montreal and left thousands homeless, inspiring Bourget to rebuild his cathedral in the English section of Montreal and in imitation of St. Peter's of Rome.

17. Blanchet to Gavreau, 22 February 1848, Registre de Lettres, Series A, Vol. III, AAS.

18. Blanchet to Bourget, 30 March 1838, Archives de la Chancellerie de l'Evêché de Valleyfield; see also Blanchet to Truteau, 30 March 1838, Registre de Lettres, Series A, Vol. 3, AAS.

19. Blanchet to Kenrick, Archbishop of Baltimore, 31 May 1853, Registre de Lettres, Series A., Vol. II, AAS.

20. The diocese of Walla Walla was suppressed in 1853.

21. P.S. Ogden to John B. Preston, 17 July 1853, Registre de Lettres, Series A, Vol. III, AAS.

22. Blanchet to Bourget, 10 October 1867, 195.133; 867-71, ACAM.

Thomas McCulloch and William McGavin: A Neglected Transatlantic Literary/Religious Connection

J. C. WHYTOCK

In Maritime early nineteenth-century education, literature and church life there is one who towers above all other Presbyterians – Thomas McCulloch. A host of studies have been done on McCulloch explaining several aspects of his varied and energetic life.[1] It is certain that more studies will continue to emerge and be welcomed. This paper is an effort to explore one neglected aspect of Thomas McCulloch, namely his friendship with William McGavin and their relationship concerning matters of a transatlantic literary/religious nature. Because little is known of their friendship, this paper begins by establishing certain biographical matters. Attention will also be given to McGavin's letters to McCulloch which are invaluable for McCulloch studies. Brief compass will be made here to the letters and Roman Catholic polemics. Then the paper will proceed to examine parallel religious and moral literary themes in McGavin and McCulloch. Finally, the Covenanter ideal will be examined in each, and this examination will point to a web of Scottish writers.

Thomas McCulloch and William McGavin: Two Scottish Lads

The lifelong friendship between Thomas McCulloch and Rev. John Mitchell of Glasgow, and with the Mitchell family, has been duly noted since *Life of Thomas McCulloch* which was published by his son William McCulloch and edited by Thomas' granddaughters in 1920.[2] In many ways this is the strength and the weakness of this standard biography.[3] It offers much by way of contact between McCulloch and Scotland via the

Mitchells but does not sufficiently explore other Scottish connections. For example, William McGavin is not included in the biography's index and the name occurs only once in the main text and only as "From Mr. McGavin of the 'Protestant.'"[4] Thus, it is easy to miss William McGavin.[5] A proper exploration of McCulloch and McGavin rewards a rich return to the student of McCulloch. It is good that the new *Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology* includes an excellent entry on McGavin, and with a link to Thomas McCulloch, something which the John Mitchell article omits.[6]

William McGavin was born in Auchinlock, Ayrshire in 1773, into a Seceder family (Antiburgher – the same denomination as the McCullochs). Auchinlock is famous for having been the burial place of the noted Covenanter, Alexander Pedan, remembered as the "prophet." McGavin's birthplace was significant as a Covenanter region and this surfaced in his writing.[7] As a boy he was apprenticed as a weaver, then bookseller, in Paisley where he attended the Oakshaw (Seceder) Street Church. The Oakshaw Street Church, Paisley, was the church home of the McCulloch family and we are told by a McGavin biographer that one of McGavin's closest friends during his Paisley youth was Thomas McCulloch – "a young man of great energy and superior attainments . . ." who was "among his more intimate friends" and, further, that they remained lifelong friends.[8] The other close friend of William McGavin's boyhood was Alexander Wilson, who achieved fame in America as an illustrator, ornithologist, friend and precursor of John Audubon.[9]

Thomas McCulloch was born in1776, in Fereneze, now part of Barrhead, but at the time a distinct area between Neilston and Paisley. The Fereneze Hills run toward the border with Ayrshire and were the centre of a specialized textile trade.1[10] It was an area which was going from a rural economic base to that of an industrialized region during McCulloch's childhood.

McGavin and McCulloch formed a close friendship from their common church connection in Paisley. McCulloch, unlike McGavin, proceeded to study at the University of Glasgow. While at the University he gave private lessons tutoring Hebrew. One of his students was Ralph Wardlaw.[11] Wardlaw's name will appear at various junctures of a study on McCulloch but here it is sufficient to note that Wardlaw was later McGavin's close friend.[12]

The Six McGavin Letters and Roman Catholic Polemics

Having introduced the matter of the close friendship between McCulloch and McGavin in Scotland, we break off exploring fuller biographical details and turn to the McGavin-McCulloch relationship after McCulloch's departure in 1803 to New Scotland (Nova Scotia). We begin with William McGavin's six extant letters to Thomas McCulloch between 1808 and 1819, which appear to have been ignored in McCulloch studies.[13]

In reading these letters there are at least four areas which deserve study: one, the relationship between McGavin and McCulloch on Roman Catholic polemics; two, the relationship between the two and literature; three, the relationship between the two and the exchange of news, new theological works and society enterprizes; and, four, the mention of McGavin's interest in McCulloch's "New College" (Pictou Academy).[14] Each of the four areas is worthy of a separate paper. However, I will limit my treatment to the first two, namely Roman Catholic polemics and literature. For both McGavin and McCulloch the religious and the literary were never far apart.

Thomas McCulloch's two largest theological works were on Roman Catholic polemics, to which McGavin made several references. *Popery Condemned by Scriptures and the Fathers* . . was printed in Edinburgh in early 1808.[15] The first extant letter from McGavin to McCulloch is dated 7 March 1808; in it McGavin proceeded to tell McCulloch that he had obtained a new copy of *Popery Condemned* from Rev. John Mitchell (it may even be that McCulloch meant it as a complimentary copy for McGavin) and he wrote:

> I have been very much amused by it, and have received no small instruction and information upon various points of the popish controversy. It is a subject upon which I would not have thought of reading, had the book not come from a friend . . . My wonder was excited by the great mass of information you had collected from the writings of the ancients, and could not help admiring the patience that carried you through so many ponderous volumes which you must have consulted . . .[16]

McCulloch obviously appreciated his good friend's words of encouragement and wrote two letters to McGavin in 1809, one on 25 July and the other on 20 December. One can infer from McGavin's reply of 15 March 1810 that McCulloch had informed his friend of the ongoing battle against Roman Catholicism in Nova Scotia which had necessitated

McCulloch to put pen to paper again in *Popery Again Condemned by Scriptures and the Fathers* . . . which was printed in Edinburgh in 1810.[17] McGavin expressed his comments and encouragement to McCulloch, "Do not be afraid of the Vicar General, I should like to see his book and your reply."[18]

Again in 1811, McGavin wrote another letter to McCulloch with further commendation to McCulloch for his *Popery Condemned* writings.[19] McGavin was obviously one of McCulloch's best readers. The next pertinent letter was written 11 March 1815. This piece of correspondence does not concern itself with issues Roman Catholic, but other literary matters to be considered shortly.[20] The McGavin letter of 1816 highlights McGavin's service of furnishing McCulloch with British news and information. This letter reveals the intimate web of family and friends that brought these two men into mutual accord.[21]

The last letter which I have located to date from McGavin to McCulloch is dated 27 March 1819.[22] McGavin freely admitted his use of McCulloch's two volumes of *Popery Condemned* in his own serial *The Protestant*: "You will see that I have made use of your name, and have sometimes availed myself of what you have written. I sometimes think that if I had not read your volumes, I would not have thought of writing on the subject, so I hope your work will be of more extensive benefit perhaps than you even thought of."[23] It would appear that McGavin became Thomas McCulloch's popularizer, taking McCulloch's name many places. McGavin's *The Protestant* was first published in Glasgow and there were separate printings in Dublin, Liverpool and Albany, New York. It received the attention of many, including the Bishop of St. David's, Wales. Comments have been made that *The Protestant* was even more popular in the United States than in Britain.[24] In attempting to find direct references in *The Protestant* to McCulloch's *Popery Condemned*, I found sixteen in volumes one and two. Two such references which are blatantly obvious: "As my friend Mr. McCulloch observes . . . [who is quoting from Aquinas on worshipping the cross] I make no apology for quoting so largely from so lively a writer as Mr. McCulloch, whose interesting work is not known in this country, except by a few individuals. This gentleman, who is a minister in Nova Scotia, has most ably exposed the errors of Popery . . ."[25]

It is not difficult to conclude from these six letters and from *The Protestant* that the man behind McGavin was McCulloch. Andrew Thomson, one of the leading evangelicals in the Church of Scotland, wrote a review on *The Protestant* and said: "This work . . . will be found to

contain a more complete view of the errors of Popery than any work that has been written since the happy Revolution in 1688."[26] Should not a footnote have been given to Thomas McCulloch?

McGavin's production of *The Protestant* appeared at an opportune time for McCulloch was busy with the struggles to develop Pictou Academy. The boyhood friendship from Paisley continued even after McCulloch's departure for Nova Scotia, and the letters of McGavin highlight the exchange in the area of Roman Catholic polemics. I turn next to the area of literature, as readers are first introduced to it through the McGavin letters, then in a focused examination of select literary works and themes.

McGavin and McCulloch: Parallel Literary Themes-Religious and Moral

McGavin's six extant letters to McCulloch present the matter of McGavin's literary output in a simple factual manner. First McGavin decried the fact to McCulloch that he had been unable to publish more: "I have been so much taken up with the cares of business, during a period of singular commercial distress, that I have published nothing on any subject since I wrote you last."[27] Since this is dated, 1811, it was before his writing on Roman Catholic polemics, and this points towards his other major writing enterprize–"tracts,"of which he made abundant references in four of the six letters.

Generally the word *tract* is perceived to be a "short treatise or discourse or pamphlet especially on [a] religious subject,"[28] such as the Oxford Tracts of the Tractarian Movement. McGavin's tracts were most definitely on a religious subject but were often conveyed through the means of a story, so one has to have a certain elasticity in the use of his term "tract." For example, in Letter No.4, dated 11 March 1815, McGavin listed some of the tracts that he was sending to McCulloch. They were: "The Royal Visitor," "Profit and Loss," "A Journey in the Highlands," "True Riches," and "Mrs. Murray and Her Children."[29] About a year later McGavin wrote again to McCulloch and told him that he had sent the third part (tract) of "Mrs. Murray and Her Children" but said "whether there shall ever be a fourth part I cannot tell."[30] These tracts were the only literary works mentioned by McGavin, excepting some verses he had written which were published without his knowledge.[31]

If one looks for a direct influence "from the pen of your correspon-

dent" (McGavin)[32] upon McCulloch's literary endeavours of 1821 to 1823, in *The Mephibosheth Stepsure Letters* one will be hard pressed to find even a few literary similarities in terms of style with the McGavin tracts. This should not detract from the overall argument as it is encouraging to see new studies (such as one recently done by Gwendolyn Davies) commending other McCulloch literary material as showing the best reflection of McCulloch's nineteenth-century literary preoccupations.[33] For too long readers have been limited to thinking of McCulloch as merely the father of Canadian humour with the use of satire.

There are clear parallels between McGavin's "tracts" and McCulloch's literary works but these lie most clearly in *Colonial Gleanings – William and Melville*, his novellas. Granted, "William" was extracted from *Stepsure* but when it was put with "Melville" it took a new literary form. *William and Melville* was aimed at parents in Scotland concerning their children going abroad, with all the potential dangers to their souls. It made for good Sabbath reading and fit with McGavin's tracts.[34] In 1826, McCulloch was successful in securing a publisher for *William and Melville* in Edinburgh.[35]

McCulloch's *William and Melville* and McGavin's *Mrs. Murray and Her Children* are an excellent pair for comparison and, in particular, three parallel religious and moral themes appear, namely: spirituality versus materialism (our modern "lingo"); pious training; and, evangelism and conversion.[36]

The first parallel theme of spirituality versus materialism is prominent in both books. The story of McGavin's *Mrs. Murray* centres around Mrs. Murray, the widow of two children: Mary, age eight, and James, age five. Her husband had died at age forty. While very prosperous, he had had no regard for his soul due to absorption in business. McCulloch's *William* concerns a young man in Ayrshire growing up and longing after the pursuits of a fellow Scot who had acquired a vast fortune in America and then returned home. William wants to do the same: "In the opinion of the youth of Scotland, to go abroad and to get rich, are terms nearly synonymous."[37] He leaves for Nova Scotia, seeking his fortune, and settles in Halifax. With the passage of time, he too, becomes engrossed in business and eventually business crowds out all true spirituality from his soul.[38] Both Mrs. Murray's husband and William are like the parable of the rich farmer who built more barns but neglected his soul.[39] McCulloch made certain that his readers did not lose sight of this theme when he quoted from the Scottish Psalter of 1650, Psalm 49:11, where the rich

think that their houses will last forever but they fail to see that they cannot perpetuate themselves.[40]

Turning next to the parallel theme of pious training in McCulloch's *William and Melville* and McGavin's *Mrs. Murray* B little searching is required. William, like Mrs. Murray's children, Mary and James, had been duly instructed-catechized in the scriptures and Christianity; William by two pious parents, Mary and James by their mother.[41] Family religion, in addition to church, received a predominant place in each book as the crucial sphere for pious training of the youth. Even in *Melville*, where Melville lacked such pious training in his youth, there is an example for the reading parents of what not to do. Yet Melville encountered the positive example of the piety of a house in the wilderness which leads naturally into the third parallel theme – evangelism and conversion.

Both books abound in this clearly evangelical theme, and are in keeping with the doctrinal perspective of the authors who were steeped in the theology of the free offer of the gospel. One reads in Mrs. Murray about a rebellious son who was "awakened" by the remembrance of the Scriptures.[42] William, at the end, is found reading a letter from his father and cries out "My father, my Bible, my Sav____," with the last word of course being "saviour." William drifts off without uttering it. That scene mixes together the remembrance of pious training and the evangelical call to conversion and repentance of sin. It serves as an exhortation to the reader to believe in Christ.[43] With Melville one reads the story of a convert from, at best, nominalism to a living Christian faith.[44] The means that God uses in Melville's conversion is the great Presbyterian, James MacGregor, whom McCulloch writes into his story as a great evangelist, traversing the Maritime backwoods with the unadulterated gospel, without any New Light admixture. Yet old Nelson and his daughter Elizabeth also have their duty in witness and evangelism with Melville.[45] In much the same way Mrs. Murray, a woman, is held up as a model in the way she visited the poor, distributed tracts, catechisms, and, in essence, represented evangelical Christianity.[46] McGavin's writing is abundantly clear on the theme of being "in Christ" and the task of evangelism, as is McCulloch in *William and Melville*.

It is highly speculative and unnecessary to ask just how much McGavin's tracts aided McCulloch in pursuing such a literary course in *William and Melville*. The overall literary style, coupled with the religious and moral themes of spirituality versus materialism, pious training, and evangelism and conversion, are worthy notes of comparison. Such a study

also helps put McCulloch's work into the wider context of his day.

The Covenanter Ideal and the Counter-Scott Circle

Until recently little attention has been given to the Covenanter Ideal as expressed in Thomas McCulloch's literary works. It is not a central matter in *The Stepsure Letters*, but becomes much more central in *William and Melville* and in his unpublished literary works. Interestingly, the Covenanter Ideal was a major concern of William McGavin. Both men shared a common sympathy for the Scottish Covenanters and in particular for those who suffered during the days of persecution, the Killing Times.

In *William and Melville* one receives rather extensive information on the Covenanters, akin to an historical fiction novel. William's home south of Glasgow (likely Ayrshire) was the house from which William's great-grandfather had been taken, "to cement with his blood, in the Grassmarket of Edinburgh, that noble structure of civil and religious privilege which is the glory of Scotland[47] [and] your great-grandfather . . . was dragged from this house and persecuted to the death, for the testimony of Jesus . . ."[48] Likewise, with the story of Melville, one learns much Covenanter history. The setting is on a western Scottish moor, the land of the "Mountain Men" or "Cameronians." McCulloch gave glowing praise to this body and wrote of "the beneficial influence of presbyterian government upon the religious and good order of mankind."[49] Onto the moor, where young Melville is, comes Andrew Welwood, a weaver and a Reformed Presbyterian. McCulloch makes a point of informing the reader that Welwood had examined the Bible "and respecting many points of the ecclesiastical history of Scotland, he possessed more accurate views than some, who, to the disgrace of the nation, have been recognized as its best historians . . ."[50] McCulloch was obviously making a "jab" at Sir Walter Scott. Following this interlude the story resumes to reveal how Melville's great-grandfather was indirectly responsible for William's great-grandfather's martyrdom. This scene includes a moving depiction of Melville's great-grandfather coming to the prison of Edinburgh seeking William's great-grandfather's forgiveness.[51]

Beyond McCulloch's published *William and Melville*, there is ample evidence showing that McCulloch had a personal attachment to the Covenanter Ideal. For example, he corresponded with Rev. Alexander Clarke, a leading Covenanter in the Maritimes residing in the Chignecto region. Clarke's letter to McCulloch of 14 June 1831 shows the cordial

regard which existed between the two men, one a Covenanter and the other Seceder.[52] Further correspondence ensued.[53] Somerville was also a leading Covenanter in the Maritimes; it is noteworthy that Thomas McCulloch's last speaking engagement was at the Covenanter Church at Cornwallis, Nova Scotia for Rev. William Somerville.[54] These points only show that McCulloch's Covenanter sympathies went beyond literature to include personal respect and admiration.

Looking past McCulloch's *William and Melville* for the Covenanter Ideal one encounters a myriad of manuscript material left by McCulloch, much of which is clearly Covenanter historical fiction. In *The Life of Thomas McCulloch* following a visit to Scotland, McCulloch

> at the request of some friends there, began a series of tales designed to be an offset to Sir Walter Scott's aspersions of the Covenanters in "Old Mortality." Sir Walter entertained toward the Covenanters so little sympathy that he did not hesitate, if not to do them injustice, yet to withhold from them that meed of gratitude which his native land owners for their resistance to the will of a despot, and the well earned influence of Scotland on the world's history . . .[55]

It would be nice to know the names of the Scottish friends who suggested this subject for writing to McCulloch in the early 1820s. Because McGavin correspondence from the 1820s is not available it can only be speculated that he was one of the influencers. Nevertheless, with McGavin's vast array of publications on the Covenanters one cannot dismiss this speculation too quickly. McGavin edited the famous work by John Howie, *Scots Worthies*, and *Napthali* and published *Memories of John Brown of Priesthill and Rev. Hugh MacKail*.[56] In fact William Reid said of McGavin that there was no other contemporary of William McGavin, excepting Thomas McCrie, who possessed such a knowledge of the literature of the Reformation and Covenanting periods as William McGavin.[57] It is noteworthy that both McGavin and McCrie shared similar interests and a close friendship. McCrie wrote the biography of John Knox, whereas McGavin edited Knox's *History of the Reformation in Scotland* and dedicated this work to Thomas McCrie.[58] Thus, the revelation of the circle of friends keeps growing.

McCulloch would appear at first hand isolated from all that was being written on the Covenanters and against the Scott portrait, yet he was not really that far removed. The Mitchells may have taken one of the Covenanter manuscripts to a Scottish publisher, but in no way does this

account for the full extent of the Scottish friends urging McCulloch to write something to counter Sir Walter Scott. McGavin, McCrie and John Mitchell were also all signatories of the petition supporting Pictou Academy, another sign of the support and esteem they showed for their transplanted Scottish friend.[59]

McCulloch had a clear purpose in view for his literary work "Auld Eppie's Tales," which were rejected by Blackwoods for its course humour and for penetrating too closely into Scott's field.[60] His response was:

> I never intended to be an imitator of Sir Walter. I have neither his knowledge nor talents. But on the other hand I conceived that the kind of information and humour which I possess would have enabled me to vindicate where he has misrepresented, and render contemptible and ludicrous what he has laboured to dignify.[61]

McCulloch's biographers summarize the purpose of this novel as: "The object was to place the principles and characters of the Scottish Covenanters in their true light."[62] Thus McCulloch should be seen as producing a "counter fiction" in "Auld Eppie" and his other unpublished works, "Morton," and "Days of the Covenanter" (as has also been said of John Galt's *Ringan Gilhaize* [1823] and James Hogg's *The Brownies of Bodsbeck* [1818]). There is immense value in placing McCulloch within the wider Scottish literary field. The contemporary critics viewed Galt and Hogg as "inferior copyists" in dealing with a subject which was "preoccupied ground."[63] It seems that McCulloch was being relegated to these same ranks. John Raleigh has stated it well: "To have been alive and literate in the nineteenth century, was to have been affected in some way by the Waverley novels."[64] Parallels have been drawn between McCulloch's style and Galt's but not by way of particularly addressing the theme of the Covenanter Ideal.

There is an entire host of Scottish literature and historical writings which need to be carefully studied and compared to McCulloch around the Covenanter Ideal. Many of these writers represent a particular "anti-Scott" viewpoint concerning *Old Mortality*, such as William McGavin, Thomas McCrie,[65] John Galt, and James Hogg. Should another be added, Robert Pollock? After all, it was Robert Grant in 1882 who made a comparison between McCulloch's *William and Melville* and Pollock's *Helen of the Glen*. Pollock's work was issued as *Tales of the Covenanters*. It is highly sympathetic toward the Covenanters and includes three stories which were subsequently issued as one volume.[66]

The early-nineteenth century was a time of prolific writing on the Covenanter Ideal. Ina Ferris' seminal work, *The Achievement of Literary Authority: Gender, History and the Waverley Novels* now needs to be brought into the light of other counter fiction writers to include McCulloch of Nova Scotia and also to compare it to his Scottish contemporaries McGavin, McCrie and Pollock, if not others.[67] Least one think this subject is only a matter of historical fiction of the Covenanters in early nineteenth-century literature, readers will note that the style and theme of the Covenanter Ideal are again being popularized in the North American evangelical community in Douglas Jones, *Scottish Seas*.[68] In all likelihood one would not hear any protest from a William McGavin or a Thomas McCulloch.

Conclusion

This paper set out to show that "Two Scottish Lads" shared a common religious heritage and friendship while they grew up in Scotland. That friendship continued to be fostered by letters and other exchanges after Thomas McCulloch's departure for Nova Scotia. McCulloch clearly made an impact upon William McGavin's writings on Roman Catholic polemics, yet McCulloch too became a beneficiary in that process. An analysis of one selection of McCulloch's literary writings, *William and Melville* and one from McGavin, *Mrs. Murray and Her children*, shows the same themes and intentions of writing primarily a religious story with a moral purpose. Finally, both men were clearly part of a literary group of the early-eighteenth century which was anti-Scott and each in their respective ways produced literary or historical works in clear sympathy with the Scottish Covenanters. A proper study comparing the chronological development of Scott's *Waverley Novels* to McCulloch's "Covenanting Tales" awaits to be done.[69] Neither writer confines himself to the Killing Times, so a proper chronological study is in order – as is the securing of a place for a transplanted Scot, Thomas McCulloch, amongst the Scottish writers of the counter-Scott circle.

Endnotes

1. These studies include F.C. MacIntosh, "Some Nova Scotian Scientists," *Dalhousie Review* 10 (1930-31): 199-213; B. Anne Wood, "Thomas McCulloch's Use of Science in Promoting a Liberal Education," *Acadiensis* 17, 1 (Autumn 1987): 56-73; Thomas McCulloch, *The Mephibosheth Stepsure Letters*, ed. Gwendolyn Davies (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1990); B. Anne Wood, "The Significance of Calvinism in The Educational Vision of Thomas McCulloch," *Vitae Scholasticae* 4 (1985): 15-30; J.C. Whytock, "Thomas McCulloch's Quest to Educate," forthcoming in *The Canadian Society of Presbyterian History Papers* (1999); William Klempa, "History of Presbyterian Theology in Canada to 1875," in *The Burning Bush and a Few Acres of Snow*, ed. William Klempa (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1994), 193-218; Stanley E. McMullin, "In Search of the Liberal Mind: Thomas McCulloch and the Impulse to Action," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 23, Nos. 1 & 2 (Spring/Summer 1988): 68-85; Vincent Sharman, "Thomas McCulloch's Stepsure: The Relentless Presbyterian," *Dalhousie Review* 52 (1972-1973): 618-625. It seems that D.C. Harvey was the originator of the idea that McCulloch towered as "King McCulloch" in his time in Nova Scotia, one whom Carlyle would have found a hero ("The Intellectual Awakening of Nova Scotia," *Dalhousie Review* 13 (1933-34): 14.

2. William McCulloch, *Life of Thomas McCulloch, D.D. Pictou,* eds. Isabella and Jean McCulloch (n.p.: n.p., 1920), i. The granddaughters wrote in the preface "With his college companion, and lifelong friend, the Rev. John Mitchell, D.D. of Glasgow, and also with his son, James Mitchell, Esq., he kept up a constant correspondence, and to the latter, the authors were indebted for the return of letters which have proved so valuable . . ."

3. McCulloch, *Life of Thomas McCulloch*, 220, 83, 82, 178, 162. In the index to this biography brief reference is made to both John and James Mitchell as well as a plate of John Mitchell, and throughout the work there are additional references to the Mitchells. The more recent shorter biographical work by Marjory Whitelaw, *Thomas McCulloch: His Life and Times* (Halifax: Nova Scotia Museum, 1985) also duly noted the Mitchell/McCulloch connection (41).

4. McCulloch, *Life of Thomas McCulloch*, 27.

5. Likewise in the Public Archives of Nova Scotia (PANS), McCulloch Papers, there is only one letter from McGavin to McCulloch, so a cursory glance would lead one to conclude there is not much of a connection (see W. McGavin to T. McCulloch, 29 March 1819, from Glasgow., M 61, vol. 553 #149, PANS).

6. *Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology,* eds. Nigel M. De S. Cameron, et al (Downers Grove: Inter Varsity, 1993), 514, 594.

7. John Howie, *The Scots Worthies*, ed. W. H. Carslaw (1870; Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1995), 507-520. Pedan was disinterred and reburied at Cumnock at gallows. McGavin's boyhood home was also nearby the site of the murder of John Brown, a Covenanter martyr of some note.

8. William Reid, *The Merchant Evangelist, Being a Memoir of William McGavin* (Edinburgh, 1884), 17.

9. *The Posthumous Works of the Late William Accompanied with a Memoir; Including Autobiography Extracts from His Correspondence*, Vol. 1 (Glasgow, 1834), xx, xxii; and Reid, *The Merchant Evangelist*, 17, 19.

10. McCulloch, *Life of Thomas McCulloch*, 82; and Whitelaw, *Thomas McCulloch*, 4-5.

11. *Posthumous Works of the Late William McGavin*, I: xcvii; and W. McCulloch, *Life of Thomas McCulloch*, 8.

12. *Dictionary of National Biography* (London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1893), XXXV: 84-85.

13. *Posthumous Works of the Late William McGavin*, I: lxxii-lxxiv. The six letters include: Letter No. 1, McGavin to McCulloch, 7 March 1808; Letter No. 2, McGavin to McCulloch, 15 March 1810; Letter No. 3, McGavin to McCulloch, 15 August 1811; Letter No. 4, McGavin to McCulloch, 11 March 1815; Letter No. 5, McGavin to McCulloch, 15 August 1816; Letter No. 6, McGavin to McCulloch, 29 March 1819.

14. There is a vast amount of material which needs to be digested concerning McGavin and the Pictou Academy. This literature will not be explored in this paper.

15. Thomas McCulloch, *Popery Condemned by Scriptures and the Fathers: Being a Refutation of the Principle Popish Doctrines and Assertions maintained in the Remarks on the Rev. Mr.Stanser's Examination of the Rev. Mr. Burke's Letter of Instruction to the Catholic Missionaries of*

Nova Scotia, And in the Reply to the Rev. Mr. Cochran's Fifth and Last Letter to Mr. Burke, etc . . . (Edinburgh: J. Pillans, 1808).

16. W. McGavin to T. McCulloch, 7 March 1808, in *Posthumous Works of the Late William McGavin*, I: lxxii, lxxiv.

17. Thomas McCulloch, *Popery Condemned by Scriptures and the Fathers* . . . (Edinburgh: A. Neil, 1810).

18. W. McGavin to T. McCulloch, 15 March 1810, in *Posthumous Works of the Late William McGavin*, I: xcviii.

19. W. McGavin to T. McCulloch, 15 August 1811, in *Posthumous Works of the Late William McGavin*, I: cx.

20. W. McGavin to T. McCulloch, 11 March 1815, in *Posthumous Works of the Late William McGavin*, I: ccxxxv-ccxxxvii.

21. W. McGavin to T. McCulloch, 15 August, 1816, *Posthumous Works of the Late William McGavin*, I: ccli-cclii. T his is the only letter from McGavin to McCulloch which I have located at PANS.

22. W. McGavin to T. McCulloch, 29 March 1819, MGI Vol. 553 #149, PANS. This letter also appears in *Posthumous Works of the Late William McGavin*, I: cccxii-cccxiv.

23. W. McGavin to T. McCulloch, 29 March 1819, in *Posthumous Works of the Late William McGavin*, I: cccxiii.

24. *The Protestant* (i.e., *The Protestant: A Weekly Paper, on the Principle Points of Controversy Between the Church of Rome and the Reformed* , Vols. 1-IV [Glasgow: 1819-1822]) was issued as a bound set at the end of the serial run (Reid, *The Merchant Evangelist*, 129). A matter which needs to be more fully explored is why McCulloch received a D.D. from Union College, Schenectady, NY in 1820. Was it in part due to his *Popery* writings popularized by McGavin?

25. *The Protestant*, II: 10, 21.

26. Reid is quoting Thomson from "The Edinburgh Christian Instructor" of which Thomson was editor (*The Merchant Evangelist*, 135).

27. *Posthumous Works of the Late William McGavin*, I: cxii.

28. *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, 7th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 1134.

29. *Posthumous Works of the Late William McGavin*, I: ccxxxvi. Absent from this list of tracts is one of McGavin's most popular "tracts" and books (it appeared in both forms*), Colin Cameron, the Shepherd Boy of Glennevis*. *Colin Cameron* is a work that parallels McCulloch's writings, whether published such as *Colonial Gleanings* or a manuscript such as "Auld Eppie's Tales." Both McGavin and McCulloch returned to the scenes of their boyhood, with ancient ruins, woods and fields (see Reid, *The Merchant Evangelist*, iv, 9-10).

30. *Posthumous Works of the Late William McGavin*, I: cclii.

31. *Posthumous Works of the Late William McGavin*, I: lxxiv.

32. This is a phrase that McGavin uses in his letters *(Posthumous Works of the Late William McGavin*, I: ccxxxvi).

33. Douglas G. Lochhead, "A Bibliographical Note," *The Stepsure Letters*, Thomas McCulloch (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1960), 157; and Gwendolyn Davies, "Thomas McCulloch's Fictional Celebration of the Reverend James MacGregor," in *The Contribution of Presbyterianism to the Maritime Provinces of Canada,* eds., Charles H.H. Scobie and G.A. Rawlyk (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997), 74.

34. Gwendolyn Davies, "Editor's Introduction," *The Mephibosheth Stepsure Letters, Thomas McCulloch* (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1990), xxxvii-xxxviii.

35. Davies, "Editor's Introduction," xxxviii-xxxix. Extracts from "Melville" also appeared later in 1826 back in Nova Scotia in the "Nova Scotian" (Thomas McCulloch, *Colonial Gleanings. William and Melville* [Edinburgh: Wm. Oliphant, 1826]). It would appear that this book has not been given as much attention as it should also receive to understand McCulloch's literary output. Marjorie Whitelaw's article, "Thomas McCulloch," gives a good summary of *William and Melville* and is perhaps one of the longest references to it (see "Thomas McCulloch," *Canadian Literature* 68-69 (Spring-Summer 1976): 138-147.

36. McGavin's "Mrs Murray" began in the letters to McCulloch as a series of tracts. Eventually McGavin completed the series into four tracts and they were subsequently bound together as one volume in 1827. It was No. 14 in "Griffin's Juvenile Library – a series of Moral, Instructive, and Amusing Works, adapted for the perusal of young people" (William McGavin, *The History of Mrs. Murray and Her Children* [Glasgow: Griffin, 1827]).

37. McCulloch, *William and Melville*, 21.

38. McCulloch, *William and Melville*, 24-39.

39. McGavin, *Mrs. Murray*, 4-5.

40. McCulloch, *William and Melville*, 3. An interesting study of themes in McCulloch's *The Stepsure Letters* can be found in Robins Mathews, "'The Stepsure Letters': Puritanism and the Novel of the Land," *Studies in Canadian Literature* 7, No. 1 (1982): 127-138. Mathews notes the themes of humour, industry, puritan piety and, in particular, "the land." A similar study needs to be undertaken on *William and Melville* (see also Vincent Sharman, "Thomas McCulloch's Stepsure: The Relentless Presbyterian," *Dalhousie Review* [Winter 1972-73]: 618-625). Mathews notes that Stepsure's "fundamental goal is not the pursuit of riches," (135) a theme I am arguing for in this paper as a point of McCulloch- McGavin comparison (this is similar to Thomas McCulloch to Rev. McCulbertson, 10 July 1816, No. 22, Vol. 181, MG 100, PANS which is transcribed in part in Beverly Rasporich, "The New Eden Dream: The Source of Canadian Humour: McCulloch, Haliburton, and Leacock," *Studies in Canadian Literature* 7, No 2 [1982]: 228). Rasporich offers some interesting comments concerning themes in McCulloch's literary work *The Stepsure Letters*. Keefer also notes McCulloch's *The Stepsure Letters* and the theme of decadence: "the decadence which lured the sons of industrious farmers off the land into local taverns and shops, or into ballrooms and government offices in Halifax," (Janice Kulyk Keefer, *Under Eastern Eyes* [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987], 35).

41. McGavin, *Mrs. Murray*, 4-5; and McCulloch, *William and Melville*, 13, 15, 18-20.

42. McGavin, *Mrs. Murray*, 146.

43. McCulloch, *William and Melville*, 61.

44. McCulloch, *William and Melville*, 146

45. McCulloch, *William and Melville*, 98ff, 113ff.

46. McGavin, *Mrs. Murray*, 17, 22, 94.

47. McCulloch, *William and Melville*, 16.

48. McCulloch, *William and Melville*, 18. The clergyman of the parish were talking to young William. Further along in the text McCulloch described a blessed Sabbath scene in William's home in Scotland where "the domestic circle was entertained, not by a detail of the events of the week, but by a relation of the painful sufferings and triumphant exit of sires, who lovednot their lives unto death" (30).

49. McCulloch, *William and Melville*, 68.

50. McCulloch, *William and Melville*, 70. McCulloch then proceeds to give a brief church history lesson and extol the virtues of the Covenanters (71).

51. McCulloch, *William and Melville*, 72-76.

52. Rev. Alexander Clarke to Rev. Thomas McCulloch, 14 June 1831, No. 61, vol. 550, MGI, PANS. I am indebted to Eldon Hay for bringing this letter to my attention (see Eldon Hay, *The Chignecto Covenanters* [Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1996]).

53. Rev. Thomas McCulloch to Mr. James Ross, 16 June 1835, Box 82 (f), F & I, Maritime Conference Archives, Sackville, NB; cited in Sheldon MacKenzie, *Gathered by the River* (Winnipeg: Hignell Book Printing, 1998), 81-82.

54. McCulloch, *Life of Thomas McCulloch*, 190.

55. McCulloch, *Life of Thomas McCulloch*, 141-142.

56. John Howie, *The Scots Worthies*, ed. W. H. Carslaw mentions that McGavin was of the opinion that Sir Walter Scott used John Howie as his character for "Old Mortality." Evidently, Scott claimed that this was not the case. The McGavin editions of *Scots Worthies* were printed in 1827, 1833-34, 1846 and 1858.

57. Reid, *The Merchant Evangelist*, 206. This can easily be argued as McGavin edited the famous covenanter work *Naphtali* (1829).

58. John Knox, *The History of the Reformation of Religion in Scotland*, ed. William McGavin (Glasgow: Blackie Fullerton, 1831).

59. "Memorial on Behalf of the Literary and Philosophical Institution at Pictou, Nova Scotia" (Scotland, 1825) in which the Scottish list of subscribers is given.

60. McCulloch, *Life of Thomas McCulloch*, 142. For a good summary of the attempts to have "Auld Eppie's Tales" published see G. Davies, "Editor's Introduction," xlii-xlvi and endnotes; and William Blackwood to James Mitchell, 18 May 1829, ALS, acc. 5643/38, Blackwoods Letter-Books, *National Library of Scotland*. The manuscript is at *PANS* but, as D.D. Harvey wrote, a proper examination is difficult due to it never having been completed as a series of novels and it has become "somewhat disarranged." The manuscript is in McCulloch's own hand and a partial typescript (file 1-50, 4 and file 51-100, vol. 2435, MGI, PANS).

61. Thomas McCulloch to James Mitchell, 18 May 1829, ALS, No. 39, Vol. 553, MGI, MP, PANS; cited in McCulloch, *Life of Thomas McCulloch*, 142.

62. McCulloch, *Life of Thomas McCulloch*, 142.

63. Ina Ferris, *Achievement of Literary Authority: Gender, History, and the Waverley Novels* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 163; and Emma Letley, *From Galt to Douglas Brown: Nineteenth Century Fiction and Scots Language* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1988).

64. Ferris, *Achievement of Literary Authority*, 1.

65. Thomas McCrie, *A Vindication of the Scottish Covenanters: Consisting of a Review of the first series of the "Tales of my Landlord," extracted from the "Christian Instructor" for 1817* (Glasgow, 1824). I am thankful to Douglas Murray, University of Glasgow, for discussions with me on McCrie and Scott (see also Douglas M. Murray, "Martyrs or Madmen? The Covenanters, Sir Walter Scott and Dr. Thomas McCrie," *The Innes Review* XLIII, No. 2 [Autumn 1992]: 166-175). Murray draws attention to Kay V. Mathias, "A Study of Walter Scott's *Old Mortality*," M.A. thesis, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, 1968, among some studies on this subject.

66. Pollock wrote three "Sabbath School Tales" in 1824-25: "Helen of the Glen," "Ralph Gemmel," and "The Persecuted Family." Various editions of these three tales have appeared (see Robert Pollock, *Tales of the Covenanters* [New Edition] [Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincot, n.d.). For biographical information see Robert Pollock, *The Course of Time: A Poem*, rev. ed. (Boston: Mussey,1843), xv-xxii; "Memoir of the Author"; and *Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. XLVI: 69-70; Thomas McCulloch, *The Prosperity of the church in Troublous Times: Being a Sermon Preached at Pictou, Friday, 25 February 1814;* Robert Grant, "Introduction" (New Glasgow: MacKenzie Printers, 1882), 4. His

"William and Melville" is superior to Pollock's "Ellen of the Glen" [sic].

67. Ferris, *Achievement of Literary Authority*, 137-160 and 161-194. Now that a definitive edition of *Old Mortality* has been issued, hopefully this will inspire many to take up the challenge and explore the anti-Scott circle of writers (Walter Scott, *The Tale of Old Mortality*, ed. Douglas Mack, in "The Edinburgh Edition of the Waverley Novels" (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993).

68. Douglas Jones, *Scottish Seas* (Moscow: Canon Press, 1996).

69. A good place to begin would be Henry Grey, *A Key to the Waverley Novels in Chronological Sequence with Index of the Principle Characters* (New Edition, London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1910); and Robert S. Rait, "Walter Scott and Thomas McCrie," in *Sir Walter Scott Today*, ed. H. J. C. Grierson (London: Constable, 1932), 3-37.

The Scar of the Schism: The Image of Old Believers in Late Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature

ELENA KREVSKY

In 1881 distinguished Russian publisher and historian P. Bartenev inserted in his magazine a short "Note from the publisher of the *Russian Archive*. On historical novels." Following the habitual manner of comparing the Russian situation with that in Western Europe, he lamented the abundance of historical novels in Russia. This "unbridled historiographical fancy" could not hurt Europeans, he thought, because they were quite familiar with their past whereas Russians "started their studies only yesterday," and their "popular self consciousness" was still in its embryo.[1] He enumerated several topics still in need of elucidation, mostly listing the names of the Tsars. Interestingly, the first person that he mentioned was Nikon, a Russian patriarch (1652-1658), whose name is closely connected with the amendment of church books and the persecution of Old Believers.

As a result of the church books' amendment which began in the seventeenth century, some Russians broke away from the Church. The disagreement was over seemingly minor points: how to spell the name of Jesus, how many times to repeat *alleluia*, or how many fingers to use in making the sign of the cross. As one of the writers noted, this was a movement of simple people "whose whole faith was in those two fingers." The official church was trying to bring its books and rituals into conformity with Greek originals, while Old Believers adhered to the native Orthodoxy of their forefathers. They suffered persecutions, exile, and death. Entire Old Believer communities, when approached by government troops, would lock themselves up in wooden dwellings and set them alight. But the persecutions did not destroy the movement; the number of

dissenters continued to increase during the subsequent centuries. Vigilantly seeing to the preservation of ancient customs and rituals for more than two hundred years, they were regarded by some as the bearers of pure, untarnished Russian culture. Because of their adherence to the past, to the old books, and to old Russian orders, they were called Old Believers, Old Ritualists or Schicmatics (*Raskol'niki*). In this paper the terms "*Raskol*," "schism," and "Old Belief" are used interchangeably.

There are some firm canons for approaching Russian national consciousness or identity. In Michael Cherniavsky's classic *Tsar and People: Studies in Russian Myths*, two major pillars of Russian identity are defined as the Orthodoxy (the myth of 'Holy Russia') and the belief in a Christ-like Tsar. Leaning on this primary significance of the Orthodoxy for Russian culture, many studies of Russian intellectual history incessantly explore the West as the only significant Other of Russian national self-perception. However, in the late-nineteenth century, after Herzen's *From the Other Shore*, Leont'ev's articles, and Dostoevsky's *Diary of a Writer*, when even the thought that "only banality is all-European" had become trite, the West lost its aura of intellectual superiority. The search came closer to home.

Another conspicuous contradiction of Russian national consciousness that received a considerable amount of attention was the one between the "narod" (the people) and the "intelligentsia." Recently, Cathy A. Frierson studied the image of the people created by the populist authors during the 1860s and 1870s. She stressed the two-fold connotation of the term "narod" ("simple people" or "people") for educated Russians: that of "the other" and of the people as a nation.[2] The starting point of my argument is almost identical: if one sees Orthodoxy as the core of popular self-perception in Russia, a similar duality is conspicuous in the images of Old-Believers: they are alien, queer and, at the same time, genuinely Russian.

But there is more to their otherness. It springs not only from the popular character of their religiosity (which refers us again to the "big picture" oppositions such as "official versus popular religion" and "the intelligentsia versus the people") but also from their adherence to the past, from their being a "stony splinter" of ancient Russian history. This nuance gives them an additional quality and distinguishes them from one indiscernible whole of "the people," making attitude to the past an important component of this image. Such grandiose juxtapositions as "Russia and the West," and "the people and the intelligentsia" are

traditional in Russian thought. It is no wonder that illustrious and thorough elaborations of these topics by Slavophiles and Westernizers, as well as by Dostoevskii, Tolstoi, Blok, and Merezhkovskii among others, have become the focus of many significant works.

This paper is an attempt to erode such clear-cut visions of Russian contradictions. I am certainly not the first one to do so. Jeffrey Brooks, in his analysis of *lubok* literature (cheap editions for the people), pays special attention to the problem of changing Russian identity. According to him, "the question of what it meant to be Russian" was prominent in this kind of literature. He notes that the emphasis had been shifted in the late-nineteenth century from loyalty to the tsar and Orthodoxy to pride in a mighty empire:

> Obligations to Church and state still remained, but they no longer served as the primary expression of national identity . . . In the newer view, the most humble Great Russian was invited to think of himself as generally assisting the smaller and culturally backward nationalities that comprised the empire. This provided a sense of pride and status congruent psychologically with the other changes that were part of the greater geographic and economic mobility of common Great Russians at the end of the nineteenth century.[3]

Brooks explores changes in Russian self-image by showing their intricate connections with Russian colonialism, the "spatial dimension" of Russian identity, so to speak, whereas its "temporal dimension," the question of popular attitudes towards the Russian past remains untouched. However, the problem of historical memory seems to be at least equally important at this time of Russian self-recognition. I will tackle this issue by examining the theme of religious schism in Russian literature, in particular, the image of Old Believers and sectarians. "The Great Russian Literature" is not the subject of my account – its margins are. Surprisingly, if one turns to the writers whom B. Eikhenbaum called "the younger line, whose work was suppressed and overlooked in the Russian prose of the Dostoevskii and Tolstoi period"[4] (Dal', Mel'nikov-Pechersky, Leskov), each representative of this group shows a keen interest in and profound knowledge of the problem of *Raskolniks*. Our sources are the books of popular but "second-rate" writers, along with the articles in "thick" journals.

Until the 1860s, one could hardly meet a *Raskolnik* in Russian literature. During the reign of Nicholas I, using this word in print was

prohibited. Disregard and oppression were the main characteristics of government policies toward Old Believers. Until the reign of Alexander II, Russian society was almost ignorant of the *Raskolniks*; high officials sincerely believed that their number was negligible.[5] It was at the beginning of this reign that along with a relative easing of the Old Believers' condition, the imperial resolution of 20 January 1858 stressed that an insufficient amount of data concerning the schism was available.[6] P.I. Mel'nikov, one of the main authorities on the subject, started his highly popular "Letters on the Schism" (1862) with the assertion that neither the administration, nor society, nor even Old Believers themselves, knew what the essence of the two hundred year-old schism was.[7] During the next twenty years, scholars and officials showered the Russian public with accounts of the Old Believers' historical roots, creative work and current conditions.[8]

Importantly for this investigation, the period of the late-nineteenth century includes the cultural and social upheaval in Old Russia when traditional social groups could hardly find their place in a quickly changing society, and many old norms and values were revised. Rapid social, cultural, and political changes introduced by the Great Reforms made traditional national ideals questionable, leaving no place for romantic beliefs of the Slavophile type. These tendencies resulted in an almost complete rupture with the past in the early-twentieth century when prominent historian Mikhail Gershenzon wrote: "Unlike Slavophiles, we are growing in a different way – catastrophically."[9] A feverish search for some pillars of national identity in the past preceded these laments. It was this search that Bartenev described in his "note on historical novels." It is this search that I am trying to trace and analyze.

For an average enlightened nineteen-century publicist, the problem was simple and self-explanatory: Old Belief as a fruit of ignorance, as a meaningless love of the old times, and as a dull adherence to stony customs was doomed. It was obvious that the enlightenment would eventually crush ignorance and thereby Old Belief would lose its basis. But even for such optimistic critics, the problem of the true Russianness of Old Believers was important. If they were to be ultimately defeated, Russian society stood to lose this last stronghold of genuine Russian culture. So in some disputes on the schism, one can easily trace worry concerning Russian spiritual sustainability.

During the liberal 1860s, the most popular approach to the Old Belief was that developed by the inexhaustible Afanasii Shchapov. Son of

a poor village sexton and a native woman from the Irkutsk region in Southeastern Siberia, in 1846, as the best graduate of Irkutsk Theological Seminary, he was enrolled in the Kazan' Theological Academy. Possessing a legendary capacity for work, he spent an average of seventeen hours a day at his writing desk, his boots forming depressions in the floor. Fellow students used to come to his room to see this miracle.[10] He chose "Russian schism of the Old Belief" as a subject of his Master's dissertation, which appeared as a book in two editions in 1858 and 1859.

Written within the precincts of the theological seminary by a liberal-minded young student, the work was certainly controversial. Trying to meet the requirements of church history, it also contained elements of psychological and sociological explanation for the origin of the Old Belief. In subsequent years, other liberal authors developed these elements. Shchapov himself, in a later article, completely rejected the traditional, strictly religious interpretation of the *Raskol* in favor of a sociological one, defining it as people's opposition to the social order, to the growing political pressure of the central powers. V.V. Andreev further developed this position:

> As a resistance to innovations, *raskol* would be incomprehensible if studied in the religious sphere only. Indeed, Russian *raskol* appeared in equal measure in all the spheres of people's everyday life. Innovations, especially abrupt and unexpected ones, met with a repulse. This repulse was characteristic for the indigenous Russian part of *zemstvo*, that part which rebuffed Mongolian rule and eastern customs and later was ready to give the same repulse to the western innovations. This part of the population treasured everything Russian, whatever it was. Nobility was mostly of foreign origin and alien to this milieu . . . which consisted mostly of the merchants and peasants.[11]

According to Andreev, the presence of different persuasions in Old Belief was a consequence of local (historical and ethnographic) peculiarities. At this troublesome time, when Orthodox priests were uneasy about the strengthening of the Old Belief,[12] such a sociological approach to what was considered a part of the Church history certainly harmed the image of the Russian Orthodox religiosity. But it was just a beginning. Popular historian N.I. Kostomarov wrote in 1871 that *Raskol* "was an important phenomenon in people's mental progress." It "stirred up a dreaming mind in the Russian man."[13] The title of Kostomarov's article was very simple,

"The history of *Raskol* [written] by *Raskolniks*," and its subject was quite innocent: a digest of the history of schism written by an Old Believer.[14] But the scholar supplied this article with an extensive, stimulating historical introduction, which "stirred up" minds and caused many people to take a new look at the age-old problem of the Russian schism.

First, Kostomarov sweeps aside predominant opinion about the congruency of *Raskol* and old Russia. In old Russia, commoners were indifferent to and even cold towards religion, implying that Old Believers' zeal, their devotion to the grandfathers' rituals, marked their break with the traditional Russian attitude. So the famous professor concludes that *Raskol* "is a new phenomenon, alien to the old Russia."[15] Other links in Kostomarov's chain of paradoxes are the following: Old Belief in itself was feeble but very frightening because it could easily "stick" to any people's unrest. *Raskol* embodied people's attempts to break away from darkness and mental stagnation; it was an organ of popular self-education. But at the present moment, enlightenment was the only means to eradicate *Raskol*.

Kostomarov's paradoxes continued to develop psychological interpretation of the Old Belief, elements of which first appeared in Shchapov's dissertation. Another publicist, Iuzov, asserted that strengthening of the *Raskol* showed the failure of the society to satisfy some "vital spiritual needs of a person."[16] People willing to avoid spiritual death had only one path to follow: that of *Raskol*. In that way, *Raskol* absorbed "the best vital juices of the Russian people." As a proof, he cites old Believers' song:

> A soul is waiting for its food.
> It needs to quench the thirst.
> Try not to leave your soul hungry.[17]

In Iuzov's opinion, the study of the *Raskol* is necessary for any public figure:

> The period of the social experiments over silent masses is passing, and we finally realized that improvements in the social system had to be founded on the profound study of the nature of those personalities which constitute the given society; only in this case will the reforms succeed. The intellectual and moral peculiarities of our people became apparent for the most part in the *Raskol*.[18]

An ethnographer and a future member of the Socialist-Revolutionary

party, A.S. Prugavin begins his article with a similar idea: the spiritual and moral life of the Russian people is still as unknown as it was one hundred years earlier. Meanwhile, *Raskol*, along with peasant commune, is the most vivid phenomenon of the people's historical life. The most gifted people go into the *Raskol*. The reason for this? "In the church and school people see only uniforms, scholasticism, pedantry."[19]

Vikhrov, the protagonist of Pisemsky's novel *Liudi sorokovykh godov* (People of the forties), expresses a similar thought. He asks, "What is *Raskol* in Russia? Is it a political party? No. A religious conviction? No. A sect hiding some vicious passions? No. What is it? It is just a disposition of the Russian heart and mind. It is our own understanding of Christianity, which was not learned from the Greeks."[20]

So authors from liberal and revolutionary camps viewed the Old Belief in a very positive way, whether it was seen as an ultimate expression of the Russian spirit or a social opposition to the central powers. As for conservative authors, for them it was a nuisance. For example, D.L. Mordovtsev in a popular historical novel *Velikii raskol* (The Great Schism) calls the *Raskol* "a moral epidemic" because "suffering for an idea is morally contagious."[21]

One of the most interesting Soviet philosophers, M.K. Mamardashvili, once called Russia "the country of eternal pregnancy," meaning that its problems were never solved, its crises and revolutions never ended up in the delivery of something new.[22] This is quite applicable in this case. Suddenly the Russian public discovered a large group of people (approximately ten million by some estimates) who were Russian but did not belong to the Orthodox Church. But this excellent opportunity for rediscovering and redefining the Russian identity was not taken. The scar of the schism did not disappear.

Endnotes

1. P. Bartenev, "Ob istoricheskikh romahakh. Zametka izdatelia Russkogo Arkhiva," *Russkii Arkhiv,* No. 3 (1881): 214.

2. Cathy A. Frierson, *Peasant Icons: Representations of Rural People in Late Nineteenth-Century Russia* (New York: Oxford University. Press, 1993): 33.

3. J. Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 245.

4. Boris Eikhenbaum , "O proze Kuzmina," in *O literature* (Moskva: Sovetskii Pisatel', 1987), 348.

5. V.V. Andreev, *Raskol i ego znachenie v narodnoi russkoi istorii* (1870; Osnabruck: Otto Zeller, 1965), 352-353. Andreev cited examples showing that the number of Old Believers in Nikolaevan census was underestimated by about ten times.

6. Andreev, *Raskol i ego znachenie v narodnoi russkoi istorii*, 365.

7. Pavel I. Mel'nikov (Andrei Pechersky), "Pis'ma o raskole," in *Sobranie Sochinenii* v 6-ti tomakh, t. 6 (Moskva: Pravda, 1963), 193.

8. Andreev, *Raskol i ego znachenie v russkoi narodnoi istorii*; N. Barsov, *Duchovnye stichi sekty liudei Bozhiikh*. (1870); G. Esipov, *Raskol'nich'i dela XVIII stoletiia* (1861-63); I. Popov, *Sbornik dlia isrorii syaroobriadstva* v 2-kh t (Moskva, 1864); N. I. Kostomarov "Istoriia raskola u raskol'nikov," *Vestnik Evropy,* No. 4 (1871); F.V. Livanov, *Raskol'niki I ostrozhniki* 4t. (1873); P.I. Mel'nikov-Pecherskii, "Pis'ma o raskole," *Severnaia Pchela,* No. 5,7,9,10,14,15, (1872); "Staroobriadcheskie arkhierei i Ocherki popovshchiny," *Russkii Vestnik* (1863-66); *Sbornik Kel'sieva,* 2 vols. (London 1860-61); A.P. Shchapov, *Russkiii raskol staroobriadchestva* (Kazan', 1859); *Zemstvo i raskol* (1861); *Umstvennyia napravleniia russkogo raskola*. Andreev states that there were plenty of articles published during the sixties in the church journals (*Khristianskoe Chtenie* , *Pravoslavnyi Sobesednik*, *Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie*, *Dukh Khristianina*).

9. Mikhail O. Gershenzon, *Griboedovskaia Moskva. P. Ia. Chaadaev. Ocherki proshlogo* (Moskva: Moskovskii Rabochii, 1989), 315.

10. Nikolai Ia. Aristov, *Afanasii Prokof'evich Shchapov* (A. S. Suvorina, 1883), 9.

11. Andreev, *Raskol i ego znachenie v narodnoi russkoi istorii,* 76-77.

12. See Gregory L. Freeze, *The Parish Clergy in Nineteenth-Century Russia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 269, 366, 370, 421, 424-5. Freeze relates the following episode: when provincial priest I. S. Belliustin published articles with similar ideas (depicting the Church and Old Belief as two "parties"), he was subject to "the investigation that lasted over a year and nearly ended in Belliustin's defrocking" (394).

13. N.I. Kostomarov, "Istoriia raskola u raskol'nikov," Sobranie sochinenii, kn. 5, t. XII (M. M. Stasiulevicha, 1903), 212. This was first published in *Vestnik Evropy*, No. 4 (1871).

14. Pavel Liubopytnyi, *Khronologicheskoe iadro staroobriadcheskoi tserkvi, ob'iasniaiushchee vse otlichnyia ikh deianiia s 1650-1819 g.* [manuscript].

15. Kostomarov, "Istoriia raskola u raskol'nikov," 232.

16. I. Iuzov, *Russkie dissidenty. Starovery i dukhovnye khristiane* (1881), 5.

17. Iuzov, *Russkie dissidenty. Starovery i dukhovnye khristiane*, 110.

18. Iuzov, *Russkie dissidenty. Starovery i dukhovnye khristiane*, 5.

19. A.S. Prugavin, "Znachenie sektantstva v russkoi narodnoi zhizni," *Russkaia mysl'*, No. 1 (1881): 312.

20. A.F. Pisemsky, S*obranie sochinenii v deviati tomakh*, t. 5 (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda," 1959), 250.

21. D.L. Mordovtsev, *Velikii raskol: Istoricheskii roman iz epokhi tsarstvovaniia Alekseia Mikhailovicha* (Moskva: Sovramennik, 1994), 329.

22. Mikhail Berg, "V strane vechnoi beremennosti," *Literatunaia gazeta*, No. 14 (1994): 3.

CSCH Presidential Address 1999

The Three-Headed Calf: Triple Vision and the Canadian Society of Church History

SANDRA BEARDSALL

I would like, at this, the fortieth annual meeting of the Canadian Society of Church History, to explore with you some aspects of the history of our Society. Because I am a student of the history of evangelical Christianity, I will begin with a personal testimony. And because I have been nurtured in the bosom of liberal theology, I would like to focus our thoughts around a story by the prairie author Sandra Birdsell, for whom I frequently have the honour of being mistaken.

First, then, the testimony. It happened in the cafeteria at the University of Ottawa a rather unlikely setting for anything momentous, but that is part of the genre, isn't it? The Canadian Society of Church History was on lunch break, and a large number of us had gathered around one long table to engage in a number of conversations. There we were, women and men, at different stages of life and scholarship, historians, religionists, and theologians, all sharing mediocre food and great insights, cross-pollinating our disciplines, and enjoying ourselves. It was for me one of those expansive, blissful moments, one in which I experienced what is best described by Marguerite Van Die, in her 1992 presidential address on nineteenth-century religious experience: I sensed "not only the bonds of a community set apart in sacred time and space . . . but also . . . the continuity of the faith and the generations."[1] I was filled with gratitude for

those who had created and shaped this Society, this space for us both to "be" and to be challenged. As with many who find their hearts strangely warmed, I looked around at the alien souls eating by themselves, or in tiny groups, and was sad for them. I was sorry that *their* academic societies did not seem to foster the same wonderful combination of diversity and collegiality. At this cafeteria table I was dwelling in the inclusive world I had always hoped academia could be, and I yearned for all to share my joy.

But also like many converts, my initial elation was followed soon after by a hard test of my faith. It came at the next day's business meeting of the Society. It wasn't simply our lack of funds that brought me down; all the organizations of which I am part are similarly straitened. Rather, it was the hint of discontent in the air, frustrations with our CCSR membership, debates about dropping this connection or that, dissatisfaction with *Studies in Religion* (*SR*), that made me realize that all was not quite so rosy in our little academic paradise.

I would learn that the struggle is not new. At a 1980 CSCH symposium entitled, "Church History of Canada: Where from Here?" Keith Clifford stated, "For some time now I think our CSCH has been suffering from an acute identity crisis . . . Are we historians first or religionists first?"[2] Nineteen years later, the identity crisis is apparently no less acute, even if the patient often masks the symptoms well. As a newcomer to CSCH, and as a member of the executive, which is charged with co-ordinating efforts to help the Society to live and thrive, I realized that I needed to learn much more about who we are. As one who tells others that history is good for them, I decided that an exploration of CSCH history would be good for *me.* And while some of you will know this history far better than I, I believe a review can assist us as a Society, as we wrestle, once again, with questions of identity and direction.

As a way of framing the questions we bring to our history, I would like to draw upon Sandra Birdsell's narrative, "The Two-Headed Calf,"[3] from her recent short story collection. It is a complex tale about a Manitoba woman seeking to understand the conflicting world-views she has inherited. Sylvia is the daughter of Betty, a rebellious German Mennonite teenager, who refuses to disclose to Sylvia the identity of her father, telling her only that "neither my parents nor his wanted us to marry."[4] Sylvia is still a child when she comes to realize that her father is an Ojibwa/French Métis man, Arthur Champagne, "who had once tramped three miles on the Red River on one snowshoe to invite Betty to dinner."[5] But she will spend

much of her adult life – and all of this short story – trying to find her way through the tensions and incompatibilities created by this liaison. "Just be you," Sylvia's Mennonite grandfather used to say to his young granddaughter. At which an adult Sylvia muses, "*Just be you* . . . But how was it possible not to be imprinted by other people's histories, their secret fears and desires? . . . To just be would require a miracle."[6]

The title of Sandra Birdsell's story comes from an experience that Sylvia, again as a child, has at the local fair. Inside a dingy sideshow tent, Sylvia finds a glowing white cube which contains a stuffed Jersey calf, with two identical heads extending from a single neck. The calf entrances Sylvia:

> The calf had two brains driving one body. It made her wince to imagine the heads straining on the single neck, the yanking and tugging against its own flesh and muscle. Or had it, she wondered, become an adroit acrobat, a contortionist, the heads working in tandem, anticipating each other's impulses and desires before they were thought, or felt? The calf's eyes looked to the left and, at the same time, to the right. Its heart would react according to what its eyes saw, the message the two brains sent to it: prepare to do two things at once, flee and stay. Sleep and eat. Laugh and cry.
>
> Perhaps, Sylvia thought . . . one message cancelled the other and the calf's heart had stopped beating.[7]

The calf's biological dilemma, Sylvia's personal dilemma, reminds me of our academic dilemma. Can we imagine our Church History Society to be an entity with three heads, facing outward to history, religious studies, and theology? If so, how did we get this way? Are we an accident of nature and circumstance, or the result of some late 1950s experiment? What happens when we respond to stimuli from three worlds? Is it possible for us just "to be," or will the mixed messages we receive about who we are do us in? And who wants a three-headed calf, anyway? Do we play any meaningful role in the Canadian academic barnyard, or are we really intended for a tattered tent in a tawdry sideshow – a slightly shocking lesson in the pitfalls of interdisciplinarity? These are the questions I would like to bring to a review of our history, which will have three parts: an overview of the Society's life, a look at the shifts or changes we can detect, and a description of continuities I believe we can name.[8] To undertake this

review, I have decided to do a study from within, to try to find out what we, in our meetings and papers, have told *one another* about who we are.

Historical Overview

The Society has presented its history to itself, in a formal way, only once before that I can discern: a "twenty year retrospect" delivered by John Moir in 1979.[9] It was a detailed accounting of persons, places and anecdotes. While this memoir should be updated, my purpose in this section is simply to highlight the key events which, over the past four decades, have given the Society its present shape.

The initial impetus for the Society came in the late 1950s from Lorne Pierce, the editor-in-chief of Ryerson Press, who wanted to create, in John Grant's words, "a reservoir of scholars and ideas that would make possible . . . a centennial [1967] three-volume history of the church in Canada."[10] Together with H.H. (Nick) Walsh, Pierce convened a meeting with church history professors from the "larger Protestant theological colleges"[11] to form an executive. Yet the purpose was to form a Society that lay "outside of any denominational context,"[12] and to that end, Abbé Maheux sent a letter of support. The executive created a purpose statement for the Society: "to promote and encourage research in Church History, with particular attention to Canadian Church History."[13]

There were twenty-six attendees at the first meeting, held in Toronto. The new Society set an early precedent of stable membership fees: the 1960 rate of three dollars did not change for sixteen years.[14] The 1961 meeting at McGill University saw CSCH meet jointly with CSBS and CTS to hear the presidential addresses. And so the Canadian Society of Church History settled early into its annual pattern of meeting, both alone and in joint sessions, hearing papers, eating together, and electing an executive. We have had thirty-six presidents, seven of whom have been women, and five of whom have been named "John." 1967 saw the first presentation by a senior graduate student, much to the delight of the "academically established members," who had already presented at least once, and as Moir puts it, "scarcely needed more public exposure."[15] The inclusion of graduate students thus became a point of pride for the Society. No doubt some of that "family feeling" I experience in the Society began as members encouraged junior scholars, while at the same time caring for its faithful seniors, such as an elderly Tom Boon, who, says John Grant,

added "a certain note of curiosity" by fainting during the meeting.[16]

The annual publication of the papers also began in 1967, for the convenience of members. Paul Laverdure indexed all the papers from 1960 to 1984, researching their publication history, and retrieving as many unpublished pre-1967 manuscripts as he could for the Victoria College Archives. This task included negotiating with a poor scholar then living in Spain, who would only give information for pay.[17] The index is a resource which should also be updated – if only we could pay a poor scholar to do it!

In 1969, CSCH met with the Learned Societies for the first time, and in 1970 federal funds provided our first travel grants. That same year, the Canada Council shifted its funding away from the *Canadian Journal of Theology* toward a new, more broadly-based journal, to be known as *Studies in Religion* (*SR*). Meeting at the Learneds, and the creation of the new Canadian Society for the Study of Religion (CSSR) forced the CSCH to choose between connecting with what Moir calls "old friends"[18] at CTS and CSBS, who were meeting at the same time as CSSR, or with the Canadian Historical Association. Fears about the amenability of *SR* to historical research, and the new complexity of meeting at the Learneds, gave our odd calf, as its second decade dawned, its first unambiguous experience of multiple and competing stimuli.

The struggle came to something of a head, if that metaphor is appropriate, in 1987 when the Society agreed to subscribe to *SR*, as a member of the CCSR (the Canadian Corporation for the Study of Religion).[19] John Moir quit the CSCH in protest. And as if to underline the frustrations wrought by triple vision, this year Tom Faulkner, another long-term member, and ardent and articulate *supporter* of our involvement in CCSR, has decided to leave CSCH because of what he sees as our wavering commitment to *SR* and the Corporation.

Throughout these challenges, however, CSCH has continued to meet, to welcome new faces and invite fresh scholarship. As of this afternoon, members and guests have delivered 355 papers on hundreds of topics. Meanwhile, in the thirty-nine years since the inception of CSCH, God has died in the West, Modernism has become very ill, babies have boomed and turned fifty, the earth's atmosphere has heated up by a half-degree, the academy has discovered that women and non-white persons can think, and the world has shuddered through a Cold War, innumerable hot ones, and the current chilly climate created by the global flight of

capital. Has all this activity – internal and external – affected the CSCH? Let us look now at some of the shifts and continuities.

Shifts

I see the shifts that have occurred in CSCH, apart from the structural ones noted above, to have happened in three interwoven areas: membership, paper topics, and approaches, and I will look briefly at each.

At a 1993 CSCH panel on "Teaching Canadian Religion," John Webster Grant stated that the shift of focus of religious studies from the seminary to the secular university had been, for him, "relatively painless compared with the mental adjustments" required by the increased pluralism represented in the student body.[20] In the CSCH, the membership changes reflect both the shift of focus and some of the pluralism. In the first decade, there was a predominance of clergy and professors, some from history departments, most from theological schools.[21] Not until 1970 did the Society have its first non-clergy president, and it took until 1975 to elect a second one.[22] Now during the late 1990s, the presence of two clergy presidents in a row is an anomaly (Paul Friesen and I), and we see fewer and fewer clergy in attendance at meetings. While graduate students have been a welcome feature since the late 1960s, the past few years have seen a decline in the attendance of more established scholars. One problem to which I hope not to contribute is the "case of the disappearing past-presidents." A trend of the 1990s has been the arrival of more participants from evangelical circles, a fact noted by Bob Burkinshaw in his 1995 presidential address, as he identifies CSCH as a welcoming forum for studies of evangelicalism.[23] Ethnically, we have remained more white and Northern European than the culture around us. And while we consider ourselves to be the "Societé canadienne d'histoire de l'Élgise, and have conducted some business in two languages, we do not seem ever to have heard papers given in French.

And then there are the women. In 1961, the McGill Faculty of Theology offered free accommodation and meals to all CSCH participants, warning that "accommodation for ladies" was not available, so that those who brought wives would have to stay elsewhere.[24] Paul Laverdure recalls being at a CSCH banquet in the late 1970s where the only women present were those serving the food.[25] The first woman to present a paper was Janet Scarfe, in 1976, and the next was Elizabeth Muir, in 1984. The

numbers of female presenters increased to two and then three per year, until the 1990s, when women have represented between one-quarter and one-half of every programme. After electing Phyllis Airhart as president in 1985, the Society has gone on to choose six more women for that role. As John Grant sees it, women have naturally come to play their part as they have come into advanced academic study, and the Society seems to have accepted this shift without difficulty. One member tells me that her sense of being an outsider, when she arrived in the late 1980s, stemmed not from being a woman, but from being neither a paid academic nor a cleric.

Our topics have reflected our shifting membership, and an increasing trend to Canadian subjects. Until the mid-1970s, with two early exceptions, Canadian topics never garnered more than half of a programme. By the 1980s Canadian subjects were clearly outstripping others, and in 1993, of seventeen papers, none were on non-Canadian topics. I have also tried to discern what proportion of each programme through the years might be seen to be of interest to each of our three constituencies: history, theology, and religious studies, with a fourth category for methodological issues. This task is of course difficult and arbitrary – even a beast with three heads moves them around a fair bit – although I did try to use the characteristics of each constituency as described by Tom McIntyre in a paper to the Society in 1985.[26] I determined that in almost every year, our presentations have been primarily historical, with theological subjects gradually decreasing, but not disappearing, and topics of a religious studies nature increasing since the 1980s, but rarely to more than 20% of any one programme. With our changing membership profile have come increasing numbers of papers about women and on evangelicalism. Methodological or historiographical presentations, the first of which occurred in 1967, have trickled in and out through the years; a recent trend is that of Society presidents choosing to give "historiographical" addresses.

Perhaps more telling in reviewing the shifts in our collective personality are the changing approaches described in those methodological papers. Before the first meeting in 1960, every founding member was sent a copy of a paper by Nick Walsh, in which he set what he saw as the task of the historian of the Canadian church.[27] Walsh's proposed methodology was unabashedly theological, stating that "only he who is excited by his participation in the church is able to understand church history."[28] While his language carries Protestant neo-orthodox assumptions, and a dread of

"sociologists,"[29] Walsh's main concern was to free Canadian church historians both from Europeans' preoccupation with their "national churches," and from American denominationalism, to look to "the destiny which awaits the whole of the church Catholic."[30] A decade later, a historiographical paper by Keith Clifford suggests, minus the theological underpinning, that historians are still seeking, with the aid of John Webster Grant, to free themselves from external, mostly American perspectives.

By 1980, the question of identity shifts from "Canadian" to "church." In the "Where from Here?" panel John Grant suggests that church history is going to have to deal not simply with a "battery of institutions," but with a more "diffuse and elusive entity" that is the church.[31] That identity question broadens again in 1992. At a joint CSCH/CTS/CSSR panel on "doing church history" the question, "What constitutes a church?"[32] is raised, but so is the identity of "history" itself, with language of deconstruction[33] and "re-membering."[34]

In 1994, Randi Warne picks up this identity question and addresses it to historians themselves, noting that personal academic identity is shaped in part by the hostile academic, social and economic climate within which church historians must work, one in which many who love and contribute generously to the study of church history will never find full employment.[35] Beth Profit, in 1996, also addresses the identity of the historian,[36] and Will Katerburg, in 1997, suggests that history is itself "identity,"[37] which creates both opportunity and limits for the historian.

And then, just to annoy those of us who reject the fatalistic notion that history is circular, in 1998 we find Paul Friesen raising, after a long absence, the question of the specific role and authority of the theologian in doing religious history.[38] This foray, however, is almost the mirror-image of that of Nick Walsh, four decades ago. Paul's paper wades bravely into the murky waters of a current debate, so current that it continues in the latest issue of *SR*, about whether theology bears not only any similarity to, but shares any compatibility with, religious studies.[39] Theologians, it has been suggested, can serve only as "native informants" to religionists.[40] If Walsh in 1959 assumed, without looking into the tent, that the calf had only one, theological, head, Friesen, in 1998 needed to coax some religionists to come to the fair at all.

Another significant difference between Walsh's and Friesen's approaches are, of course, the absence of reference to a Canadian identity for church history scholarship. It disappeared, as we have seen, from

CSCH papers after 1980. At the same time, papers on Canadian topics now formed the majority of the annual programme. Have we stopped talking about Canadian identity, and begun to live it? Have we fulfilled the mandate set by the founders in 1960, to encourage the study "particularly of Canadian church history"? Perhaps the bigger challenge lies in the first two words of that mandate, "To promote": the task of continuing to find others to join us in our endeavour.

Continuities

If an elucidation of the shifts in the Society over the years seems selective and subjective, my sense of the "continuities" is even more speculative. There are some obvious recurring themes: financial woes, and declining attendance, both of which were first raised as early as 1961, the latter of which John Moir calls "a hardy perennial for discussion."[41] But the deeper continuities present themselves, it seems to me, as paradoxes, as probably befits a multi-headed calf. I would name three. One is the paradox of our simultaneous openness and wariness, another is what I would call our "passive advocacy," and the third is our "cautious confidence."

It seems we knew early on that our calf would have to look in several directions. From the 1960s, historiographical papers remind us that the discipline cannot be narrowed, either in scope or in methodological tools.[42] We have urged ourselves to look more deeply within religious traditions to piety and practice, and more broadly without to comparative studies.[43] We have recognized the challenge of serving three constituencies, but we have encouraged one another not to abandon the methods of any; rather, to "respect the elements of correlation,"[44] "to have more canons, not fewer."[45] In his 1997 address, Will Katerburg asks "what relationship should be fostered" among the many communities with a stake in the writing of religious history. He concludes that "separation may contain divisiveness and bad manners; it may also inhibit creative scholarship."[46] When we hear ourselves speak like this, when we see how readily and respectfully we have embraced newcomers and their research interests, we seem like the most expansive crowd in the cafeteria.

And yet, by maintaining relationships in several directions, we tend to remain wary of all of them. We express mistrust of *SR*, in part because it takes the canon right out of our fort altogether, but more because its

length restrictions limit the number of historical papers it can include. We do not spend much energy in support of the CCSR. We have not met jointly with CTS and/or CSSR since 1992, and we seem somewhat insignificant to the sprawling CHA. Perhaps the Canadian Catholic History Association (CCHA) is the most kindred to our spirits, but they do not push our boundaries in quite the way our other associates do. And so we find our Society to be rather isolated, even as we name ourselves and our methods as broad and inclusive.

The second paradox may be related, the one I call "passive advocacy." By this phrase I mean that we rarely, as a Society, seem to take a stand, or set out on a mission, and yet we often work on important, controversial issues. I think of CSCH as "passive" in the sense that it did not go out to recruit feminists, evangelicals, or radicals, that it avoids making political statements, and doesn't even particularly enjoy the machinations of the academic bureaucracy. Our passivity can cause us pain; it can make us appear disengaged or irrelevant. And yet, despite our apoliticism, we *are* nibbling at the edges of oppression. Back in 1968, John Webster Grant's paper, "The Reaction of WASP Churches to Migration in the Laurier Era" was too hot to find a publisher.[47] Last year the papers of the CSCH quietly raised issues of gender, race, class, first nations, and age. They did so not by making grand claims on those topics, but simply by bringing the names of the marginalized to light, allowing their dismissed or forgotten voices to echo in the halls of academe.

The final paradox is again related: our "cautious confidence." As early as 1980, our own members predicted that church history was "destined soon to vanish."[48] Trying to belong in three constituencies, we are not completely at home in any.[49] And yet, throughout the years, there also rings a note of certainty that in our research and writing we are doing something meet and right, that we know our task and our boundaries. I think of panel responses by Brian Clarke and others to Ramsay Cook's *The Regenerators*, in 1986, and to David Marshall's *Secularizing the Faith*, in 1994. In both panels, the respondents articulate a depth of understanding of the church's history that could only come from entering a dialogue among history, faith, and the tools of social analysis.[50] Beth Profit says our work makes us better at examining "our own presuppositions and values."[51] Martin Rumscheidt argues that as a church historian, "I do not merely describe, but I also confront: I recreate. In re-creation, I am aware of being involved."[52] Somehow, the tricky task of interpreting signals from

several directions seems to make church historians not only cautious, but also confident, willing not only to report, but also to remake and to be remade. And this confidence continues, despite the obstacles the years have thrown its way.

Conclusion

And so, here we are: thirty-nine years old, open yet wary, passive yet advocating, cautious yet confident. This is our story, or my reconstruction of it. Does it help us with our questions about ourselves as a Society? Can the calf keep looking three ways? Do we have a place in the menagerie?

Back in Sandra Birdsell's story, we learn that Sylvia's mother Betty, the rebellious Mennonite, does not go into the tent to see the two-headed calf. "I am not remotely interested in freaky things,"[53] she says. Betty is, however, able to solve *her* identity problems in mid-life. "The woman who once wanted fire," says Sylvia, "settled for being the wife of an Anglican minister, wearing socks with her Birkenstocks, a dirndl skirt, and a long T-shirt to accommodate a rather comfortable girth," speaking "platitudes, homilies that substitute for caring now that her life seems predictable and safe."[54]

One option, then, is for the CSCH to find itself the academic-society equivalent of an Anglican minister, a "safe" place to continue its life. But for Sylvia, the narrator, this solution doesn't satisfy. The story, however, offers us another way to examine ourselves, strange beast that we are. Sylvia is preoccupied with the calf's heads, and the effect of their competing messages on the young animal's heart. What would happen if we looked, not to our competing constituencies first, but to our own heart? What if we asked, "Do we have the heart for this task?"

That question is ultimately not mine, but ours, to answer. It seems to me, though, as I have immersed myself in the thoughts and words of the members of this Society, that we do indeed have a sturdy heart, one that can perhaps withstand even the frightening task of being a multi-disciplinary creature. Will Katerburg, reading Nietzsche, calls history writing "a mystical, even religious endeavour."[55] Marguerite Van Die, in concluding her address, speaks of "that transcendent dimension with which imaginatively we continue to grapple – even as it, by its nature, continues to elude us."[56] "The amazing thing," John Webster Grant told me recently, "is that we are still here." But we are – a bit tattered, a bit conflicted, but *here*.

Like every good convert, I have come through my post conversion valley to a new peak, a second naivete, where once again I can give thanks for those who shaped this Society, this space for us both to "be" and to be challenged. And once again, I do hope that others can share my joy.

Endnotes

1. Marguerite Van Die, "Recovering Religious Experience: Some Reflections on Methodology," *Historical Papers: Canadian Society of Church History Papers* (hereafter *CSCH Papers*) (1992): 160.
2. N.K. Clifford, "Church History of Canada: Where from Here?" *CSCH Papers* (1980): 8.
3. Sandra Birdsell, "The Two-Headed Calf," in *The Two-Headed Calf* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart), 141-189.
4. Birdsell, "Calf," 179.
5. Birdsell, "Calf," 150.
6. Birdsell, "Calf," 188.
7. Birdsell, "Calf," 177-178.
8. In presenting this research I am most indebted to a bevy of highly-qualified, unpaid "research assistants": members of this Society who provided data, reflection, and suggestions for this paper.
9. John Moir, "The Canadian Society of Church History – a twenty-year retrospect," *CSCH Papers* (1979): 76-97.
10. John Webster Grant, "Church History of Canada: Where from Here?" *CSCH Papers* (1980): 21.
11. Moir, "Retrospect," 77
12. Moir, "Retrospect," 76.
13. Moir, "Retrospect," 97.
14. Moir, "Retrospect," 79.
15. Moir, "Retrospect," 87.
16. Grant, telephone conversation with author, May 1999. See also, Moir, "Retrospect," 87.

17. Paul Laverdure, telephone conversation with author, May 1999.

18. Moir, "Retrospect," 91.

19. Laverdure, telephone conversation.

20. John Webster Grant, "Teaching Canadian Religion: Some Questions of Approach," *CSCH Papers* (1993): 273-77.

21. Grant, telephone conversation.

22. Moir, "Retrospect," 90, 96.

23. Robert K. Burkinshaw, "Aspects of Canadian Evangelical Historiography," *CSCH Papers* (1995): 184.

24. Burkinshaw, 80.

25. Laverdure, telephone conversation.

26. Tom McIntyre describes "historians" as being interested in topics like politics, social class, and religion; "religionists" see history as one means of illuminating religious issues; and "theologians" understand the study of history as a contribution to education for ministry" ("Teaching Religious History in Three Different Settings: Complexes of Correlations," *CSCH Papers* [1985]: 81).

27. H.H. Walsh, "The Challenge of Canadian Church History to its Historians," *Canadian Journal of Theology* 5 (1959): 162-169.

28. Walsh, "Challenge," 163.

29. See Clifford, "Where from Here?" 1.

30. Walsh, "Challenge," 167.

31. Grant, "Where from Here?" 24, 25.

32. Tom Sinclair-Faulkner, "What do Church Historians Study?" *CSCH Papers*, (1992): 139.

33. Walter Principe, "How Do Historians Determine What is Authentic Christianity?" *CSCH Papers (*1992): 147. Principe here argues the *limits* of deconstruction.

34. Martin Rumscheidt, "How Ought Church Historians to do Church History"? *CSCH Papers* (1992): 151.

35. Randi R. Warne, "A Paean to the Faithful," *CSCH Papers (*1993): 279-285.

36. Beth Profit, "Texts and Contexts: Meaning and Methodology in Church History," *CSCH Papers (*1996): 217, 222.

37. William Katerburg, "History as Identity: Subjectivity, Religion, and the Historical Profession," *CSCH Papers* (1997): 134.

38. Paul Friesen, "Give me that old-time Religion: The Postmodernist Plot of the Theologians," *CSCH Papers (*1998): 129-40.

39. See Kenneth Gordon MacKendrick, "The Aporetics of a Tennis-playing Brontosaurus, or a Critical Theory of Religion: A Rejoinder to Russell T. McCutcheon and William E. Arnal," *Studies in Religion* 28 (1999): 77-83.

40. Report of a panel held at the American Academy of Religion in 1996. G.R. Evans, "The Compatibility of theological and religious studies?" *Bulletin of the Council of the Societies for the Study of Religion* 26 (1997): 50-68.

41. Moir, "Retrospect," 85.

42. Clifford, "Religion," 522-23.

43. Paul Dekar, "Church History of Canada: Where from Here?" *CSCH Papers (*1980): 13.

44. McIntyre, "Teaching," 83, 86.

45. Tom Sinclair-Faulkner, "The Canon of the Classroom: A Case Study in the Teaching of Religion in Canada," *CSCH Papers* (1993): 263.

46. Katerburg, "History as Identity," 148.

47. Moir, "Retrospect," 89.

48. Grant, "Where from Here?" 24.

49. "So, History truncated religion, Religious Studies had reservations about Christianity, and theologians and other religious practitioners wanted to focus on what was happening NOW. Where did that leave Church History?" (Warne, "Paean," 282).

50. On *The Regenerators*, Brian Clarke is concerned with Cook's "static, dualistic interpretation of orthodoxy" ("Modernism, Tradition, and Orthodoxy: A Comment on *The Regenerators*," *CSCH Papers* [1986]: 149), while Randi Warne challenges the "narrowness" of Cook's definition of religion ("*Post hoc ergo propter hoc*: History, Theology and *The Regenerators*," *CSCH Papers* [1986]: 155). On *Secularizing the Faith*, John Stackhouse, Jr. challenges David Marshall's right to "pronounce upon" the authenticity of

faith of a theological development (“Who is to Say?: Defining and Discerning Secularization in Canadian Christianity,” *CSCH Papers* [1994]: 199). Brian Clarke asks, “On what grounds does one decide that one particular form of historic Christianity has normative purchase, particularly now that Liberal Protestantism – which also made claims of its own to orthodoxy – is part of the Protestant heritage?” (“*Secularizing the Faith*: A Comment,” *CSCH Papers* [1994]: 204).

51. Profit, “Texts,” 222.

52. Rumscheidt, “How Ought?” 152.

53. Birdsell, “Calf,” 180.

54. Birdsell, “Calf,” 184.

55. Katerburg, “History,” 149.

56. Van Die, “Recovering,” 165.