HISTORICAL PAPERS 1997
Canadian Society of Church History

Annual Conference
Memorial University of Newfoundland
03-04 June 1997

Edited by
Bruce L. Guenther

Canadian Cataloging 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. 1. Canadian Society of Church history.

BR570.C322 fol. 277.1 C90-030319-0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Papers

CSCH President's Address

Please Note

The papers presented by Jim Opp, Enrico Cumbo, Terrence Murphy and Hans Rollman were not made available for publication.

"The Voice of One Crying in the Wilderness" or Verbal Bigotry – T.T. Shields, *The Gospel Witness* and Roman Catholicism, 1922-1942

ROBERT R. SMALE

Division and conflict in Christianity are not a modern phenomena. In fact, it is as old as the faith itself. A brief perusal of the New Testament reveals that σχισματα (schisms/divisions) were a problem that even the early church faced. Disagreement among the apostles themselves plagued the church in its infancy, particularly Paul and Peter's conflict over whether or not Gentiles should be forced to adhere to Jewish laws and customs. However, when Luther ostensibly uttered those now fateful words, "I cannot . . . I will not . . . Recant. Here I stand," he not only destroyed the vestige of a catholic church, in the sense of one church representing and speaking for all of Christendom, but he also ensured that diversity and conflict would be the pattern of Christianity not only amongst Protestants and Catholics, but even amongst Protestant denominations themselves. Thus, while the Reformation was in one sense an attempt to purify the church, it has left the church with a legacy of bitterness, envy, distrust and conflict. Since the utterance of those fateful words, this rift has been most clearly manifested in the relationship between Protestants and Roman Catholics.

Throughout the course of Canadian history, clashes between Protestants and Roman Catholics have been quite common. During the latter part of the nineteenth century, open hostility to Roman Catholicism was a

popularly expressed phenomenon. This anti-Catholicism was not simply politically motivated, it also had a theological and social inclination to it as well. As J.R. Miller points out, "a proper appreciation of the emotive force of anti-Catholic feeling requires an exploration and understanding of its several surfaces [nevertheless] [t]here could be no mistaking the liveliness of Catholicism as a public issue during the Victorian period."[1]

Roman Catholicism, during the Victorian era, was attacked as being morally and politically degenerate, responsible for criminal, poor and unattractive societies, a brutalizer and degrader of women, a corruptor of the minds of youth and biblically and spiritually bankrupt. In making their case against Roman Catholicism, nineteenth-century Protestants asserted "that Rome was heretic, schismatic, and riven with dissension."[2] But of even greater concern to Protestants of the nineteenth century was Rome's claims and lust for power. "Popery 'never can be satisfied with less than complete domination, and that, too, in matters political as well as spiritual'. . . Catholics 'always aim . . . at supremacy; and when supreme, they are even intolerant. They can never be affectionate subjects to a Protestant monarch.'"[3] The natural outcome of all this, Protestants charged was centuries of persecution and tyranny on the part of Rome. Consequently, Canadian Protestants viewed Roman Catholicism, at the turn of the century, as a threat not only to basic fundamental civil liberties, but also to ties with the empire and later on, the Commonwealth. As Brent Reilly has correctly pointed out, "the maintenance of democratic freedoms and of the links with Great Britain were twin impulses which drove some Protestants to organized defence against what they perceived as Catholic's aggression."[4]

For most Canadian Protestants, the Roman Catholic church was little more than "a ruthless, unchanging, non-Christian organization intending world-wide socio-political control and the elimination of Protestantism."[5] As both John Wolffe and Richard Lougheed correctly maintain, anti-Catholicism was not merely "a racial prejudice but an integral component of evangelical theology prior to the mid-twentieth century."[6] As David Bebbington maintains Roman Catholicism constituted a "grand threat to evangelical values." He states that

> evangelicals shared the common British aversion to Popery as a compendium of all that was alien to national life, whether religious, political or moral. They inherited the reformation identification of the

> papacy as Anti-Christ, the seventeenth-century fears that linked popery with continental autocracy and the popular suspicions that hovered round celibacy and the confessional. They [also] added their own specific sense of the spiritual deprivation of Catholics.[7]

In *The Two Babylons* (popular edition first published in 1871), Reverend Alexander Hislop captured the sentiment of Protestants of this period in their attitude toward Roman Catholics:

> There never has been any difficulty in the mind of any enlightened Protestant in identifying the woman "sitting on seven mountains, and having on her forehead the name written," "mystery, Babylon the Great," with the Roman apostasy . . . now while this characteristic of Rome has ever been well marked and defined, it has always been easy to show, that the Church which has its seat and headquarters on the seven hills of Rome might most appropriately be called "Babylon," in as much as it is the chief seat of idolatry under the New Testament, as the ancient Babylon was the chief seat of idolatry under the Old . . . It has been known all along that Popery was baptized Paganism; but God is now making it manifest, that the Paganism which Rome has baptized is, in all its essential elements, the very Paganism which prevailed in the ancient literal Babylon, when Jehovah opened before Cyrus the two-leaved gates of brass, and cut in sunder the bars of iron . . . Her judgement is now evidently hastening on; and just as it approaches, the Providence of God, conspiring with the Word of God, by light pouring in from all quarters, makes it more and more evident that Rome is in very deed the Babylon of the Apocalypse . . . and, finally, that the Pope himself is truly and properly the lineal representative of Belshazzar.[8]

Roman Catholicism was, therefore, viewed as the very antithesis of Christianity – namely, the Anti-Christ. Consequently, as Richard Lougheed notes, anti-Catholicism was clearly "a constant evangelical theological tenant throughout pre-Vatican II history."[9]

Into this broader context Thomas Todhunter Shields, the militant fundamentalist pastor of Jarvis Street Baptist Church in Toronto for over forty-five years, must be placed. T.T. Shields was born in the English city of Bristol, in 1873. Throughout his life Shields retained a deep sense of affection for the country of his birth often promoting Britain as the

champion of freedom and liberty.[10] This sense of pride in his British heritage played a significant role in shaping not only Shields' ideals, but also many of the rigid stands he took on issues throughout his contentious career.[11] Shields' convictions were also strongly influenced by the fact that he was part of a lengthy ministerial line dating back over 200 years in his family.[12] In this context, Shields inherited a broad spectrum of beliefs from his forefathers. Three in particular are worthy of note – Calvinism, a devotion to the Baptist tradition, and anti-Catholicism.

As a convinced Calvinist, Shields' doctrine stressed five basic concepts – the total depravity of humanity, unconditional election, limited atonement, irresistible grace and the perseverance of the saints. Thus, Shields' theology was grounded in the principle of the sovereignty of God. For as Shields himself stated in a 1925 sermon entitled, "Kept by the Power of God," "I am a bit of a Calvinist myself. I mean by that, I Believe in the sovereignty of God, that He chooses His people."[13] This conviction invariably led Shields into conflict with Roman Catholicism, since he believed its sacramentalism denied the individual true access to God.

> [T]he sacrifice of the mass is a repetition of this – "priests standing daily ministering," doing the same thing over and over again. Sin is never taken away by that means. And so all your prayers, and your penances, and all the severe discipline of that system is but a modern manifestation of this ancient principle, standing "daily ministering," and yet never getting the thing done.[14]

Thus, Shields believed that Roman Catholicism "ha[d] taken every simple doctrine of grace and made merchandise of it," with the practical effect being that the church of Rome claimed to have a monopoly on salvation "and you have to have it only at [their] price."[15]

Though he came from an Anglican tradition, Shields throughout his life was to retain a staunch and devout commitment to the Baptist tradition he adopted.[16] In 1927, when asked to become the leader of a non-denominational tabernacle movement, Shields replied – "I am a Baptist by conviction, and I shall stand for those truths which have characterized Baptists through the centuries . . ."[17] Shields' commitment to Baptist tradition was in fact so strong that he stated on at least one occasion that only Baptists were doctrinally sound and thus one may conclude through inference the only true believers. In a 1923 sermon entitled, "Why Baptists should

Proselytize Roman Catholics and Others," he stated:

> I understand there are some Baptists, who do not believe in making converts of Roman Catholics . . . I frankly confess I do, not only of Roman Catholics – but you Methodists and you Presbyterians; I would like to make Baptists of everyone of you. You see, if I thought the Methodists were right, I would join the Methodists; if I thought the Presbyterians were right, I would join the Presbyterians; and if I thought the Episcopal Church were the only church, I would seek "holy orders" there. But it is because I believe the Word of God teaches the very thing you saw tonight, as well as the body of principles for which Baptists have historically stood, that I would like to make Baptists of you all.[18]

Why would there be any need to convert people of these various denominations unless Shields somehow believed that they were not in fact Christians in the New Testament sense of the word?[19] Thus, Shields it would appear was claiming a Baptist monopoly over Christianity, the very thing he so harshly criticized Roman Catholics for doing.

Shields' dedication to two Baptist distinctives invariably led him into conflict with Roman Catholicism. The first was the pattern of congregational polity, which was the logical expression of the teaching of the priesthood of believers and thus, a protest against hierarchial control; and the second, the consistent witness of Baptists to the principle of religious liberty, the corollary of which is the separation of church and state. As a minority group, during the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, Baptists had been subjected to serious restrictions upon religious liberty. However, in order to shield their belief in the priesthood of all believers and religious freedom, Baptists insisted upon the complete separation of church and state. Thus, Baptists throughout their history have generally maintained an anti-Catholic attitude in order to safeguard the principle of religious liberty and the separation of church and state. As Robert G. Torbet notes "[b]asically it is a fear of their intolerance and political pretensions which underlies the universal attitude of Baptists toward Catholics."[20] Nevertheless, Baptists have consistently defended the right of Catholics to worship according to the dictates of their conscience, but they have refused to accept the validity of the Catholic principle of intolerance. As Torbet further contends Baptists "have opposed such pretension as was expressed by Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical of 1 November 1885, *Immortale Dei*,

when he declared that 'the State must not only have care for religion, but recognize the *true* religion.'"[21]

Consequently, T.T. Shields is perhaps best remembered by many Canadians as this country's outstanding anti-Roman Catholic leader. Essentially, as L.K. Tarr states, Shields regarded the church of Rome as "the advocate of a religious system that was, at its very core, the antithesis of Scriptural truth [and he] shared the New Testament's writers repugnance for ritualism, legalism, formalism, and sacerdotalism all of which [he believed] found expression in Romanism."[22]

I have thus far examined those factors that helped to foster Shields' anti-Catholic bias. I will now outline how this bias was manifested in Shields' weekly publication *The Gospel Witness*, from its inception in 1922 to the creation of the Protestant League in October of 1941.[23]

Even before *The Gospel Witness* went into circulation on 20 May 1922, T.T. Shields had already gained a noted reputation as a spokesperson against the church of Rome. During the Great War of 1914-1918, Shields had been quite critical of Quebec and its Roman Catholic population for hindering the war effort. He further attacked them for not joining the Union government and for impeding the implementation of conscription.[24]

Though written at the outset of World War Two, the following nevertheless expresses the attitude Shields held during the years of the First World War:

> The Canadian Roman Catholic Hierarchy in the last war did everything in its power to restrict and retard Canada's war effort. I know there were individual Roman Catholics who were far otherwise: I speak now of the official attitude of the Church of Rome in this country. It was decidedly against us – against France, against Britain, and for Germany. Even many of our French-Canadian fellow citizens put their religion before their social affinity, and stood for Germany as against France.[25]

However, in spite of his criticism of Quebec and French-Canadians' contribution to the war effort, Shields later contended that the formation of the Union government was the only time in Canada's history that Parliament was ever independent of Roman Catholic Quebec.[26] In this context, it is apparent that Shields was expressing a degree of dissatisfaction that the government did not seize upon the opportunity to cast off the Roman yoke

in its entirety.

On 17 May 1922, Jarvis Street Baptist Church gave Shields the authority to begin editing a paper on a three week trial basis. The paper was to have a twofold purpose – "to exercise some little influence toward a clear and unwavering witness to the truth of the gospel and to the distinctive principle for which we stand in all our denominational activities."[27] Invariably, the paper became an instrument whereby Shields propagated his views on a variety of social and political issues.

During the early years of *The Gospel Witness*, Shields' attacks upon Roman Catholicism were essentially theologically oriented. According to the stated purpose of *The Gospel Witness*, his duty was to disseminate the truth "as we may be given to see it."[28] Consequently, while he claimed to have nothing to say against Roman Catholics, he nevertheless considered it his duty to point out the failures of Roman Catholicism. Shields charged that it was "a system that I venture to believe cannot stand in the light of God's Holy Word; and yet I should accomplish nothing by mere denunciation."[29] How Shields could have so much to say against Roman Catholicism and in the process avoid addressing Roman Catholics is difficult to comprehend. Nevertheless, he often tried to draw this distinction by claiming that his quarrel was not with individual Catholics, who in many instances were "most amiable people," but with the Catholic system, its principles and hierarchy.[30] Though Shields may have attempted to draw this distinction, it was marginally successful at best, since his public attacks on Roman Catholicism often aroused strong emotions amongst the Catholic population of the country.[31] Shields, however, simply regarded this as further proof of the control of the church hierarchy over its citizenry. In a 1940 sermon entitled, "The Pope's Fifth Column – Everywhere," Shields charged that "[w]e should have no French-Canadian problem in this country if the Roman Catholic Church, with its priests and teachers, were not constantly instilling anti-British and separatist ideas into the minds of the people."[32]

In the inaugural years of *The Gospel Witness*, Roman Catholicism was not the primary antagonist of Shields. This dubious honour fell to modernism and more specifically the McMaster University controversy.[33]

As a result, Shields had some rather flattering statements to make about Roman Catholicism, particularly when judged in light of what he would say only a few years later. In terms of basic doctrine – belief in God, the inspiration of Scripture, the virgin birth, the deity of Christ, the origin

and impact of sin, the final judgement, and the atonement – Shields contended that the Roman Catholic Church "as far as it goes . . . is perfectly orthodox according to Scriptural standards [and] therefore much is to be said in favour of the Roman Catholic Church."[34] He continued by stating,

> that if I had to chose between being a Modernist – denying the inspiration of Scripture, denying the Deity of Christ, denying the blood atonement, denying all religious authority, and being a law unto myself – and a Roman Catholic any day . . . I can understand how amid all the darkness and superstition of Rome, men may somehow or other find their way to Christ and be saved; but this damnable philosophy . . . leaves us without any religion at all; it plunges us into darkness; it leads us straight on the way to agnosticism, and ultimately to infidelity.[35]

Yet, within fifteen short years Shields would assert,

> who that has any knowledge of the past will fail to recognize the "falling away," the apostasy, which found, and still finds its supreme exemplification in the Roman Catholic Church was and is on a far greater, a more colossal scale than that which we call Modernism? The Roman Catholic Church, I believe is represented in the final book of the Bible as the mother of harlots, and her illegitimate progeny under the Christian name are very numerous. She has corrupted the springs of Christian teaching in all ages, from her inception. When she says she is the original church, she is right historically. She is the church that became apostate, "falling away" from the truth of Christ. But God has always had a remnant according to the election of grace . . . whenever men have broken away from the darkness, and returned to the light, they have always done so as did Luther, by recognizing the supreme authority of the Holy Scripture.[36]

Shields believed that modernism had the tendency of reviving the Church of Rome in measure to the decline of evangelical Christianity. Nevertheless, it was a revival of apostasy not spirituality. Furthermore, Shields contended that modernism was "not comparable in its extent or in its blackness, to that of [the Church] of Rome" responsible for some of "the vilest of all iniquities . . ."[37] Hence, by the late 1930s Shields was claiming he would rather be a modernist than a pagan apostate Catholic.

What is reflected in all of this is Shields' utter distaste for both Roman Catholicism and modernism. In spite, of his statements to the contrary, Shields certainly would never have acquiesced to either of these positions. Modernism was quite simply judged to be the more pressing issue in the 1920s and thus received the brunt of Shields belligerent rhetoric. However, Roman Catholicism did not go unscathed during this period. Not only did Shields occasionally point out the doctrinal (theological) errors of the Roman Church, but in August of 1924, he also brought Dr. J. Frank Norris, a fundamentalist evangelist from Fort Worth, Texas to conduct a five-day crusade on the errors of Romanism. Norris proceeded to provide a stinging attack upon Catholic doctrine and also to charge that Romanism was a tremendous political menace.[38] Both Norris and Shields concurred that the Catholic Church, as anti-Christ, was part of a world-wide conspiracy, attempting to set up an ecclesiastical autocracy, claiming to be supreme over all nations and people. Norris charged that the only essential "difference between Romanism today and Romanism in the dark ages is that she does not now, on this continent at least, possess the civil power to enforce her persecuting decrees."[39]

This emphasis on the political rather than the theological dangers of Romanism became the major focus of Shields' attack by the 1930s. Three basic factors essentially account for this. The first was the recognition on Shields' part that he had essentially lost the debate with modernism, since he had ceded control of McMaster University and in the process divided the Baptist Convention in 1927. The second factor which fostered this intensified attack upon Roman Catholicism was brought about through events in the international arena. The third factor was a more local political issue within the province of Ontario.

Early in 1929, the Italian government and the Vatican came to an agreement when both parties signed the Lateran Agreements, thereby reconciling the papacy and the state after all but sixty years of enmity. Shields contended that this agreement amounted to a recognition of papal temporal power, which had a significance for world affairs. In essence, Roman Catholics owed their first loyalty to the Pope and not the country of their residence.[40]

Thus, Shields harshly attacked Premier Taschereau's speeches in the Quebec legislature in praise of the Lateran Agreements, as being in direct opposition to the "principles British citizens stand for."[41] Furthermore, he warned that "Protestants of all denominations need to wake up, or one [sic]

of these days they may discover the affairs of this country have passed into the hands of men who are but vassals of Rome."[42]

As Fascism in Italy and Spain and Nazism in Germany began to pose threats to international peace and stability, by the late 1930s, Shields came to the conclusion that both were part of an international Catholic conspiracy directed primarily against British democratic ideals.[43]

> The Roman Catholic religion differs from other forms of religion that bear the name Christian in that it believes and teaches that it should be propagated by force, that it has an inherent right to compel conformity to its doctrines. Hence it has always been a persecuting religion, even to the extent of shedding the blood of its opponents . . . Growing out of this, Romanism, of necessity is a political system. Hence it endeavours to secure control of the state, and use the powers of the state for its propagation . . . Moreover, the Roman Catholic Church, wherever you find it, is an enemy of human liberty: it always has been. It is the enemy of every state except a totalitarian state.[44]

Shields further charged that

> if any Pope could bless Franco and his bloody ways, he could bless the devil. I abhor the system that will associate the name of God, and call Heaven's blessing upon that output of hell that you see in the civil war of Spain. The power that will do that will do anything . . . I am, toward Roman Catholicism, absolutely intolerant. If there is an evil on earth toward which a man is justified in taking an attitude of intolerance, it is [towards] Roman Catholicism.[45]

Thus, by the outbreak of the Second World War Shields was willing to be called bigoted and narrow in his attitude towards Roman Catholicism. He strongly voiced the opinion that the Roman Catholic Church was the "Anti-Christ of Scripture out of which the ultimate anti-Christ will arise . . ."[46] In Shields' view the Catholic Church was the world's greatest totalitarian political organization and a "friend of neither democracy [n]or any democratic institution."[47] His only regret in speaking out against Roman Catholicism and its unholy alliances, especially with Fascism, thus far was that he should have "spoken more frequently and more strongly."[48]

In February 1939, the Ontario government of Mitch Hepburn began drafting legislation designed to give Catholic elementary schools a greater

share of funds through a more equitable distribution of corporate taxes.[49] Hepburn hoped that the legislation would not provoke a religious controversy. Almost immediately, however, storms of protest began to flood in criticizing the government's proposal, including a dissenting voice from the pulpit of Jarvis Street Baptist Church. In spite of such opposition, the bill was passed on 9 April 1936 by a vote of sixty-five to twenty.[50]

Shields in his customary manner launched a savage attack on the Premier and the entire concept of separate school legislation. He had already charged that Hepburn was the "toll" of two organizations: organized liquor traffic and the Roman Catholic Church, "both of which were blights on any state."[51] The decision to go ahead with the funding legislation for separate schools only seemed to reinforce his previous assessment.

Shields was convinced that the Roman Catholic separate schools were the "prolific mother of most of the political corruption" in the country. The bill was merely further proof that the church hierarchy was hording national revenue in order to further the propagation of Romanism within the country. Thus, "no one at all conversant with the facts of the case can, for a moment, question that the Hepburn government is subject to Roman Catholic direction and control."[52] This legislation was simply further proof of a world-wide Catholic conspiracy working toward the suppression of democratic ideals, since it separated the various elements of society fostering division and henceforth made national unity simply impossible, so Shields contended.[53]

Shields charged that if he was the Premier of Ontario the entire separate school system would be abolished, since the avowed purpose of the Catholic hierarchy in Canada "is to strengthen through Separate Schools, and by other means . . . the Roman Catholic Church in Canada, that it may be in a position to dictate to the government of every Province in Canada."[54] Such a statement contradicts Shields' previous assertions that he would have extended religious freedom to Catholics and also negates the fundamental Baptist distinctive, the belief in religious toleration. Since the Catholic Church had initiated the battle cry, Shields was now convinced that the only way to deal effectively with her was through an all out declaration of war, since Romanism showed a complete lack of respect for civil law. Thus he charged, "it is with the political character of Roman Catholicism we are at war – and must ever be at war."[55] Consequently, the separate school funding question in Ontario merely affirmed Shields'

contention that Roman Catholicism

> is essentially parasitical in its nature and habits . . . it fastens itself upon every state as a leech, and sucks its very life blood. It infects the blood stream of every political party, and, like a deadly bacillus destroys the red corpuscular principles by and for which the party lives, and reduces it to an anaemic mass of potential corruption. Like a cancer, Roman Catholicism insinuates itself into every government and raps its parasitical and strangling tentacles about every governmental organ, converts it into a banqueting house for political buzzards, and makes it a stench in the nostrils for every lover of righteousness . . . It impoverishes education by diverting its supplies to the support of its own system of propaganda . . . I do not exaggerate, but speak the plain, sober, truth, when I say, that the only right the Roman Church has to the title "Catholic" consists in the universality of its malignant influence.[56]

Thus, while Shields may have tempered his hostility towards Roman Catholicism in the early years of *The Gospel Witness*, he was by 1940, openly critical and hostile to the point of declaring outright hatred and contempt for anything remotely associated with Romanism.

> . . . We should hate the system of Romanism. I do. I make no apology for it. I hate it as one of the world's greatest scourges; and all of history is confirmatory of that assertion. To me, the Roman Catholic Church is just as much an implacable enemy of mankind as Hitler himself.[57]

By the outbreak of the Second World War, Shields believed that the papacy and Nazism-Fascism were allied together as part of an international conspiracy to subvert British democratic ideals.[58] Early in 1940, Shields had commissioned L.H. Lehmann, an ex-Roman Catholic priest and editor of *The Converted Catholic*, to write a series of articles for *The Gospel Witness*, outlining the extent of this relationship. Lehmann contended that,

> it can be safely said that Nazi-Fascism and Jesuitism, the two greatest reactionary forces in the world today are but two facets of the same unity – one civil, and the other ecclesiastical. Catholic Action was brought into being coincidently with the rise of Nazi-Fascism, and

> was later consolidated by the Lateran Pact with Mussolini in 1929, and by the secret treaty with Nazi Socialism in 1933.[59]

Shields saw these three "isms" as forming some type of tri-partite pact bent on world domination. While it may be argued that the ecclesiastical structure of the Roman Catholic Church was hierarchial, authoritarian and expansionistic in outlook, it certainly was not formally allied with Fascist ideals. Nevertheless, it is not surprising that Shields would draw parallels between the Roman Catholic Church and Fascism, especially when the Church had signed a Concordat with Mussolini and had recognized the legitimacy of Hitler's Germany. The Catholic Church's failure to speak out against the realities of Fascism is one of the dark annals in her history. However, some Protestant Churches were equally guilty of this. Furthermore, the authoritarian nature of the Catholic Church, which Shields openly criticizes, was equally reflected in many Protestant circles, especially his own. In spite of several votes of non-confidence in his leadership, at Jarvis, Shields staunchly refused to resign. It was either "his way or the highway." If there was ever a Baptist Pope, then Shields would certainly qualify. Certainly, the dictator of Jarvis Street Baptist Church had plans to "conquer" Canada with his own brand of Protestantism.[60] Though Shields' assertion that the Catholic Church was ecclesiastically authoritarian, due to its episcopal hierarchy, his notion that it was in an alliance of world conquest with Hitler and Mussolini is ridiculous. From the earliest days of Fascism, some Catholic priests warned of the impending dangers associated with this ideology and risked their lives as members of the resistance movements in various countries. Shields' militancy and dogma unfortunately never allowed him to look beyond the narrow confines of his own warped ideology in order to pursue the greater good.

At the outset of the war, Shields had issued a call for national unity, even though he believed the Catholic Church was behind both domestic and international problems.

> We have come to a time when all differences in our national life should be forgotten or submerged, and freely and entirely subordinated to the cause of national unity. I hope we may ignore all political and racial distinction, the land of our birth, or the race of our origin, and reckon ourselves to be, all of us, Canadians, or better still, for the purposes of this war, British Canadians.[61]

Was Shields being sincere here or was this merely rhetoric on his part? He could hardly expect Catholics and French-Canadians to forget years of attack on his part questioning their loyalty to Britain and British institutions.[62] Furthermore, his statement called upon Canadians to become British-Canadians, somehow implying that French-Canadians were not Canadians, thereby, adding further insult to injury. Nevertheless, the true sincerity of Shields' call for national unity can be measured by the fact that only a few weeks later he renewed his attacks upon Catholicism with as much vigour as ever.

Thus, the early years of the war developed into a sort of crusade in which Shields charged that the Roman Catholic Church was not only a threat to basic civil liberties, but also to ties between Canada and Britain. Furthermore, Rev. J.B. Thomson of Dufferin Street Presbyterian Church, speaking from the Jarvis Street pulpit in response to the Catholic mass held on Parliament Hill in September 1941, charged that Quebec's opposition to conscription was hampering the ability of Canada to make all out war against Nazi aggression.

> The Roman Catholic Church, because of her influence with the Government, is hindering Canada's war effort. For example: 'No conscription'! Why? Because Quebec objects . . . We are out to win the war. But I ask you this: Is it fair that Protestant boys who volunteer to fight Canada's battle should lease Roman Catholic boys to take their jobs? (No!) . . . It is a shame. It is not British.[63]

Consequently, Shields contended that *The Gospel Witness* assumed a sort of prophetic mission in the early years of war.

> For the last six months we feel *The Gospel Witness* has exercised a very special ministry in calling attention to the danger which resides in the intrigues and machinations of the Papacy throughout the world. In no country is it more active than the Dominion of Canada, and it is doing more to hamper Canada's war effort than all other enemy agencies combined.[64]

The complete control of Quebec by the Catholic hierarchy had precipitated such an action Shields vowed. The Federal government's error in advertising a special mass to be held on Parliament Hill on Sunday, 14 September 1941, which excluded any mention of a concurrent Protestant service,

proved too much for many Protestant clergy and laity to handle.[65]

On Tuesday, 16 September 1941, Shields called the leaders of Toronto's Protestant community together to voice their outrage and concern at the government's recent action. A resolution was presented attacking the mass on parliament hill "as an insult to the conscience of the majority of Canadian citizens and destructive of national unity."[66] In essence, the sponsoring committee charged that this was merely further proof of the Catholic hierarchy controlling the political affairs of the country.[67] It is somewhat surprising that Shields would criticize the government for destroying national unity when his own personal attacks upon Roman Catholicism had in many respects been responsible for creating division within the country.

In order to combat this devilish horde and defend British civil leaders, they eventually came to the consensus that a "Protestant Vigilance League" needed to be created. Thus, on 18 September 1941, the Canadian Protestant League was born. The League had a three-fold purpose:

> i) the preservation, maintenance, and assertion of the traditional, civil and religious liberties of British subjects;
> ii) to practice, defend, maintain, and to propagate the great doctrines of the Protestant Reformation;
> iii) [and to oppose], the supreme authority, falsely claimed by the Roman Catholic Church; and also against the Roman Church's political methods of propagating its tenets, and of extending and exercising this illegitimate authority.[68]

What is evident here is that the founders of the League saw "British," "Protestant," and "democratic" as interchangeable terms. In the process, they placed loyalty to the British cause before issues of doctrine and anti-Catholic rhetoric.[69]

While many Protestants sympathized with the purpose and goals of the League "they were constrained from too close an attachment to anything that involved the leadership of Dr. Shields."[70] Nevertheless, The Protestant League provided Shields with the opportunity to spread his militant anti-Catholic message throughout the country during the remaining years of the war. For the most part, Shields repeated the same old platitudes, though with fervent hostility, that the British liberties in Canada were being threatened by the Catholic hierarchy, who were in complete

control of the government of W.L. Mackenzie King. This fact was evidenced according to Shields by King's failure to establish conscription in 1942, even though widespread popular support was expressed through a national plebiscite.[71] Thus, what conclusions can be drawn with respects to Shields' anti-Catholic bias?

First of all, Shields may be commended for his efforts in pointing out doctrinal errors in Roman Catholicism and most certainly the Church's official position with respect to Nazism and Fascism. The failure of the Catholic Church to condemn neither Mussolini nor Hitler in any official public statement during the war years has been a blight upon her history. Nevertheless, Shields' notion of a world-wide Catholic conspiracy in alliance with Nazism and Fascism is certainly nothing more than sheer fantasy. The signing of Lateran Treaty in 1929 between Mussolini and Pope Pius XI, while recognizing Catholicism as the sole religion of the state and providing for Catholic religious instruction in schools was hardly the forging of an imperialistic alliance. Its primary motive was to marginalize the Church's role in Italian politics to the hundred acres of its independent sovereignty, Vatican City. By settling the outstanding disputes between the church and the state, Mussolini had effectively limited a major source of opposition and criticism to his regime, in the process transforming the office of Pope from one which had been influential in European politics into essentially a spiritual leader. Nevertheless, Mussolini's interference with the Catholic Action, the church's youth program, did result in a public denouncement by the Pope in the Encyclical of 1931. Within Germany, the Nazi Party initially tried to harness the German churches, both Catholic and Protestant, to the service of nationalism, self-sacrifice for the national cause, belief in a chosen people and the removal of Jews from national life. While petitions to self-sacrifice and destiny were expedient to some aspects of Christianity, by 1937, Hitler had lost all faith that the churches could be of any use to his goals for Germany. Though German resistance to Nazism was divided and weak, it nevertheless convinced Hitler of the worthlessness of Christianity, since it represented an obstruction to his geo-political goals of world domination. Therefore, Hitler's intention was to eradicate the church from European affairs, following his victory over the Soviet Union. In the interim, the church was subjected to a series of persecutions largely carried out by local Nazi officials. These persecutions helped to further fuel the resistance movement, which in early 1940 Pope Pius XII secretly supported, when he

allowed himself to be used as a channel of communication between the conspirators and the British government on the grounds that it would save lives.[72] Thus, notions of a tri-partite pact between Roman Catholicism, Nazism and Fascism bent on world conquest and domination are completely unwarranted. What it merely confirms is the tendency on the part of Shields to associate anti-Christ with any position or view differing from his own. Such predilections can be extremely dangerous and damaging to all religions, something Shields often failed to recognize and when he did tended to ignore in any event.

Shields himself charged that his anti-Catholic attitude was aroused during the Great War, when he entered Westminster Catholic Church and saw a book written by Cardinal Mercier entitled "The Duty of Catholics." The book essentially argued that it was the duty of all Catholics to marry at maturity and produce a population for the Church. Parents were to encourage their offspring in this capacity. Shields held that, "I have never seen the distinction between Christianity in the New Testament sense, and Roman Catholicism more clearly defined."[73] The Roman Catholic Church was thus propagated through human initiative, while a truly New Testament church was fostered through the infinite grace of God. Whether it was this particular incident, his strong association with British democratic ideals and Britain herself, or the other factors discussed at the outset of this paper, that shaped his attitude towards Roman Catholics, the fact still remains that T.T. Shields was militantly anti-Catholic.

Supporters of Shields might attempt to justify his view by arguing that he was simply expressing the commonly held attitudes of the day. With that type of reasoning one could invariably proceed to justify the holocaust, since the Nazi were after all merely expressing the attitudes that many held towards Jews!

Nor can one accept the argument of Dr. Olive Clark, one of Shields' close associates at Toronto Baptist Seminary, that Shields promoted an anti-Catholicism of love aimed at liberating laity and priests who had been duped by the diabolical Roman system and its authoritarian bishops during his attacks upon Roman Catholicism. Love is not expressed through bigoted and outright racist attacks upon individuals and their values. Furthermore, the fact that many people were "saved" does not mark some type of God-ordained blessing upon the means and efforts of Shields in this capacity.[74] The fact that people were "saved" is not any testimony to justify Shields' prejudiced vendetta against Roman Catholics, nor a sanctioning

of his methods, which he claimed were correct, but rather it points to the power of the gospel to affect change even beyond the shortcomings of human endeavour. God, at times, brings about wondrous events, like salvation, in spite of human motives and shortcomings. The damage that T.T. Shields and other fundamentalists like him caused is still being felt by the church today. Sectors of Protestant Christianity, particularly within Baptist circles, have never sufficiently redressed these matters nor apologized for its often extremist attitudes on these issues and so below the surface bitterness often still remains.

Was T.T. Shields a prophetic voice crying in the wilderness in his attacks against Roman Catholicism or was he guilty of verbal bigotry? Let the words of Shields himself answer that question – "We are willing to be called bigoted and narrow, if we must be . . . !"

Endnotes

1. J.R. Miller, "Anti-Catholic Thought in Victorian Canada," *Canadian Historical Review* 66, No. 4 (December 1985): 474.
2. Miller, "Anti-Catholic Thought in Victorian Canada," 487.
3. As cited in Miller, "Anti-Catholic Thought in Victorian Canada," 491.
4. Brent Reilly, "Baptists and Organized Opposition to Roman Catholicism 1941-1962," in *Costly Vision: The Baptist Pilgrimage in Canada*, ed. Jarold K. Zeman (Burlington: G.R. Welch, 1988), 181.
5. Richard Lougheed, "Anti-Catholicism Among French Canadian Protestants," *Historical Papers: Canadian Society of Church History* (1995): 162.
6. Lougheed, "Anti-Catholicism Among French Canadian Protestants," 162.
7. *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1989), 101.
8. A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons* (London: S.W. Partridge and Co., 1903), 1-3.
9. Lougheed, "Anti-Catholicism Among French Canadian Protestants," 163.

10. *The Gospel Witness*, 2 January 1941, 9 ("We repeat what we have said in this paper during the war and before the war, that the greatest enemy of all free countries, particularly Britain and the United States, is the Italian Papacy.")

11. C.A. Russell, "Thomas Todhunter Shields, Canadian Fundamentalist," *Ontario History* (December 1979): 264.

12. Russell, "Thomas Todhunter Shields, Canadian Fundamentalist," 264.

13. *The Gospel Witness*, 19 March 1925, 4.

14. *The Gospel Witness*, 16 November 1922, 3.

15. *The Gospel Witness*, 20 December 1923, 4.

16. His father's call to pastor a Baptist Church in Plattsville, ON in 1888 had brought the family to Canada (Russell, "Thomas Todhunter Shields, Canadian Fundamentalist," 264).

17. As cited in Russell, "Thomas Todhunter Shields, Canadian Fundamentalist," 265.

18. *The Gospel Witness*, 20 December 1923, 2-3.

19. Shields even went so far as to characterize Pentecostalism as a cult; its beliefs were taught in the curriculum of Toronto Baptist Seminary in a course dealing with such phenomena (see *The Gospel Witness*, 30 January 1930, 1; and *The Gospel Witness*, 2 July 1931, 6).

20. Robert G. Torbet, *A History of Baptists* (Valley Forge: Judson Press 1950), 455.

21. Torbet, *A History of Baptists*, 520.

22. L.K. Tarr, *Shields of Canada* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1957), 160.

23. In the archives of Jarvis Street Baptist Church, there is a collection of books from Dr. Shields' personal library which contains volumes of books on the pitfalls of Roman Catholicism, which also certainly influenced Shields' attitude to that particular Church – some of the authors and titles are as follows: A. Hislop, *The Two Babylons* (1903); John Canning, *Errors of Romanism* (1851); Jeremiah J. Crowley, *Romanism: A Menace to the Nations* (1912); Jeremiah J. Crowley, *The Pope* (1913); E.H.

Landon, *A Manual of Councils of the Holy Catholic Church* (1909); C. Lattery, ed. *The Papacy* (1925); Robert Fleming, *The Rise and Fall of the Papacy* (1849); W.M. Collier, *At the Court of His Catholic Majesty* (1912); and others.

24. Russell, "Thomas Todhunter Shields, Canadian Fundamentalist," 266.

25. *The Gospel Witness*, 4 January 1940, 1. Dr. Frank Norris, while conducting a crusade in Massey Hall on invitation from Shields, went as far as to state that "the great war was instigated by the Pope and the Kaiser who were intimate friends." He further blamed the Catholic influence for delaying America's entry into the war by two years. Undoubtedly, Shields would have concurred with this assessment, since he provided the commentary on Norris' message ("The Doom of the Papacy Foretold in the Word of God," *The Gospel Witness*, 28 August 1924, 7).

26. *The Gospel Witness*, 21 July 1938, 5.

27. *The Gospel Witness*, 8 July 1922, 7.

28. *The Gospel Witness*, 20 May 1922, 1.

29. *The Gospel Witness*, 16 November 1922, 3.

30. *The Gospel Witness*, 17 December 1925, 4. "It is against principles and not against personalities we protest" (see *The Gospel Witness*, 8 August 1940, 3).

31. See *The Gospel Witness*, 4 September 1924, 12; and *The Gospel Witness*, 11 September 1924, 7.

32. *The Gospel Witness*, 8 August 1940, 7.

33. For a discussion of this crisis see G.A. Rawlyk, "A.L. McCrimmon, H.P. Whidden, T.T. Shields, Christian Education and McMaster University," in *Canadian Baptists and Christian Higher Education* (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 1988); Russell, "Thomas Todhunter Shields, Canadian Fundamentalist," 269-273; Tarr, *Shields of Canada*; and L.K. Tarr, "Another Perspective on T.T. Shields and Fundamentalism," in *Baptists in Canada: Search for Identity Amidst Diversity*, ed. Jarold K. Zeman (Burlington: G.R. Welch, 1980), 209-223.

34. *The Gospel Witness*, 20 December 1923, 4.

35. *The Gospel Witness*, 20 December 1923, 4.

36. *The Gospel Witness*, 7 July 1938, 3.
37. *The Gospel Witness*, 10 November 1938, 5.
38. *The Gospel Witness*, 28 August 1924, 6.
39. *The Gospel Witness*, 28 August 1924, 6.
40. *The Gospel Witness*, 21 February 1929, 6.
41. *The Gospel Witness*, 21 February 1929, 8.
42. *The Gospel Witness*, 21 February 1929, 8.
43. *The Gospel Witness*, 15 August 1940, 3 ("Great Britain, to begin with, is the chief object of the Vatican's Hostility and has been for many years.")
44. *The Gospel Witness*, 21 July 1938, 2-3.
45. *The Gospel Witness*, 21 July 1938, 8. "The civil war in Spain was a Catholic war, fomented by the Church, financed by the Church, blessed by the Church – witness the recent establishment of the Church in Spain" (*The Gospel Witness*, 4 January 1940, 5).
46. *The Gospel Witness*, 16 February 1939, 1.
47. See *The Gospel Witness*, 8 August 1940, 1; and 4 January 1940, 5.
48. *The Gospel Witness*, 8 August 1940, 3.
49. See Neil McKenty, *Mitch Hepburn* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1967), 76-89.
50. McKenty, *Mitch Hepburn*, 80.
51. See *The Gospel Witness*, 5 September 1935; 16 April 1936; 9 April 1936; and 30 April 1936.
52. *The Gospel Witness*, 16 April 1936, 14.
53. *The Gospel Witness*, 8 April 1936, 5-6.
54. *The Gospel Witness*, 30 April 1936, 12.
55. *The Gospel Witness*, 23 April 1936, 9.
56. *The Gospel Witness*, 23 April 1936, 9.

57. *The Gospel Witness*, 5 September 1940, 2. Though the separate school legislation was eventually repealed, Shields charged that the Roman Church would stop at nothing "since [she was] like a burglar [who] would return under the protection of darkness, and break in some quieter method" (*The Gospel Witness*, 16 February 1939, 1; and 29 September 1937, 9).

58. *The Gospel Witness*, 2 January 1941, 9. ("We repeat what we have said in this paper during the war and before the war, that the greatest enemy of all free countries, particularly Britain and the United States, is the Italian papacy.")

59. *The Gospel Witness*, 6 November 1940, 6.

60. John G. Stackhouse, *Canadian Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century: An Introduction to Its Character* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1993), 26.

61. *The Gospel Witness*, 7 September 1939, 3. See his statement about not wanting to hamper the war effort in *The Gospel Witness*, 28 September 1939, 6.

62. See *The Gospel Witness*, 7 July 1938, 1; and 21 July 1938, 4.

63. As cited in Reilly, "Baptists and Organized Opposition to Roman Catholicism 1941-1962," 183.

64. *The Gospel Witness*, 13 February 1941, 3.

65. Reilly, "Baptists and Organized Opposition to Roman Catholicism 1941-1962," 182. One was nevertheless held later that week.

66. Reilly, "Baptists and Organized Opposition to Roman Catholicism 1941-1962," 183.

67. See *The Gospel Witness*, 18 September 1941.

68. *The Gospel Witness*, 23 October 1941, 1-2.

69. Reilly, "Baptists and Organized Opposition to Roman Catholicism 1941-1962," 185.

70. Reilly, "Baptists and Organized Opposition to Roman Catholicism 1941-1962," 185.

71. Reilly, "Baptists and Organized Opposition to Roman Catholicism 1941-1962," 186.

72. Owen Chadwick, "Great Britain and Europe," in *The Oxford Illustrated History of Christianity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 354-367.

73. *The Gospel Witness*, 16 April 1936, 7.

74. L.K. Tarr, *Shields of Canada*, 161.

The Influence of Class and Gender on Parochial Voluntary Associations: An Anglican Example from St. John's, Newfoundland, 1877-1909

LAURA B. MORGAN

This paper, and the thesis from which the material is drawn, was largely inspired by James Obelkevich's assertion that every aspect of religion has a "social resonance," and that religious institutions develop according to their specific social context.[1] It was also influenced by the increased attention to themes of class, ethnicity and gender in English Canadian religious historiography of the last decade.[2]

St. Mary's and St. Thomas's, the churches at the heart of this study, were both made independent parishes of the Anglican diocese of Newfoundland in 1877: St. Mary's in the west end of St. John's and St. Thomas's in the east end. Although of a common denomination, diocese and city, these parishes had different populations and were located in very different neighbourhoods. St. Mary's was located in the industrial, working-class district of St. John's, and St. Thomas's in the wealthy, middle and upper-class one.[3] St. Thomas's parish population had a high number of working-class families and individuals (many of them unskilled), but its congregation was dominated by members of the city's commercial and political elite. St. Mary's congregation, like its parish population, was mainly families and individuals of a middling status: skilled workers (many of them self-employed) and members of the proprietary lower middle-class. In contrast to the latter, the lower middle-class element at St. Thomas's was mainly white-collar, commercial

employees and their families. Occupational and family analysis also showed that members of the middle-class proper at St. Thomas's were generally professionals, whereas at St. Mary's they were likely to be business owners with roots in industrial or artisanal activities.[4] It is within this context that I will discuss some of the sexually-specific, church-sponsored associations that were active at St. Mary's and St. Thomas's in the late Victorian and Edwardian era. In doing so I will illustrate how social status, which affected individual experience and shaped the character of a community, also influenced the development of organized religious institutions within that community and the experiences of those people who chose to partake in church life.[5]

Men's Associations

Established in June 1891, the St. Mary's Association's aim was "deepening the interest of the members of St. Mary's Congregation in the affairs of their church." The Association was open to any male over fifteen years of age who could pay the monthly subscription of 10¢. While there were no attendance rolls, officer lists indicate that Association leaders were mainly of the lower middle-class, followed by the skilled working-class.[6] This distribution of power was reflective of parish demographics although it suggested that at St. Mary's lower middle-class men were somewhat more likely to head associations than their working-class counterparts. This finding is not surprizing given the well-documented lower middle-class interest in church life and leadership. It is also not surprizing that the activities and mandate of the Association suggested an interest in respectability and upward mobility. It was, in essence, a literary and debating society.[7] A description in the *Diocesan Magazine* stated that "the tone of the Association is high . . . it aims at the improvement of the mind by debate and conversation, and presents to its members the means of innocent and rational amusement."[8] At St. Thomas's, a similar society was not established until the Llewellyn Club was founded in 1915.[9]

At the same time, the St. Mary's Parochial Association's name suggests its deep roots in the west end Anglican community giving it a local flavour typical of artisanal organizations.[10] The way in which the Association rotated its officers from year to year also suggested that the organization had a co-operative ideal.[11] This contrasted with the idea of earned advancement to long-term positions of authority associated with the

military structure of the Church Lads Brigade, an association popular in the east end. In addition, the St. Mary's Parochial Association was fraternal in nature. Mary Ann Clawson has shown that fraternalism mainly attracted skilled workers and proprietors, and was closely tied to artisanal identity and its male-centred culture. While English Canadian historians Gregory S. Kealey and Bryan Palmer have identified class ties within fraternal organizations and examined the way membership encouraged class consciousness, Clawson described how, despite shared socio-economic status, members of fraternities defended masculinity more than they promoted class identity.[12] She explained how members of fraternities rejected the middle-class Victorian view of women as the moral and spiritual guides of men – a cornerstone of True Womanhood ideology – and promoted male autonomy.[13] Such an analysis can explain why a motion on whether or not to admit women to the Association proposed at its second meeting was defeated.[14] St. Mary's Parochial Association represented an amalgamation of lower middle-class and skilled working-class cultural elements, a mixture that reflected the social setting in which its leaders and members lived. The Association especially illustrates the way working-class ties remained with the more upwardly mobile members of the west end population.

When Camplin Cogan, formerly curate at St. Thomas's, became rector of St. Mary's in 1902, he instituted several new male organizations in the parish. One of these, the Young Men's Club, was a classic example of the Anglican church-sponsored "working-lad's" institute designed by Victorian middle-class sponsors to offer a place of "respectable" leisure to lower-class adolescents.[15] Cogan's institution of this type of club in the largely working-class west end, given his class background and experience in the east end, was not surprizing.[16] Established from above by a newcomer to the parish, the St. Mary's Young Men's Club was reforming and prescriptive by nature, in contrast to the fraternalism and self-help of the men's association organized by members of the congregation itself.

Cogan also introduced the Men's Bible Class to St. Mary's. At St. Thomas's, assuredly because of that parish's theological connection to the Low Church, there were strong Men's and Women's Bible Classes during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. These bible classes were educational usually consisting of discussions and lectures about scripture or more specific matters of church doctrine. The place of sexual divisions in the organization of these classes was clear: the rector's wife (or another

prominent, religiously devoted woman from the congregation) taught the female class, while the rector or curate had charge of the males.[17] There was a clear sense of gender difference in the interpretation and understanding of scripture. As well, during the 1880s the Men's Bible Class met Sunday mornings at 10:00, while the women's class met at 2:30 on Sunday afternoons.[18] The latter time slot was chosen, perhaps, to coincide with Sunday school, under the assumption that women would be the ones bringing children to the sessions. By the early-twentieth century, however, the Men's Bible Class at St.Thomas's had taken on a more prominent social and associational face, and began sponsoring entertainments and teas.[19] While a bible class was held on Friday evenings at St. Mary's during the late 1880s, it was Cogan who introduced the associational, and sexually specific, version of the bible class. The immediate acceptance of this association in the west end was perhaps due to the tradition of fraternal organizations in the parish as this organization had an educational and social, rather than prescriptive, mandate.

In contrast, the most popular men's associations in the east end were more prescriptive than fraternal. Just as they promoted "True Womanhood," the Victorian bourgeoisie painted a picture of the "Christian Gentleman" whose life was a balance of business achievement, social sensitivity and dedication to church and family. Involvement in secular or church-sponsored self-improvement societies was part of this role.[20] The "Christian Gentleman " ideal was promoted by Victorian churches as part of "muscular Christianity," and the Church of England in Newfoundland was no exception to this general trend.[21] The clergy at St. Thomas's were major promoters. Rector Arthur Wood wrote in 1889:

> How many appear to think that the work of Religion and the Gospel should be left chiefly to Clergymen, aided it may be by a few women! How few seem to realize that the great work of the Church of Christ is a work to be done by men! . . . Religion among us must not be an effeminate sort of thing: we must not be content with milk instead of solid meat, well enough perhaps for those who like it, but not enough to satisfy the wants of men.[22]

While not misogynistic, Wood portrayed women as second-rate parishioners and church workers. He believed that the "strength of a church or congregation reside[d] largely in the young men," and that males should

be at the forefront of all parish work.[23]

Thus inspired, the clergy at St. Thomas's encouraged the establishment of several men's associations, and their upper and middle-class constituents answered the call. Throughout the 1890s the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, an American organization designed as a mission of men to men, operated in the parish.[24] It is worth noting that while former St. Mary's curate John Rouse (who accepted the rectorship of a Chicago, Illinois parish in 1891) sent the earliest description of this association to Newfoundland, the St. Thomas's branch of the Brotherhood, which was the first in the diocese, was established only after Arthur Wood toured the United States and Canada in 1893. Several years earlier, Wood had expressed his concern about the "good deal of beer drinking . . . among the older lads" of St. John's, and saw the Brotherhood as a means for "young tradesmen" to socialize apart from saloons and "bad company."[25] It is clear that the Brotherhood carried a prescriptive mandate: its outreach programs encouraged church involvement and "respectable" behaviour among members of the working class and poor.[26] One of the major activities of the St. Thomas's Brotherhood, for example, was visiting outport vessels moored at the St. John's docks to distribute reading material and to encourage crews to attend church services.[27] By 1903 interest in the Brotherhood had declined, officially because of political rivalry among members. This may seem strange to one unfamiliar with nineteenth-century Newfoundland politics where outport communities were part of districts often represented in the House of Assembly by St. John's men many of whom worshipped at St. Thomas's. For the politically ambitious, shipboard visitation under the auspices of the Brotherhood was an excellent opportunity to campaign for outport votes. Despite this collapse, the association was revived by new rector Edgar Jones in 1916.[28] A St. Mary's branch was not established until 1927.[29]

Another successful, but more long-lived, association was the Church Lads Brigade, or CLB. British in origin,and organized along para-military lines, its stated purpose was "the advancement of Christ's Kingdom among lads of all classes, the promotion of reverence, discipline, and self-respect, all that tends towards true Christian manliness."[30] While also part of "muscular Christianity," the CLB was more openly prescriptive than the Brotherhood: it specifically aimed for physical, mental and moral improvement. In addition, its military structure meant that the mostly upper-class and middle-class leadership could hold clear positions of

authority over the rank-and-file in contrast to the revolving leadership preferred by the St. Mary's Parochial Association. The large crowds that attended annual CLB services after its establishment in 1892 attested to its popularity at St. Thomas's.[31] In contrast, the St. Mary's Company, established by Rector Edward Botwood in 1896 and administered by the Cathedral Company, had disbanded by 1902. While some boys from St. Mary's remained involved in the CLB, it was several decades later before a strong west end company was formed.[32]

Women's Associations

While much of the literature on women's religious experience has focused on the middle-class, McLeod's work has shown that the idea of nineteenth-century women being more active in religious organizations than men was just as, if not even more, true for the working-class.[33] At the same time, Marks has analysed the class composition of women's religious organizations and discovered that while working-class women were often Sunday School teachers and rank-and-file members of voluntary organizations, leadership positions were dominated by the middle-class. In fact, in the towns Marks studied only 25% of Anglican women's organization officers were from the working-class.[34] A comparison of St. Thomas's and St. Mary's therefore provides an excellent opportunity to see if these ideas about women's class-based experience in church-sponsored associations were equally true in neighbourhoods with very different class profiles as well as to see if the type of organization preferred by women was tied to their social status.

According to their mandates and activities, church-sponsored women's organizations have been classified into two basic types: the ladies' aid (or auxiliary) and the women's missionary association. In contrast with the primary women's organization at St. Mary's, which was of the missionary type, the St. Thomas's Women's Association fit the ladies' auxiliary type of organization. Organized in 1879, its members were concerned with raising money for poor relief, local schools, and parish building and improvement. They were also motivated by a need for fellowship, and developed a feeling of identity and belonging in the parish structure.[35] The social function of the St. Thomas's Women's Association can been seen in a report written by president Hale Wood in 1894. She stated that the "opportunities given to members of the parish, who

otherwise would seldom or never see each other, to meet in friendly intercourse have been most valuable" and encouraged parish women of "whatever social grade" to join the group.[36] While officially classless, the Association, like the male fraternities described by Claws, may not have been so functionally. Marks's assessment of female voluntary associations rings true for St. Thomas's: while working-class women may have joined the Association, positions of power and influence were held by a middle-class and upper-class leadership. This can be seen in officer lists for the years 1890 to 1904, which showed that upper-class, middle-class proper and lower middle-class women together held 90% of Association offices. By the turn of the century, half of these offices were going to the members of the lower middle-class, while the number of upper-class officers had declined to 20%. This latter trend was perhaps due to interest in secular feminist activities, which were largely centred in St. John's East.[37]

A favourite form of indirect poor relief administered by female voluntary associations in late-nineteenth-century St. John's was based on the clothing, boot, or coal club model, sometimes referred to as thrift societies. Mainly co-ordinated by middle-class women who believed that such clubs encouraged saving, careful spending and industriousness among the poor, they functioned by imposing middle-class values and an idealized middle-class way of life on the working classes and unemployed. These clubs operated through members' collection of money from the poor on an instalment basis, their solicitation of a donation from a middle-class or upper-class sponsor to supplement these deposits, and their returning of the grand total to the depositor as a "gift certificate" redeemable for predetermined items in a store selected by the organizers.[38]

While a St. Mary's Clothing Club was organized with the encouragement of rector Edward Botwood in 1879, it attracted few members and remained a relatively small organization. In 1888 the club operated on a budget of around $35, compared with the Cathedral club's budget of over $575.[39] At St. Thomas's, the thrift club was organized as a branch of the Women's Association, and the distribution of indirect poor relief in this way became a major parish enterprize.

The St. Thomas's Women's Association's mandate and activities showed that its members not only embraced middle-class ideas of morally reforming the poor to be thrifty and self-reliant, but also accepted the middle-class Victorian gender ideal of women being the "moral guardians" of their families within the home.[40] For example, the system of visitation

used by the Association to decide which poor families deserved financial assistance focused on the domestic abilities of their lower-class "sisters." This can be seen in Hallie Wood's 1889 reflections on households the Association had visited:

> When one considers all the varied work that the wife of the ordinary working man has to get through in the course of a week, one wonders how it can be accomplished. And consider that one moderately-sized room does duty for parlour, kitchen, wash-house, nursery, and all. It is pleasant to think how general is the case that this parlour-kitchen is quite presentable, fit to receive anybody who may come into it.[41]

Using such a measure as a woman's housekeeping ability to determine whether or not a family was "deserving" suggests that the leaders of the Association considered a woman's maintenance of the domestic sphere as an indicator of the respectability of an entire family. Women in the home working as moralizing agents was a key component of nineteenth-century separate spheres ideology, and the Association's approach to helping the poor showed that the middle-class Victorian women of St. Thomas's parish thoroughly embraced the domestic ideals inherent in the concept.[42]

The St. Thomas's Women's Association also carried out a major program of fund raising for parish improvements and class-based experience is apparent in the special projects they supported. Ritualism, which affected Anglican worship in the late-nineteenth century, involved increased use of music, candles, flowers and stained glass to enhance the experience of worship.[43] It has been considered reflective of a change in late-Victorian secular aesthetics, especially the growth of an increasingly consumption-minded middle-class.[44] The congregation at St. Thomas's was one of the first in St. John's to cultivate sacred parish music as performance, and the Women's Association raised most of the money needed to buy new organs for the church in 1881 and 1909.[45] In addition, the congregation extensively renovated their church in 1874, 1882 and 1903, each time adding ritualistic features (such as a centre aisle) to a building that was originally constructed as a Low Church preaching house.[46] The Women's Association and Young Ladies' Guild (which was made in its senior counterpart's image) raised money in support of these projects generally, and also specifically financed the purchase of chancel furniture such as an imported pulpit and choir stalls.[47] Marks's observation

that the Victorian middle and upper-classes built increasing elegant homes in an effort to display their taste and status, and that this impulse was also directed towards constructing large and impressive churches in which they could worship, holds true for St. Thomas's.[48] The support for these church-improvement activities by the parish's female organizations shows the influence of this class experience.

Finally, the St. Thomas's Women's Association presented an interesting opportunity to examine if the social class of members affected the Association's standing and power within the church. In 1892 members of the St. Thomas's Women's Association decided on their own initiative to raise money for construction of a new parish hall rather than continuing to direct most of their profits to the church wardens to pay pre-existing debts. Some members of the congregation disagreed with this change and Arthur Wood, who had written three years earlier that the Association's help in paying off the church debt was "a plain proof, if one were wanted, of the practical benefit of such organizations," felt compelled to defend the women's actions in diplomatic and practical terms:

> Volunteer workers must be permitted, to a large extent, to choose their own object, provided it does not conflict with the welfare of the parish generally . . . [when the rooms open] the ladies who are now aiming to provide the cost . . . will probably be commended by the Parish, not only for their zeal, industry, and perseverance, but also for their prudential foresight, in securing beforehand the cost of the building; contrary to the usual custom of entering upon expenditure first, and meeting the expense as best we can afterwards.[49]

When the new parish building was opened in 1899 St. Thomas's congregation and clergy generally recognized the Association's role in initiating and financing this project. New rector Henry Dunfield even asked the women's permission to name the hall in memory of Arthur Wood, who had died in 1897.[50] In contrast, at a major fund-raising event in 1897 Bishop Llewellyn Jones announced that "whatever comfort and efficiency may be lent to the future working of the parish [by this hall] will be largely owing to [Reverend Wood's] fostering care and foresight." While that speech may have been influenced by grief over Wood's recent death, at the building's opening Bishop Jones recognized the Association's fund-raising efforts but again did not credit the member's initiative and perseverance in the face

of congregational protest.[51] If the members of St. Thomas's Women's Association were empowered in any way by their financial role in the parish, it did not strengthen their place in the diocesan church, especially when one remembers the simultaneous promotion of "muscular Christianity." Being female, it seems, outweighed being a member of a wealthy and powerful family.

In the west end, the situation was somewhat different. Edward Botwood was one of the first Anglican clergy in Newfoundland to publicize the need for members of the church in St. John's to support financially home missions in the outports and Labrador. To this end he organized the Women's Home Missionary Association (WHMA) in 1879, a group that in its first year enrolled 400 members. The local press recognized St. Mary's women as the most active supporters of this project, but credited this to Botwood's influence.[52] An independent St. Mary's WHMA and auxiliary Sewing Circle were organized in 1880, with the stated object of raising money for home missions through the sale of work by Sewing Circle members, holding socials and soliciting collections from parishioners. Besides being of St. Mary's congregation, members were required to pay 5 shillings in annual dues.[53] The popularity of the home mission cause at St. Mary's can be seen in the fact that between 1880 and 1890, St. Mary's WHMA gave nearly $2500 to the Diocesan Synod for home missions, compared to $2200 from St. Thomas's and $2800 from the much larger Cathedral parish.[54] St. Thomas's, especially, seemed to have little interest in home missions. The rector encouraged more concern for this cause, and in the early 1900s he asked that a donation for home missions be included in the St. Thomas's Women's Association's budget. They agreed, and east end interest in home missions began to increase.[55]

Between 1880 and 1899, close to 85% of women who attended St. Mary's WHMA meetings were from either the lower-middle, independent producing or skilled working-classes. Consistass culture ealignment: The ere for skilled working-class women, who made up an average of 37 per cent of attendees. The number of lower middle-class women who attended modestly increased from 27.5 per cent in 1880-84 to 31 per cent by 1895-99.[56] At the same time, between 1880 and 1885 WHMA offices were nearly evenly distributed among the middle-class proper, the lower middle-class and the skilled working-class. However, after 1885 members of the lower middle-class increasingly began to hold the highest number of leadership positions (from 24% in 1880-84 to 44% in 1900-04), followed

by a growing independent-producer presence. The number of middle-class proper officers declined to 13% in 1890-94, but had recovered to 18% by the turn of the century. It is striking that the number of skilled working-class officers declined from 24% in 1880-84 to 12.5% by 1900-04, figures consistent with Marks's findings for small-town Ontario. As was seen with the men's organization, however, the influence of working-class culture in the association's activities remained strong. While this may be tied to the leader's social origins, the numbers provided above show that despite changes in leadership many of the most active and dedicated members of the St. Mary's WMHA were from families headed by artisans.

Unlike ladies' aids, the money raised by missionary associations was directed to the mission field rather than spent in the parish, and was usually handed over to a higher ecclesiastical authority. While they had control of the fund-raising process, the women in missionary associations did not have control of spending, and the literature suggests that this limited their sense of power.[57] The women of St. Mary's congregation, however, appeared to have just as strong a sense of independence as those of St. Thomas's. It is true that St. Mary's women did not have the same financial presence in the parish as was seen in the east end; neither did they determine their own fund-raising mandates. Members of St. Mary's WHMA demonstrated a different type of independence, especially after the mid-1880s. In contrast to St. Thomas's, the president or some other officer, rather than the rector, chaired annual meetings of the Association. Likewise, the women served as auditors of their own accounts.[58]

This pattern changed somewhat after Camplin Cogan began his term as rector in 1902. He began to chair Association meetings, and insisted that all officers meet with him quarterly to discuss Association business. Early in his career Cogan had been missionary in White Bay, and in 1906 he called a special meeting of the Association to tell the women of his special interest in that mission and to ask if all money they raised could be directed exclusively to that part of the island instead of the mission at Random Sound, Trinity Bay, which the WHMA had supported since 1880. The women, seemingly unquestionably, agreed to this change. He also began auditing the Association's books, something members had been doing themselves for almost 30 years.[59] The acceptance of male authority over their organization may have provoked resentment among some of the women at St. Mary's especially because it came (perhaps not coincidentally) during a time when feminist ideas were starting to circulate in St.

John's, especially among the elite women of the East End where Cogan served as curate. Nevertheless, the skilled working-class and lower middle-class women of the St. Mary's WHMA appeared less willing to challenge parish clergy's efforts to control their association than their upper-class and middle-class counterparts at St. Thomas's.

Marks has recognized that lesser amounts of leisure time could limit working-class participation in parochial associations, and this factor appeared to affect the WHMA's activities.[60] The Association had no strong social element, and in the 1880s and 1890s members often held sales of goods in their own homes rather than dedicating much time and effort to organizing large-scale fancy fairs as was seen at St. Thomas's. Such neighbourhood sales may have also shown a community-oriented approach to fund raising, in contrast with the St. Thomas's Women's Association sales, which were often advertized city-wide.[61] After the turn of the century, perhaps because of the growing lower middle-class presence in the association's leadership (or Cogan's influence), the St. Mary's WHMA held more large-scale sales.[62]

Conclusion

In summary, the secular class status of members – and of parishioners generally – influenced what parochial voluntary associations were accepted. Class experience also influenced associational activities and mandates. At St. Thomas's, a middle and upper-class-dominated parish resulted in a network of prescriptive men's and women's associations that favoured, among other things, the promotion of idealized gender roles. At St. Mary's, a parish heavily influenced by skilled working-class culture led to more fraternalistic and community-centred parochial organizations. At St. Thomas's, the middle-class and upper-class women who were active in voluntary associations achieved some measure of power and influence in their parish (perhaps influenced by the growing St. John's feminist movement as well their own financial strength) but this did not translate into a wider diocesan recognition of their efforts and the church continued to promote "muscular Christianity." The skilled working-class and lower middle-class women at St. Mary's asserted a different kind of independence, but were also more willing to accept the imposition of male authority over their association. In addition, this study shows how nebulous lower middle-class experience could be, and that it cannot be understood without

considering the social circumstances in which members of that class lived. At St. Mary's, members of the lower middle-class were closely tied to the skilled working-class and achieved considerable community influence. At St. Thomas's, this group was overshadowed to a large extent by the same upper-class and middle-class proper parishioners they wished to emulate. Finally, one must reflect on a sub-theme running throughout this entire discussion: the extent to which the unskilled working-class, although a presence in both parishes, was alienated from church-based associational activities.

Endnotes

1. James Obelkevich, *Religion and Rural Society: South Lindsey 1825-1875* (London: Oxford University Press, 1976), viii, ix-x; Laura B. Morgan, "Class and Congregation: Social Relations in two St. John's, Newfoundland, Anglican Parishes, 1877-1909," M.A. thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1996. The research on voluntary associations presented in this paper is only one part of a broader analysis that also compared developments in parish administration and financing, liturgy, architecture and interior design, and poor relief.

2. For a historiographic overview see Mark G. McGowan, "Coming Out of the Cloister: Some Reflections on Developments in the Study of Religion in Canada, 1980-1990," *International Journal of Canadian Studies*, 1-2 (1990), 175-202. For examples of these new approaches see Brian Clarke, *Piety and Nationalism: Lay Voluntary Associations and the Creation of an Irish-Catholic Community in Toronto, 1850-1895* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993); Doris Mary O'Dell, "The Class Character of Class Participation in Late Nineteenth Century Belleville, Ontario," Ph.D. diss., Queen's University, 1990; Lynne Sorrel Marks in "'Ladies, Loafers, Knights, and Lasses': the Social Dimensions of Religion and Leisure in Late Nineteenth-Century Small Town Ontario," Ph.D. diss., York University, 1992; Terrence Murphy, "Trusteeism in Atlantic Canada: the Struggle for Leadership among the Irish Catholics of Halifax, St. John's, and Saint John, 1780-1850," in *Creed and Culture: the Place of English-Speaking Catholics in Canadian Society, 1750-1930*, eds. Terrence Murphy and Gerald Stortz (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992).

3. Elizabeth Oliver, "The Rebuilding of St. John's after the Great Fire of 1892: A Study in Urban Morphogenesis," M.A. thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1983, 63, 223-226.

4. For a detailed explanation of the class structure developed for Victorian St. John's and the statistical breakdown for each parish see "Class and Congregation," chapters 3 and 4. In brief, I developed a six-part social hierarchy and placed families based on the occupation of the head of household and family connections. The upper-class was mainly merchants, leading professionals, and high-ranking government officials. The middle-class proper was manufacturers, lesser professionals, management and families in joint craft/commercial enterprizes. Inclusion of the latter group was based on the discussion of artisan-to-merchant mobility in Sean Cadigan, "Artisans in a Merchant Town: St. John's, Newfoundland, 1775-1816," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* (1993): 95-119. The lower middle-class included the classic petty bourgeoisie of shop-keepers and other proprietors, white-collar salaried workers, sea captains and master mariners. For the latter see Eric Sager, *Seafaring Labour: the Merchant Marine of Atlantic Canada, 1820-1914* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989), 105-110. The independent-producing class owned their means of production, and achieved competency by combining it with their own labour. It included farming and fishing families, and self-employed artisans. The skilled working class was made up of artisans and seamen (again based on Sager); the unskilled working class of labourers, teamsters, and service workers. A further methodological note: doing social history for 19th-century Newfoundland is complicated by the fact that there is limited nominal census data available to the researcher. In addition, Anglicans do not keep the kind of membership lists available for other Protestant denominations. My approach to solving these problems was to rely on personal and occupational information provided in church registers and city directories for assigning class status. To get some sense of parish demographics I took an approach to compiling population statistics that presumed three levels of church participation: parishioners, congregation, and leadership. To find the names of "parishioners" – city residents who had at least a rudimentary connection to either St. Thomas's or St. Mary's – I used baptismal registers for the years 1880-1905 in combination with district statistics compiled by other historians of St. John's. The "congregation" were those who had a stronger connection with the churches, and I used diocesan lists of subscribers to the General Church Fund (which were arranged parochially) as my source. Finally, the leadership database was compiled from lists of voluntary

association and parish officers that were available in minute books, local newspapers, and, after 1889, the *Diocesan Magazine.*

5. I do not discuss more centrally controlled voluntary associations that formed in the early-twentieth century such as the Church of England Women's Association (CEWA, later Anglican Church Women or ACW) and the Church of England Men's Society (CEMS).

6. Entry recorded 8 May 1891, *Vestry Minute Book, 1886-1946*, Parish of St. Mary the Virgin Archives; "St. Mary's Association," *Diocesan Magazine* (October 1891); "St. Mary's, St. John's" and "St. Mary's Parochial Association," *Diocesan Magazine* (August 1893); "St. Mary's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (August 1894).

7. Jeffrey Cox, *English Churches in a Secular Society: Lambeth 1870-1930* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 84.

8. *Diocesan Magazine* (August 1893).

9. Parish of St. Thomas, *Constitution and Rules of the Llewellyn Club of St. Thomas's Church* (St. John's: Times Print, 1915).

10. Geoffrey Crossick, "The Emergence of the Lower Middle-Class in Britain: A Discussion," in *The Lower Middle-Class in Britain 1870-1914,* ed. Geoffrey Crossick (London: Croom Helm, 1977), 27-28.

11. Joan R. Gunderen, "The Local Parish as a Female Institution: the Experience of All Saints Episcopal Church in Frontier Minnesota," *Church History* 55, No. 3 (September 1986): 321.

12. Marks, "Ladies, Loafers, Knights and Lasses," 255-257.

13. Mary Ann Clawson, *Constructing Brotherhood: Class, Gender, and Fraternalism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 6-7, 14-17. This view was accepted by Marks in "Ladies, Loafers, Knights and Lasses," 255-257.

14. *Diocesan Magazine* (October 1891).

15. *Church of St. Mary the Virgin, St. John's, Newfoundland, 1859-1984: 125 Years of Service* (St. John's: the Church, 1985), 85; Cox, *English Churches,* 82.

16. St. Thomas's was planning a young men's club of this sort by 1897, and it was in place while Cogan was curate. "St. Thomas's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (June 1897) and (February 1900).

17. "St. Thomas's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (November 1899), (November 1902), (November 1903) and (December 1905).

18. "St. Thomas's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (January 1889).

19. "St. Thomas's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (February 1905) and (April 1906).

20. Marks, "Ladies, Loafers, Knights and Lasses," 25-26, 266-267, 286, 296-297.

21. Gail Bederman, "The Women Have Had Charge of the Church Work Long Enough: The Men and Religion Forward Movement of 1911-12 and the Masculinization of Middle-Class Protestantism," *American Quarterly* 41, No. 3 (September 1980): 434-435.

22. "St. Thomas's, St. John's: Work for Men in the Church," *Diocesan Magazine* (May 1889).

23. "St. Thomas's, St. John's: Our Young Men," *Diocesan Magazine* (February 1896).

24. K.S. Inglis, *Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England* (London: Routledge Press, 1963), 42-43.

25. "Our American Letter," *Diocesan Magazine* (January 1892); "St. Thomas's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (January 1890), (May 1893) and (December 1893); and P.B. Rendell and E.E. Knight, *History of St. Thomas's Church, 1836-1961* (St. John's: s.n., 1961), 48.

26. Inglis, *Churches and the Working Classes*, 42-43.

27. "St. Thomas's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (June 1898) and (July 1901).

28. "Cohesion," *Diocesan Magazine* (July 1903); and Rendell and Knight, *History of St. Thomas's*, 48.

29. *Church of St. Mary the Virgin*, 97.

30. B.E.S. Dunfield, "The Church Lads Brigade," *Newfoundland Quarterly* 11, No. 1 (July 1911): 7-8.

31. See, for example, "St. Thomas's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (December 1907), (November 1908), (October 1912). St. Thomas's, known as the "Old Garrison Church," has a long history of connections with the military. This heritage may have contributed to the popularity of the CLB.

32. "St. Mary's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (November 1907); *Church of St. Mary the Virgin*, 97; and Helen Porter, *Below the Bridge: Memories of the South Side of St. John's* (St. John's: Breakwater, 1979), 1.

33. Hugh McLeod, *Religion and Irreligion in Victorian England: How Secular was the Working Class?* (Bangor, Gwynedd: Headstart History, 1993), 48.

34. Marks, "Ladies, Loafers, Knights and Lasses," 160-175.

35. Barbara Brown Zikmund, "Women's Organizations: Centres of Denominational Loyalty and Expressions of Christian Unity," in *Beyond Establishment: Protestant Identity in a Post-Protestant Age*, eds. Jackson W. Carroll and Wade Clarke Roof (Louisville: West minister/John Knox Press, 1993), 116-38; Marks, "Ladies, Loafers, Knights and Lasses," 146-154; "St. Thomas's, St. John's: St. Thomas's Women's Association," *Diocesan Magazine* (March 1889). In September 1890 the Association held a fancy sale to raise money for a new school room in the east end. See *Evening Herald,* 6 February 1890, 10 March 1890, 12 June 1890. For examples of Association fund being directed towards church debts see "St. Thomas's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (January 1890) and (January 1892).

36. "St. Thomas's Women's Association," *Diocesan Magazine* (June 1894).

37. See Margot Duley, *Where Once Our Mothers Stood We Stand: Women's Suffrage in Newfoundland, 1890-1925* (Charlottetown: Gynergy Books, 1993), 24, 39-44, 53, 59-60.

38. Cox, *English Churches*, 74; Richard J. Helmstadter and Paul T. Phillips, eds., *Religion in Victorian Society: A Sourcebook of Documents* (New York: University Press of America, 1985), 212, 318. Examples include the St. John's Industrial Society (see *Times [St. John's]*, 1 December 1877; the St. John's Self-Assisting Clothing Society (see *Times [St. John's]*, 3 May 1879; and the Dorcas and St. Vincent de Paul societies (see *Times [St. John's]*, 11 February 1880, 8 October 1881, 13 October 1883, 2 November 1887).

39. "St. Mary's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (March 1889) and (September 1889).

40. *Times (St. John's)*, 1 December 1877, 3 May 1879; "St. Thomas's, St. John's: Helping the Poor," *Diocesan Magazine* (February 1893); G. Kitson Clark, *Churchmen and the Condition of England 1832-1885: A Study in the Development of Social Ideas and Practice from the Old Regime to the Modern State* (London: Methuen, 1973), 183, 186.

41. "St. Thomas's Women's Association," *Diocesan Magazine* (March 1889).

42. Linda K. Kerber, "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History," *Journal of American History* 75, No. 1 (June 1988): 14; and Nancy A. Hewitt, "Beyond the Search for Sisterhood: American Women's History in the 1980s," *Social History* 10, No. 3 (1985): 36.

43. Gerald Parsons, "Reform, Ritual, and Realignment: The Experience of Victorian Anglicanism," in *Religion in Victorian Britain: Traditions*, ed. Gerald Parsons (New York: Manchester University Press, 1988), 34-35; and John Shelton Reed, "A Female Movement: the Feminization of Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Catholicism," *Anglican and Episcopal History* 57, No. 2 (June 1988): 199-200.

44. Marks, "Ladies, Loafers, Knights and Lasses," 134-137.

45. *Evening Mercury,* 8 February 1882; *Organ Fund, 1909*, Parish of St. Thomas Archives. By way of comparison, the organ purchased for St. Thomas's in 1909 cost almost $6700 while the new organ for St. Mary's 30 years later only cost $2600, see "St. Thomas's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (June 1907) and (May 1909); and *Church of St. Mary the Virgin, 1859-1894*, 110.

46. *Times (St. John's)*, 2 January 1875; LeMessurier, *Church of St. Thomas*, 16; Rendell and Knight, *History of St. Thomas's Church*, 23; "St. Thomas's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (January 1904), (February 1904), (July 1904); and Frederick Jones, "Edward Wix," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography IX.*

47. "St. Thomas's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (April 1912), (October 1912), (February 1913), (August 1913).

48. Marks, "Ladies, Loafers, Knights and Lasses," 134-137.

49. "St. Thomas's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (June 1889) and (January 1892).

50. "St. Thomas's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (November 1897).

51. "St. Thomas's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (December 1897), (April 1898), (April 1899), (June 1899), (October 1899).

52. *Times (St. John's)*, 2 May 1888; "Women's Home Missionary Association," *Diocesan Magazine* (December 1889).

53. Minutes recorded 9 February 1880, 11 January 1881, and 7 April 1881, *Women's Missionary Association Minute Book, 1880-1909*, Parish of St. Mary the Virgin Archives.

54. "Women's Home Missionary Association," *Diocesan Magazine* (July 1890).

55. "St. Thomas's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (March 1898), (March 1900), (December 1900), (January 1902), (March 1904), (March 1905), (April 1906), (March 1907), (May 1908), and (April 1910).

56. Statistics compiled from *St. Mary's Women's Missionary Association Minute Book, 1880-1909*, Parish of St. Mary the Virgin Archives.

57. Zikmund, "Women's Organizations," 116-38; Marks, "Ladies, Loafers, Knights and Lasses," 146-154.

58. Minutes recorded 18 April 1882, 19 April 1883, 23 April 1884, 9 April 1886, 21 April 1891, 26 April 1892, 27 April 1893, 24 April 1894, 30 April 1896, 26 January 1897, 27 January 1898, *Women's Missionary Association Minute Book, 1880-1909*, Parish of St. Mary the Virgin Archives; and "St. Mary's Branch of the WHMA," *Diocesan Magazine* (June 1891), (June 1896), (March 1898).

59. Minutes recorded 27 January 1903, 2 February [1904], 10 July 1906, *Women's Missionary Association Minute Book, 1880-1909*, Parish of St. Mary the Virgin Archives; "St. Mary's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (January 1889) and (May 1911).

60. Marks, "Ladies, Loafers, Knights and Lasses," 160-175.

61. Minutes recorded 23 April 1884, 29 April 1890, 24 April 1894, 27 January 1899, *Women's Missionary Association Minute Book, 1880-1909*, Parish of St. Mary the Virgin Archives; and *Times (St. John's)*, 2 February

1884.

62. "St. Mary's, St. John's," *Diocesan Magazine* (March 1902) and (August 1909).

Like Water on a Rock: Ordained Women and the Transformation of Canadian Anglicanism

WENDY FLETCHER-MARSH

It was a cold morning, brisk in its November anticipation of early winter. In the sacristy of a small rural church an older woman was busy putting on the vestments of her priesthood. The occasion of that morning Eucharist was of particular significance to those gathered – it was an anniversary service. On that cold day, 30 November 1996 a notable number of "regular" and a few guests had gathered to mark the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the ordination of women to the priesthood. For the woman slipping the stole and chasuble over her alb in the sacristy it was also the twentieth anniversary of her own ordination to the priesthood. As she looked at her reflection in the tiny mirror hung on the back of the closet door, the young woman beside her, ready and waiting, holding the heavy cross on its long wooden pole looked at the priest and asked somewhat sharply (as perhaps only a twelve-year-old can do), "what difference do you think it has made – I mean do you think it has made any difference that they ordained you, that they have been ordaining women to the priesthood for twenty years now?" Somewhat taken aback and yet not taken by surprise the priest answered reflectively, "I'm not sure. It has made a difference to me. I have done what I love and what I think God wanted me to do for the last twenty years and longer. But beyond that – I'm not sure I could say."

The question posed by that twelve-year-old in a tiny sacristy almost a year ago was not unique. The question – "what difference has it made"? – is no stranger to the historical mind. Any who seek to examine the

changing place of women in ecclesiastical structures in the twentieth century must eventually come up against just such a question. This paper is one person's attempt to begin the process of addressing that question with all of the limitations and perils implicit in attempting the historical analysis of a phenomenon which is still happening and indeed will continue to unfold long after this generation of thinkers and readers is gone. One might ask – what is the dateline between journalism and historical study anyway? It is my contention that the first twenty years of women in the priesthood in the Anglican Church of Canada is a feasible project for historical investigation. However, the lens through which we look today is unique to us and will be replaced by later generations. Today we only begin to formulate an understanding which later generations of historians and historical actors will of course redact and re-formulate. Some have argued that the greatest discovery of the post-Newtonian era is the realization that unadulterated objectivity is impossible. When we study something we change it and in turn are changed by it. It is with full awareness of this dialectical relationship between the desired empirical objectivity of the standard academic genre and the necessary subjectivity implicit in all human experience and narrative that I embark on this journey of exploration.

The methods I have employed to develop some response to the primary question – "what difference has it made?" – themselves reflect the dialectical tension between objectivity and subjectivity. Given the time frame which this study explores (1976-1996) little archival material was available to me. As such, it was incumbent upon me to generate a database which would in some way shed light on the question at hand. I chose the method of prosopography illumined by oral history to achieve this goal. The assumption here is that until we know something about who these women are, we cannot make any assessment of what their lives and work have meant. Who are they then becomes the necessary first question.

Prosopography or collective biography requires access to human beings or information about them. As such, I began the process of finding the numbers and names of women actually ordained to the priesthood in the Anglican Church of Canada as of 1996 (no central repository of this information is kept by the church). I then circulated to these women (476 in all) a questionnaire which asked for basic biographical information and for reflective responses to specific questions about their vocation and experience. After two mailings I closed the database with a response rate

of just over 61%. I then conducted selected interviews with women of diverse perspective and experience to shed further light on the empirical data. While sociologists might argue that a 61% rate of return will give a reasonably representative profile of the group studied, I am not approaching this study with that as a direction. In other words, rather than saying that my statistical and narrative findings are representative of the whole 476, I have decided to understand the material as representative of what it is – the experience and stories of 291 women in the priesthood. The others elected not to participate in the study and as such their experience is inaccessible to the historian at this juncture. What I am presenting here is a profile of women in the priesthood in Canada which is as comprehensive as possible but which is not complete (if any historical study is ever complete).

Something must be said about the way in which this paper understands the use of prosopography. At first glance, it appears that this database was formulated to find the dominant features of a particular group within a single denomination and national context within a narrow time frame. However, as the commonalities in the backgrounds, personal lives, vocations, career patterns and ministry experiences began to emerge, it was clear that identification of contextual variants was essential to a meaningful analysis of the data. The data base and narrative text demonstrated that diversity was as striking as commonality and attention to the subtle diversity within the commonality is critical to understanding the subject.

Given the layers of diversity inherent within the more general categories of commonality, the collective profile can only be understood in a comparative fashion. For example, 47% of women said that they have experienced sexual harassment in ministry but what they meant by that, as well as what those who said they had not had such an experience meant, is only measurable in light of great diversity of perspective and experience.

While I was in the process of collecting data for this study, some expressed concern that the genre of prosopography would turn great inherent diversity into a melting pot. Just the opposite is the case. While prosopography does show patterns and trends, it also highlights places of glaring disjuncture both within and outside of the trends. The perspective which frames the context for this paper is grounded in the notion that no phenomenon can be understood as a solitary event existing in isolation from all other historical events and realities. As such, any attempt to say anything meaningful about any historical phenomenon implies comparison,

whether or not the historian is acknowledging the parameters of implicit comparison which have factored into the final analysis. Contextual variants can be refined to almost microcosmic proportion. All historical analysis requires the identification of significant contextual factors which influence outcomes of historical processes. These contextual factors help the historian to track consistencies and points of difference in each situation. Identifying not only significant factors, but distinguishing factors (factors which distinguish actor A from actor B, or context A from context B) are a necessary pre-condition of valid interpretation. In other words, in all historical analysis the implicit and microcosmic diversity of historical and human processes must be recognized explicitly as the container within which all causation happens. To do anything less is to shortchange the potential depth of one's analysis. Prosopography then becomes a vehicle for defining a container for interpreting diversity rather than an attempt to homogenize and present all subjects as the same.

It is clear to me, after creating a collective profile of ordained Anglican women in Canada that the beginning place of wisdom in the exploration of the history of these pioneer women lies not in their collectivity alone. Rather, their collective identity and experience can only be interpreted when the polarities, the poles of their diverse experience and practise of ministry are identified in comparative relationship with each other. The Anglican axiom of unity in diversity provides a paradigm for interpreting this rich twenty-year history. It is not my intention to compare diversity against some baseline of normativity – such a theorized baseline only defeats the richness of a microcosmic comparative approach. Rather, I use the tool of comparative analysis as a point of departure to explore the incredible plethora of dominant realities which characterize this tapestry and to discern the subtexts of majority and minority experience.

As the study began to take shape, it became self-evident that weaving the story of these women alone would not adequately frame a way of answering our primary question of investigation, i.e, "what difference has it made?" Further layers were then added to the study. A small group of male clergy ordained from the same period randomly selected from across the country were asked the same questions addressed to the women. While 200 men were approached to participate in the study only 103 chose to do so providing a lower rate of return than in the women's case (51%). Finally, thirty parishes who have experienced the ministry of women enthusiastically participated in the study. This final aspect of the study may

take us closest to answering our primary question. While very few of those in the parish groups were able to directly answer the question of difference and meaning, all attempted to respond to it. The form of their response although not requested was almost universal – the people from parishes began to tell stories of individual women whom they had known in ministry. The fabric of those stories fashion the wisdom and interpret the meaning which can be had at this juncture with regard to the last twenty years.

As is probably apparent from this introduction, this paper utilizes statistics, narrative text and story to construct its analysis – to fashion its wisdom. I will begin with a look at the basic statistical profile of the 291 women, and then unpack nuances in that profile through the identification of significant subtexts leading toward some response to the question- what difference has it made from the perspective of the women themselves. Finally, I will consider the perspective of the thirty parishes from the vantage point of both statistics and story to formulate a response to our initial question what difference has it made in relation to the parishes and people who have lived with women in the priesthood and to the ecclesiastical structures which they all inhabit.

Confidentiality was guaranteed for both women clergy and parish participants in this study. There appeared to be no other way of responding to the multiplicity of issues inherent in a writing about living subjects. As such, no parishes or individuals will be named other than through the study identification number given to them by me. Several participants did not identify themselves to me and even I know them only by number. Naming names has never been the purpose – discerning collective patterns and unique wisdom more effectively meet the challenges of our undertaking.

A Statistical Profile

In this collective biography the basic categories of families of origin, personal back ground (including work history, vocation and education), ministry employment patterns, and experience of ministry were unpacked with a series of questions. The most significant of these will be elaborated here.

Family of Origin

Within the group of 291, place in birth order was varied. However, the single largest group identified itself as eldest children – 42%. 13% were only children while 23% were the youngest in the family and the marginally smallest category with 22% were middle children. 47% of the sample identified the socio-economic class of their family of origin as middle-class. No direction was given as to what constituted middle-class and it was apparent that people interpreted the category differently. Both women with parents with grade school education and working in the traditionally designated "blue-collar" workforce and women with parents who had post-graduate university degrees in traditional "white-collar professions" chose this category. A couple of women did not self-designate as they found this category offensive. 32% stated that they were raised in working-class families (again undesignated) and 19% chose upper-middle, with no one electing to identify their families as "upper-class."

The educational level of parents was somewhat surprising in light of other studies on the educational background of the parents of women in professions newly opened to women. Other studies have indicated that the first generations of women in a profession tend to come from families with a significant degree of post-secondary education.[1] Such was not the case here. The largest single group of fathers held an elementary school education (34%). 32% had secondary school diplomas while 22% held baccalaureates and a further 12% a post-graduate degree. Interestingly, the largest single group of mothers held a order was eldest diploma (46%), with the next largest group holding an elementary school diploma (36%). 15% held a baccalaureate degree and 3% held a post-graduate degree of some kind. While mothers held fewer university degrees than the fathers, they also had a higher level of basic education than did the fathers.

The occupations of fathers and mothers were diverse and revealed little significant pattern. The largest single group of fathers (worked in the category of "professions" including doctors, lawyers, teachers, dentists, clergy and university professors. The next largest group worked (31%) worked in the trades. This category included plumbers, steamfitters, electricians, farmers and tool and die makers among others. 24% of the fathers in the sample worked in some form of business/enterprise, often self-employed or as sales representatives. 6% of the men worked in factory work and another 6% in service industries. None were identified as primarily homemakers. The mothers were primarily homemakers with 62%

of women designated in this category – not a typical for the time period. However, the remainder of the sample did engage in paid work outside of the home. The single largest category for this work was employment in the service industry (19%). 10% worked in white-collar professions, 5% in the trades, 2% as factory workers and a further 1% as self-employed business people.

Personal Background

This study measured several aspects of the personal background of women clergy. In this category, diversity seems more evident than any significant pattern. I found that as one might expect a significant majority of women clergy are Canadian citizens (81%). 14% hold dual citizenship from Canada and one of either the USA, Great Britain and Australia. Three are American citizens and 1% retain British citizenship.

The largest single category in birth order was eldest child. 42% of participants in the study were eldest children. 23% were youngest children, 22% were middle children and 13% grew up as only children. This profile once again seems to parallel some studies on birth order and profession which suggest that people inclined to the clerical life tend most often to be drawn from the category of eldest child.[2] Only 8% were children of clergy, relative to 18% of their male clergy peers.

At the time of the study, 55% of participants were married; 24% were single; 14% were divorced and 17% were widows. These statistics challenge a popular myth which holds that most women clergy are divorced women. In fact, the 14% of participants who are divorced reflect a smaller contingent of divorced clergy than their male peer group who were divorced at the rate of 22% (current status). 66% of the women were either raising or had raised children. 19% of the women are part of a clergy couple – their spouse is also a priest, while 3% of their male colleagues found themselves within that category.

The level of education for women clergy is high – reflecting the Canadian House of Bishops standard for ordination (Master of Divinity [M.Div.] degree or equivalent). 73% of the women in the study hold the M.Div. degree. 16% hold undergraduate degrees in theology. 8% hold no degree and 3% hold doctoral degrees (including D.Min. and Ph.D.). Relative to their male counterparts, women ordained in the last twenty years both have more and less overall education. In other words, more hold the M.Div. degree – 73% versus 68% of male clergy – but fewer have

pursued doctoral studies – 3% versus 12%.

An overwhelming number of women chose the vocation of ordained ministry (or were chosen by it) as a second, third or fourth vocation. 94% of those who participated prepared for ordination after at least ten years in other life paths or professions. This reflects an overall trend in the ministry toward second vocations. However, the number of second vocations among women was much higher than among male clergy respondents. 94% of women were ordained as a second vocation while only 68% of men fell into this category.

Tracking the dates of ordination for women reveals an interesting trend. The study measured numbers of women ordained by five-year increments. 9% of women clergy studied were ordained in the first five years. Between 1981 and 1985 a further 25% were set apart. Between 1985 and 1989 a further 45% of women were ordained. Between 1990 and 1996 21% of the total accepted holy orders. What do we see here? There does not appear to be an increasing or expanding trend in the ordination of women. Some fear that women clergy are "taking over the church" with an exponential growth in their number with advancing years. While it is true that there is a steadily growing number of clergy, there is not a proportional growth. The bulk of ordinations occurred during the 1980s – 70%, relative to 30% in the decade framing the 1980s (in two five-year increments).

The bulk of ordinations during the 1980s become even more interesting when one correlates dates of ordination with birth dates and forms of ministry. 5% of the women clergy were born between 1910 and 1920; 13% were born between 1921 and 1930; 19% were born between 1931 and 1940; 38% were born between 1941 and 1950; 19% were born between 1951 and 1960 and only 6% were born between 1961 and 1970. The bulk of women clergy are in their late forties and their fifties. 37% are over the age of 57. Only 6% (as of 1996) were under the age of 37. When one correlate ages with ordination dates one discovers that these young women were almost universally (with a statistically unmeasurable exception – under 1%) ordained in the 1980s. In other words, vocations among young women are almost unheard of in this decade (while young men in decreasing numbers continue to present themselves for ordination). Furthermore, with the exception of the first group of women ordinands a majority of women who are 60 and over have been ordained in this decade. One might hypothesize a general trend in aging among the clergy

especially when this is paired with statistics from male clergy peers. While the statistics are not as dramatic, the proportion of older men seeking ordination has risen dramatically in this decade. The Anglican Church of Canada is an aging church with an aging clergy (preponderantly but not universally) – even its newest clergy.

The relationship between age and current ministry position is also interesting. First let us consider the categories of current (as of 1996) employment. The largest single category of women (47%) are working in paid full-time parish ministry; 12% in part-time paid parish ministry; 12% are retired but in active parish ministry; 8% are in pari-time non-stipendiary ministry; 2% are in full-time non-stipendiary ministry. A total of 81% identify themselves as working in parish ministry in some fashion. The remaining 19% defined themselves in relation to ministry in the following fashion: 6% in institutional chaplaincy; 3% in theological education; 6% left ministry to raise children; 5% left church work and are employed in the secular arena or are looking for work there.

It is notable that 81% are self-confessedly active in parish work of some kind. Those in chaplaincy and theological education and raising their children also live for the most part in parishes and are actively engaged in the life of their parish communities. Only 5% overall consciously rejected church work and with that choice most disaffiliated from regular parish involvement also. That leaves 95% still intact in relation to the institutional church. However, considered from another angle, less than half of women clergy are working in the "traditional" career path of full-time paid parish ministry (relative to 72% of their male clergy peers).

The variety among women clergy in terms of part-time work for the church is striking. What this demonstrates is that women are on different career paths than their male counter-parts in many cases. Is this difference by choice or lack of options? The answer depends largely on individual women. Some who are not in full-time paid ministry state that diocesan structures and parish communities have not been open to their ministries. Some hypothesize that while parishes will accept women as an assistant they do not want women in the position of rector, which is what most full-time paid positions are. Other women are clear that they have had no impediment to the progression of their clerical careers because of their gender. 61% of women in the study stated that they have experienced no gender barriers in their career and some even stressed that at times they felt their gender had been an advantage in their employment situation. One

woman writes: "I haven't experienced gender barriers in the progression of my career – in fact just the reverse most times. If I let my name stand for a diocesan committee I will likely be elected and I suspect it's because I'm a woman in a climate where gender equality is still a concern."[3] Many who work part-time stated that they did this because of personal choice. Many had no desire to fit into the traditional model of full-time rector. Accepting or pursuing part-time work in creative combinations was the stated choice of many women.

The 6% of women who state that they left paid ministry to raise children are an interesting group in relation to this issue. They are interesting because they represent most of the young women who participated in the study – those in their thirties who were ordained in the 1980s. Many of the youngest women have left to raise families – at first an apparent motherhood and apple pie issue having little to do with the church. However, most of this 6% state that they would not have left parish ministry if parishes and diocesan structures had been more willing to accommodate the life cycle of a woman with a young family. Repeated concern with intransigent structures, and expectations about the way in which one must exercise priesthood within parish communities revealing itself in inflexible expectations was expressed. It raises a significant question – if women are to serve the church as priests, does that mean "fit in here girls or else"? Is the church willing to accommodate the different life-cycles of some women in its expectations of ordained persons? Does inflexibility and a desire to have women exercise ministry which conforms to the pattern of their male contemporaries have something to do with the fact that most women now serving as priests and presenting themselves for ordination tend to be beyond the child-bearing age?

There are some who argue that women are no different from men and that difference in gender should make no difference to ministry. In a sense this is a defensible position – our humanity rather than our gender is the defining criteria for priesthood. However, such generalizations fail to do justice to the microcosmic diversity of all of us – a diversity which transcends even the social construct of gender. We are not all priests in the same way. The diversity which defines our humanity of necessity shapes a diverse priesthood. Any attempt to disqualify the social construct of gender as a critical component in the formation and elaboration of our diversity consigns us to simplistic and unhelpful generalizations, rather than to a critical and complex analysis of fascinating subjects. It also

truncates the rich potential for ministry to be nurtured in the bosom of a diverse community.

One cannot ignore the fact that 39% of respondents in the study did state that their gender has been an impediment or obstacle in the pursuit of their chosen vocation. Many women expressed the concern that diocesan hierarchies and parishes had been less than supportive of their ministries. Some contend that they had directly experienced bias which held that woman might serve as assistants but never as a rector in a given parish.

> I have experienced discrimination in applying for parishes. It has been made clear to me on two occasions where the parochial committee did not want a woman priest but went through the motions of the interviews because the bishop told them they had to. In my region all of my colleagues are male. During regional meetings they are usually referred to as Father or Reverend and yet they, male and female laity and clergy alike refer to me by my first name.[4]

Interestingly, many of the women who expressed concern over discrimination also talked about the shifts in attitude that they had witnessed first-hand as parishes lived with the ministries of women they had initially not wanted. When communities live with the ministry of women their fears and prejudice tends to undergo some transformation in a positive direction. Within diocesan ecclesia structures few women hold places of institutional authority beyond their own parishes. While there were some women who participated in the study that were Archdeacons and regional deans, the proportion was small – just over 1%.

Related to the issue of gender barriers and professional placement is the contentious question of sexual harassment. Intentionally, this study did not define sexual harassment. It simply asked women if they had experienced it in the context of their ordained ministry. Room was provided for people to elaborate on their response if they chose. While this lack of precision is problematic for the statistician, for the social historian it allowed for some exploration of nuances of interpretation and definition – anecdotal rather than statistical.

53% of respondents said that they had not experienced sexual harassment. Comments proffered on the choice of a negative response reflected diverse understandings of what harassment was and was not. Many who said that they had not experienced sexual harassment shared

stories of experiences which by others' criteria would have fallen within the realm of harassment. For example, one women who was clear that she had not experienced sexual harassment (harassment because of gender) was physically assaulted by a priest in her deanery after her ordination to the diaconate. He threatened her saying that if she ever moved to accept orders as a priest he would kill her. The police took this threat seriously enough that on the night of her ordination to the priesthood, they were stationed at the airport, train station and church just in case this priest showed up to follow through on his threat.[5]

Another woman talked of a similar painful experience. As an older single woman, she had been working for several months after her ordination in an isolated location. Most parishioners had been welcoming – a few remained either openly hostile or cautiously reserved. One evening she returned to the rectory after an evening prayer service held in a church several miles from her home. When she arrived she found the back door of her house open. Nervously she entered her kitchen, calling out asking if anyone was there. From the shadows of her kitchen a parishioner who had been openly hostile emerged. He said, "It's time you learned that your kind are not welcome here." He then sexually assaulted her. He was later prosecuted for this criminal act and convicted. This woman priest is adamant that she has not experienced sexual harassment in her ministry.

47% of the study respondents stated that they had experienced sexual harassment. The stories of these happenings were as diverse as the responses from those who stressed that they had not experienced sexual harassment. The stories ranged from reports of relatively minor slights, to graphic propositioning, to actions which were concertedly aggressive and at times violent. 31% stated that their primary experience of harassment was from male clergy peers, 11% from laity and 5% from seminary professors. Interestingly, virtually all of this 5% (with the exception of one individual) studied at one particular theological college during the 1980s. The level of participation in this study of graduates from that school was lower than other schools and yet they comprised the whole 5%.

The stories which were predominant told of encounters with male clergy. It seems to have been those experiences which were most disturbing to women clergy and therefore uppermost in their consciousness. The expectation of professional collegiality when frustrated was experienced as one of the most difficult dimensions of the new work.

As I prepared the original parameters of this study, I encountered a

surprising expectation. More than one individual raised a question about the inclusion of questions about sexual harassment in the study. Some made speculations that there would be a correlation between level of education and response to the sexual harassment questions. Indeed, there was a correlation but it was not the one which some had hypothesized. The greater the level of education the more likely it was that women said yes in the category of sexual harassment. This is starkly illustrated by the following: in the category of those priests without a university degree 0% said that they had experienced sexual harassment; in the category of people with a doctorate 100% answered in the affirmative with regard to sexual harassment. The percentages rose in increments by degree (BA; M.Div; Ph.D.). A correlation between age and date of ordination and a positive or negative response to these questions is also discernable. The women born in 1930 or earlier most frequently said no they had not experienced sexual harassment. The largest single group of respondents in the affirmative were those born between 1940 and 1959. Interestingly, the youngest women (born in 1960 or later) had the second lowest rate of affirmative response. The women in their forties and fifties were the most likely to experience sexual harassment. Date of ordination is also significant. 76% of all those who stated that they had experienced sexual harassment were ordained in the 1980s. Only 9% of affirmative respondents were ordained in the 1970s and 17% in the 1990s.

What can be said about the sexual harassment of women clergy in light of these statistics and the discursive elaborations collected for this study? Correlative factors such as education, age and ordination dates in conjunction with narrative text indicate that the issue is not as much whether women have experienced sexual harassment but rather one of consciousness. Different contexts, experiences and generations form individual and generational consciousness. The particular consciousness of the individual seems to be the most significant factor in determining whether or not a woman says she has experienced sexual harassment. Events themselves become secondary in the naming process.

Undergirding the diverse attitudes on the experience of sexual harassment is a notable uniformity, however. This uniformity lies in the overall assessment by women of the meaning and place of sexual harassment in their ministry experiences. Whether or not a woman says she has experienced sexual harassment, most indicate that harassment is not the issue. Most agree that it is not ultimately an obstacle to ministry. Those

who say it does exist and they do live with it, generally tend to agree that it has not prevented them from doing the work to which they have committed themselves. Clearly, there is agreement that people should not be treated in an unfair or obstructionist manner because of their gender. However, most have developed coping mechanisms to either avoid, or confront and often transcend the obstacle such experiences become. Even though such encounters were named as painful and distressing, they were consistently relegated to the realm of the marginal concern. The commitment to ministry and energy for doing it was not overwhelmed by the pain engendered by harassment. Few who have left professional ministry cited sexual harassment as a factor, while in several cases perceived institutional gender barriers was cited as a factor in career leaving.

Ministry Experience

94% of the women who participated in the study came to ministry as a second vocation, while only 6% came to the work as their first career. I will look at the second vocation women as a group with regard to vocational discernment and then the first vocation women as a group. However, before I look at the vocation of the two groups separately some interesting parallelism should be noted. Time and again adolescence was noted as a critical point in the vocational awareness process. The difference between most of those who were second vocation and those who were first vocation is the lack of opportunity to even consider priesthood at that stage of their lives for those who were born before 1960. Decades before the question of women in the priesthood was raised by the church, there were women who felt passionately called to church work and had the experience of identifying with the priest – "I could do that work; I would love to do that work" For second vocation women that sentiment was quickly dismissed and in many cases not reconsidered for decades.

The second vocation women for the most part pursued other careers before preparing for priesthood. 11% had been primarily homemakers, while the remaining 89% had worked in other arenas before ordination. As one might expect, there is a heavy preponderance of work in the traditional helping professions- teaching, nursing, social work. Many others worked in some form of business, either as self-employed entrepreneurs or as sales representatives or administrators. This balance of helping professions (71%) and business related employment (27%) – 3%other – is remarkably consistent with the comparative sample of second vocation male clergy

(67% helping professions; 29% business related; 4% other).

Consistent among the second vocation women is the gradual evolution of their vocational discernment. No participants in the study made a speedy career change. Most listened carefully over a period of many years to gentle and sometimes not so gentle nudging from the Holy Spirit and others in the community toward priesthood. Many prepared for priesthood through part-time theological studies over a number of years and in a variety of ways. Their unfolding sense of vocation was nurtured in the bosom of love of people. The desire to share with people in the unfolding journey of their lives in a sacramental way is a consistent theme. The meeting place between personal faith and the desire to share that faith and support others in theirs was the birthplace of many of these vocations. The parameters of this personal faith are broad and diverse. Statements about personal faith ranged from accounts of ecstatic religious conversion and experience, to medical and spiritual healings to stories of quiet faith developed and nurtured over a lifetime. The language for naming God was also diverse, but a consistent christocentrism recurred in many discussions of vocation. Perception of God's call and love for and the support of the community were the point of confluence for priestly vocation.

The words used to express personal vocation and calling parallelled the sample of male clergy. The only significant difference was a greater emphasis on God's call and less on the needs and love of the people. Both elements were present in the male and female sample but in inverse proportionate relationship.

The group of first vocation women used similar language of call and love of people. However, many of the younger women talked about their experience of being young and idealistic and still forming as persons: "I began my formal theological training when I was 22; at 22 I was still searching for who I was and what I wanted to do. Exploring vocation to priesthood was in a part a safe avenue for exploring who I was."[6] Many of the older women became disillusioned with work in other helping professions and turned to ministry as a greater opportunity for service.

> I sought ordination because I stood alone praying one day at the front of my church and I was asking God what I could do in this world other than what I was doing – I had been a teacher for many years and had become very disappointed in education; I couldn't make the difference I had hoped to. The answer, "You can be a priest" brought

> rebuke from me. "God," I said, "the Anglican Church doesn't ordain women." Later that day a friend stopped by seeking subscriptions to the *Living Message* magazine. The page she flipped open first showed women with collars on. I decided to pursue it and continued through open doors over several years.[7]

The first and second vocation women differed in that the younger group went first to the church as a vehicle for serving people and God – with their hope to make a difference to the world in people's lives. The possibility of such work was open to them as a vocational choice. Perhaps the fact that many of these women no longer work for the church reflects the fact that there is a life cycle to disillusionment. First vocation women experienced their first institutional disillusionment with church rather than moving to the church later in a life as an alternative when other work had became less meaningful.

Regardless of age or marital status male and female clergy all talk about the difficulty in balancing home, work and Sabbath time. This difficulty was most keenly felt in relation to parish ministry. Given the nature of congregational life, the parochial leadership role is not a nine to five job. It can expand to take as much time as one will give it. The actual parameters of the working day can stretch from morning to night – night work is necessary and not an option. Weekends for the most part are non-existent. All of these unique dimensions of the parochial clerical life can make family life and personal time difficult to navigate. Most women and men talked about the importance of setting clear limits on time available to the parish. Setting aside one day a week (but usually not more) seemed the most common vehicle for attempting to ensure some family or personal time. The single women in the study stressed that protecting some personal time was as critical for them as for the married women. Because of their single status it was generally assumed by many that their woman priest was available for parish week 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Parishes were not noted for their awareness of the need to respect limits. Indeed, young women with children (many who had left paid parish work) stressed the failure of parishes and diocesan structures to accommodate the rythmns and needs of family life. In the clergy couple (19% of the total sample) these issues of time, family and parish and diocesan expectations appear to be most acute:

> I feel a strong vocation to ordained ministry and I believe I am a good priest – modelling in my life the love of God for us and the call to be faithful to God. However, the realities of church hierarchy and structure and the realities of being married to a priest are such that I find myself unable to work in the structure. We have three small children to care for and provide a home for. Being raised in a rectory I know the importance of a loving, stable home.Our proposal to share work at home and in the church was met with resistance. Partnership is important to us as a couple and the church's lack of commitment to it (the concept of partnership) and to us as a family is distressing.[8]

The unconscious assumption that the vocation of priest means sacrifice on a variety of levels (including financial, time and family life) appear to be present still in many aspects of the parish experience. Such unnamed expectations not universally but commonly held still, seriously limit the possibility of healthy balance between work, home and family and personal time for any priest – male or female. The issue becomes particularly critical for clergy families attempting to live a dual vocation and raise a family. The stresss in this regard was relieved somewhat as children grew older. Clergy with grown children are the least vocal in their concerns about the dynamics of parish demands and family life.

One other area of concern which was raised in relation to family life was the challenges associated with living in rectories. Issues of privacy and access compounded the complexity of attempting to balance work and family. One woman priest who is part of a clergy couple wrote:

> When you live close to the church it is harder to have a sense of separation between work and home. There was no parish hall and so the office was in the rectory. Parishioners understood the rectory to be church property, "the church house" and thereby public. During our first weeks there both my husband and I had the experience of walking out of the bathroom after showering on the main floor directly into waiting parishioners! After that we started locking the screen door (most parishioners had keys to the rectory) and carrying our clothes to the bathroom with us!! The rectory was not hooked up to city water. It had a cistern which held water for bathing but which was contaminated and could not be drunk. The day we moved in a parishioner dropped by with two plastic water jugs which the parish had provided for the last priest and were now passed on to us. We

> were told the parish couldn't afford to have drinking water brought in so we could take our jugs to parishioners' houses and fill them up when we needed to. They held about three litres each! Well, we were fairly poor ourselves and so (I can't believe it now) while we were there we did just that. It was our first parish and I guess we didn't want to rock the boat.[9]

Boundary issues are particularly acute when the lines between work and home are muddied by rectory living and the clergy couple experience.

In the arena of ministry experience much diversity was evident in the stories shared. However, in two areas a striking level of unanimity was present – greatest joys and most difficult aspects of the work. Regardless of age common themes ran through both of these areas.

While many women elaborated particular aspects of the job that they particularly enjoyed (preaching, teaching, presiding, pastoral care) these specifics were presented in a relatively uniform container. Overwhelmingly women talked about the joy they found in sharing in people's lives with theme – the joys and sorrows, the full drama of human experience. Relationship was the theme consistently honoured as a source of primary job satisfaction.

> The greatest joy of parish ministry for me is being in relationship with parishioners. It, for me is an amazing honour to be trusted enough to carry the difficult stories parishioners often tell me. It is amazing to be allowed to share in some of the most intimate moments of life – birth, marriage, death. Sharing the walk and the work is what I love.[10]

This emphasis on sharing the daily journey was something of a contrast to how the male sample responded. Most male respondents emphasized the aspects of the job they liked – sacramental, preaching, teaching and few used the language of relationship. This difference may be a difference in expression rather than meaning. However, the emphasis on relationship was striking among the women and raised interesting issues in relation to the nature of the pastoral relationship particularly with reference to counselling and spiritual direction. Since the 1950s it has been normative to think of the preparation and training of clergy as an exercise in the formation of professionals – similar to the preparation of a doctor, lawyer teacher. Much emphasis has been placed on the importance of professionalism in the pastor/parishioner relationship. While the impor-

tance of professionalism particularly in the arena of sexual ethics cannot be understated, professionalism alone does not express the meaning of the pastor/parishioner relationship as experienced by many of the women clergy in the study. Many talked about their love for their people. Others talked about the importance of friendships in the pastoral relationship. In violation of traditional taboos (parishioners cannot be friends), some women clergy stated that old models of spiritual direction and pastoral care did not adequately reflect their experience. Many said that they affirmed a model of spiritual friendship rather than direction and that friendship and emtotional intimacy was a necessary pre-requisite to caring for the spiritual needs of their parishioners. Rather than seeing themsevles as the ones with all the answers, many women clergy understood themselves to be partners on a journey and occasional guides. However, they themselves needed the support and guidance of those whom for whom they were hired to be pastor on occasion. Peer pastoral relationships was how one women put this. Does this self-understanding reflect a gradually emerging shift in the paradigm of ministry as we have heretofore understood it?

Major negatives in the ministry experience were even more universal than the joys. Both men and women, people of every age group, time or ordination, education level and family background emphasized a fairly homogenous major negative – conflict, pettiness and in-fighting (turf wars) combined with unwillingness to adapt (inflexibility) in parish communities. Within this section of the questionnaire people were given no guidance as to categories of major negative (or positive). They were given simply blank space to fill as they chose. As such, it is particularly striking that the language used to describe common issues was so similar. Regardless of the category of current ministry exercised, women and men struggled with the same painful dimension of community life.

> What makes it hardest to go to work some days is the little "insignificant" details and complaints. My former rector used to say that all parishes used up energy in inverse proportion to the importance of the issue. I remember one board of management meeting where a motion regarding pro-life work was passed in 30 seconds with no discussion. At the same meeting, we spent and hour and a half talking about whether or not we should pave the parking lot. Many times my parishioners demonstrate an inability or an unwillingness to listen to each other and work through conflict. Avoidance and denial are too

common.[11]

Those who left church work entirely for secular employment were among the most vocal with regard to the difficulties of dealing with conflict and resistance to change. Most cited this as a major factor in their career changes. Eventually, most felt that the time and energy they expended on the "pettiness" of parish life was too great a price with too little opportunity for practising the work they felt that they had been ordained for.

> The amount of time and energy which is taken up in basic management tasks is huge. I don't mean just basic administration which is bad enough. I mean the management of petty conflict. People in parishes are territorial. Turf wars spark a lot of conflict which then requires a huge amount of mediation and conciliation among parties who often won't be reconciled – regardless of what the gospel says on the matter. Many times it seems that people would rather fight over the smallest issues than work together on anything. This is destructive – to them and for me – it destroys some of my hope and saps my vision. The pettiness and meaness surprised me.[12]

Other negatives which received considerable attention included the relatively low level of theological education/awareness in parishes combined with a lack of desire to improve that situation; the time spent as a building manager rather than as a pastor and spiritual leader; the overwhelming amount of work with too little support; the consumer/management mentalities which dominates many parishes, "we are not a business, we are a faith community."[13]

One of the areas which turned out to be unintentionally self-limiting in this study was in the area of gender relationships (other than in the area of harassment). While I asked people to comment on their relationships with women clergy and parishioners, I failed to ask the same in relation to men. Some participants in the study interpreted this as "looking for the negative."It really was not a conscious omission and the findings in relation to women need to be read in light of the fact that I did not ask corresponding questions in relation to men of female or male clergy. Having said all that, however, I did have a particular interest in exploring same gender relationships as particularly critical to the experience of female clergy. The reason for this is the contention that same gender

interactions are of critical importance in the church community. We know from living in the church that many congregations tend to be more than a majority female. Some estimate the gender proportion in mainline North American protestantism as 60 to 75% female.[14] The leadership in church communities, both lay and ordained, remains disproportionately male. The new symbolic archetype generated in the person of the woman priest will have a significant impact on men and women alike, but it is my contention that given the large number of women in parish communities it is primarily the response of women to this shift which will determine, in large measure, the experience of the women clergy. Hence, although much scholarship in the arena of women's history examines the relationship between men and women in a patriarchal system, the relationship between women and women is actually the issue. It is in this arena that historical meaning for women's lives is most fully shaped.

What information then was collected for the database in this critical area? I asked for categorized responses concerning relationships with female parishioners and other female clergy (positive, negative, mixed). I also allowed room for discursive commentary on the nature of these relationships. Very few elected to define these relationships primarily in terms of the negative. Only 2% stated that they had primarily negative relationship with women parishioners and 8% chose negative as their primary descriptive label in relation to other women clergy. 45% felt that they had had mixed relationships with women parishioners and 48% mixed in relation to women clergy. 53% defined their relationships with female parishioners as primarily positive (the single largest response) and 44% defined their relationships with female clergy as positive. These numbers alone do not tell about the woman to woman relationship in church life. The only thing which is particularly significant is the low level of primarily negative responses in both categories and the fact that relationships with other women clergy are viewed as more negative than relationships with female parishioners.

The numbers become more interesting when cross-referenced the attitude towards women with other things such as form of ministry employment and age. In relation to age the oldest women tend to put the most positive spin on relationships with both female clergy and female parishioners. 57% reported a positive experience in relation to both groups which is above the overall average. In relation to female parishioners no one chose negative as the defining label. However, 14% of women over 70

reported primarily negative relationships with other female clergy. The categorizations are more black and white than their younger peers who tend to chose mixed as the best way of describing these relationships. The youngest women (under the age of 40) tended to be the most comfortable with the designation of mixed in relation to both (10% negative to both and 80% mixed in relation to female clergy and 70% mixed in relation to female parishioners). Interestingly, this group is largely out of stipendiary parish ministry – although not entirely.

Ministry employment seems to make a difference in the perception of same gender relationships also. This is particularly true in relation to the category which deals with other women clergy. 8% of women in full-time paid parish ministry designated these relationships as primarily negative; women in part-time paid work chose negative 5% of the time (the smallest grouping); 8% of women who left ministry for secular employment, 8% of part-time non-stipendiary, 11% of active retired and 33% of full-time non-stipendiary women chose negative as their primary definition. Interestingly, no women in chaplaincy, theological education or women who had left to raise children chose negative to define their relationships with other women clergy. In the positive category the responses were as follows: women in chaplaincy 78%; women in theological education 75%; full-time non-stipendiary 67%; active retired 61%; part-time non-stipendiary 42%; full-time paid parish 39%; secular 38%; part-time paid parish 37%; women who left to raise children 22%. This last category of primarily younger women again seems most comfortable with the mixed designation choosing it 78% of the time. Next most likely to chose mixed were part-time paid parish (58%) and full-time paid parish (53%).

This ream of statistics could be further elaborated with more extensive cross-referencing, but for the purposes of this study I would like to simply make a couple of observations on overall patterns. First, overall relationships between women seem to be fairly nurturing ones. Most do not want to label them negative and the ones who choose mixed as a designation are overall quite satisfied with the quality of relationships. Generally there seems to be more dissatisfaction with relationships between women clergy than between women clergy and their female parishioners. Where women are working outside of the traditional parish structures relationships between women overall tend to be more positive (note women working in chaplaincy and theological education). Where the form and structure of relationships are less rigidly entrenched in clerical-

ism and traditional praxis (ie. outside parish and in parishes where new models of ministry are evolving) supportive relationships between women seem to have the greatest hope of thriving. However, having made these generalizations I must stress from my assessment of anecdotal and narrative material that every possible range of opinion has surfaced in this study. These stories range from tales of extreme rejection in both categories to passionate affirmations of life-giving support and nurture among women. Further, what given women meant by positive, negative and mixed varies with the person choosing the category.[15]

What Difference Has It Made?

At the outset I considered the story of a woman preparing to preside at the eucharist which honoured twenty years of women as clergy – her own anniversary. When asked what difference has it made, she was clear that she could only answer that question for herself. Her response was both honest and realistic. Repeatedly women interviewed for this study answered this question in very personal terms. Both positively and negatively they talked about what it had meant in their own lives through the use of story and, of necessity, subjective analysis.

The reflections shared were diverse. However, as with other aspects of this work, several generalizations with reference to meaning revealed themselves. Most women did not regret the vocational path they had chosen. Although it had not always been what they had hoped it would be, most did not wish themselves back. Most, however, had aspirations for what their past would mean to their future. While some had rejected parish ministry becomes of overwhelming hurts, betrayals and violation, most in some fashion have stayed with the church. What is striking is how many have stayed in their own way. They have attempted to carve out a niche for themselves in a church which they have often experienced as inflexible. Some have adopted traditional models of full-time rectorship; most have not. Many of these women say that if they had an agenda to change the church when they started, that is not their agenda now. Now most hope not to be changed by it in ways which compromise their own dreams and visions. Some talk about their hope for transformation and their longing to be agents in it.

As individuals in relation to an old and established institution, most women stressed that they felt that they had changed the church very little.

Indeed, there is little evidence to suggest that the ecclesiastical structures which first welcomed women into the priesthood are significantly different than they were. Some felt that they had been changed by it in ways they wished they had not. These sentiments reflect the necessary polarities inherent in life in human institutions. We live in a dialectical relationship with each other and the church, and whether it is visible to the naked eye we are changing each other. One woman talked about slow process of evolution with the following words: "I see my work with the church like water on a rock. You know – water that drips and drips and rolls a away. It appears to make no difference at all but it continues to drip and roll away and drip, and over time – a very very long time – that water reshapes the face of the earth."[16]

Parishes and the Ministry of Ordained Women

It is through a consideration of parish responses to the ministry of women clergy that one can begin to answer the question what difference has it made both to the people with whom the women have worked and to ecclesiastical structures at large. Thirty parishes scattered across the country generously participated in this project. Although the selection was randomly based on size and geography the fact that all had women clergy working among them may have tilted the outcomes in a positive direction. The overwhelming majority response was positive. Through the stories of the women, particularly those who left, it is evident that there are parishes who still have difficulty with women clergy. These are not glaringly apparent in this group of thirty.

The form of parish participation was small group response to a questionnaire designed for them. It asked for information on the parish itself and then for correlations between the parish history and experience with women in holy orders. Collective patterns of response were greater than in the case of the women as a group.

Most notable among these patterns was what I will call the attitudinal lifecycle. Most parishes stressed that before they had experience with a women priest first-hand, their congregations had some trepidation about what this would mean. "We weren't sure – we had never had a woman before and we were a little afraid. What would it be like? Would people stay away?"[17] This type of generalized anxiety was common. However, there was a lifecycle to the anxiety. 28 out of the 30 parishes

talked about the transformation in that anxiety over time. As people lived with a woman priest who was an individual and not a concept, anxiety gradually changed into genuine appreciation for what individual women brought to parish life.

> After a while we stopped thinking about our priest as a woman first and she became for us simply our priest. She married us and buried us, she baptized our babies and held our hands when we were sick; she even started a youth group and she has a pretty good sense of humour. I guess you could say we came to love her and we knew that she loved us.[18]

The transition from resistance or caution to acceptance appears to have taken anywhere from 2-5 years among the parishes studied, but most made the transition. That is not to say that all transitions were easy. Parishes shared many stories of perceived offense on both sides during the years of attitudinal transition.

Having said this, further nuances in the patterns of acceptance should be elaborated. Generalized patterns within the lifecyle of transition are discernable. For example, parishes which classify themselves as theologically broad stream tended as a group to be more open to the idea of a woman priest initially and tended to make the transition to acceptance more quickly than parishes who classified themselves as primarily anglo-catholic or evangelical. This same pattern was present in the decision-making processes by which dioceses in the Anglican Church of Canada moved to accept the ordination of women to the priesthood.[19] Rural parishes also tend to demonstrate a measurably more positive attitude to women clergy than do urban parishes. Although small rural parishes may be less progressive in theological and liturgical matters (though not necessarily), they value clergy who will come and be with them. In other words, small rural parishes often have difficulty procuring and retaining clergy. When a priest is willing to come and stay, gender becomes a non-issue for many.

I found the most interesting responses from parishes were those which related to the question of meaning and difference. What difference has it made to the church that women that there have been women in the priesthood for the last twenty years? The following two stories are examples of a primary point which was made over and over again in parish

groups and individuals within those groups. A son talks about the death of his mother:

> A few years ago my mother was dying of cancer. She hadn't had an active affiliation with a church for many years, but the associate priest, a part-time woman in the Anglican church nearest to where she lived took it upon herself to start visiting my mother who was often alone. Well my mother died on Good Friday. The day before she died, of course it was Maundy Thursday. I returned from the grocery store and Mary, the local pastor was there for a visit. My mother couldn't talk any longer so they were sitting in silence, in fact my mother was asleep. But what I saw there amazed me. My mother had been a smoker to the end and the afghan she was usually covered with was full of small holes from her falling ash. Her priest had brought yarn with her that matched the colour of the afghan and was darning the holes. For the first time, I really understood something about what Maundy Thursday was.[20]

Within another parish group, the following story was shared:

> Do you all remember last Good Friday? I don't really remember what was being preached in the sermon but I remember what happened during the sermon. Our priest assistant has three children. One of them young- she was about 3 last year I guess. Downstairs they were having a Good Friday program for the children. This little one was walking by the doors of the church proper as the group of children headed outside for a walk. She saw her mother and ran to her as she stood in the aisle preaching. The mother reached down and picked her up, comforting her, reassuring her without words while she carried on with her sermon. After a moments or so the little girl jumped down and quietly rejoined the other children. I wish my mother could have seen that. She was raised in the church- her parents were both officers in the salvation army, but never once did she experience something like that. The work of the church was always first and she and her brothers always felt pushed to the side. Love was for God and the downtrodden- not for them. None of them ever went into a church again once they were old enough to leave home. I wish my mother had lived to see something like that Good Friday service. I think she would have found healing in that. The love of God and love of a child both had a place in worship. They were not different- they belonged

> together in that moment. I wish my mother had lived to see it. God doesn't seem so far away to me now, and the priest too seems much closer.[21]

Within these stories, the answer to our primary question is to be found. It is not that women as a group do things uniformly differently from men. In fact, quite the opposite is true. Women are diverse, as are men. But when we exclude any particular group from participation in any aspect of the church community, we limit the possibilities of encountering the Christ. If it is a true theological statement that our incarnate God reveals Godself in those around us, if we limit the gender (or race or age and so on) of the group which may offer leadership, we exclude all those possibilities of seeing the face of God more nearly.

Consider the two illustrative stories above. Not all women sew and not all women would have thought to darn the dying woman's blanket – but one woman did. The social construct of gender in western culture is such that aspects of who we are as men and women are consciously and unconsciously formed in certain ways. Even if we form ourselves by rejecting gender stereotypes, we have defined ourselves in relation to the social construct. The same might be said of the woman preacher with the three year-old child. Not all women would have reacted as she did, and some men certainly would have. When we open up leadership roles to all possibilities of incarnation we optimize our capacity for understanding who God is in relation to us. Herein lies the difference. The inclusion of women clergy in the life of the church has opened up the possibility of new wisdom and new meaning both within and outside of the church.

The potential for new wisdom and meaning is nurtured through the re-formulation of symbol systems, language and experience. Symbol systems change over long periods of time. They evolve as human experience unconsciously dictates new meaning. The congregations who have lived with women clergy and have embraced the experience of their ministry are participating in the gradual evolution of a whole religious symbol system. As their understanding of who the priest is in relation to God and the people changes, so will the theology and teaching of the church. It is my contention that this process of the transformation of symbols happens in the dialectical tension between change in the hierarchy/ecclesiastical structure (the decisions to actually ordain women) and the grassroots internalization of the implications of that structural shift.

This internalization at the grassroots or parochial level of church life in its turn ultimately re-shapes the teaching and direction of the structure.

The women themselves have said that they often feel that their work as women clergy has made no difference – not many are bishops; not many are Archdeacons; not many are professors in theological colleges; few hold significant places of traditional power-holding within ecclesiastical structures – except the power of their office. But perhaps when lived wisely that power of simple presence and persistence is all that is required. Women do not have to consciously attempt to change symbols, archetypes, theology and structures. They need only be who they are in a structure which says its welcomes them. The rest will unfold in the living of ordinary days in ordinary time. Like water on a rock, the face of the earth is being re-formed.

Endnotes

1. G. Lehman, *Women Professionals* (New York: Harper and Row, 1991).
2. Lehman, *Women Professionals*, 139.
3. Study subject #257.
4. Study subject #81.
5. Study subject #29.
6. Subject #261.
7. Study subject #220.
8. Study subject #51.
9. Study subject #12.
10. Study subject #53.
11. Study subject #73.
12. Study subject #111.
13. Study subject #263.
14. Rosemary Ruether and Rosemary Skinner Keller, eds., *Women and Religion in America* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986), 339-348.

15. For a more extensive reflection on this critical area read Wendy Fletcher-Marsh, *Like Water on a Rock: The Ministry of Women and Transformation in Canadian Anglicanism* (Toronto: Artemis, 1998).

16. Study subject #37.

17. Parish subject #8.

18. Parish subject #19.

19. Wendy Fletcher-Marsh, *Beyond the Walled Garden: Anglican Women and the Priesthood* (Toronto: Artemis, 1995).

20. Parish study subject #4.

21. Parish study group #14.

Polishing the Silver Covenant Chain: An Address by Sir William Johnson to the People of Kahnawake and Kanesatake, 1762[1]

LOUISE JOHNSTON

In May of 1762, towards the end of the Seven Years' War, Sir William Johnson – English Superintendent of Indian Affairs for North America – delivered a Silver Covenant Chain address to the Mohawk people of Kahnawake and Kanesatake, two settlements near Montreal.[2] Kahnawake and Kanesatake, known historically as "Caughnawaga" and "Oka," are familiar to us from the "Mohawk Crisis" of 1990. In 1763, one year after Sir William delivered his address, France and Great Britain signed the Treaty of Paris. This settlement brought nearly a century of protracted warfare between these two great colonial powers to a close. We are all acquainted to some degree with the role the Iroquois played during that long conflict. Indeed, the Iroquois were distinguished allies of both the English and the French and enjoyed wide, even legendary acclaim for their war fighting skills. Much less celebrated and certainly much less well known, are the many attempts on the part of these same Iroquois to establish peaceful relations and alliances with the Europeans. The Silver Covenant Chain treaties were one such attempt.

The Silver Covenant Chain councils were conducted in the way of the Haudenosaunee, as the Iroquois call themselves. Typically, both parties delivered carefully constructed addresses and solemnized agreements with the ceremonial giving and receiving of wampum belts. Speakers employed vivid religious language and imagery, either Iroquoian or Christian or both.

For the Haudenosaunee, the Silver Covenant Chain councils touched the very heart of the sacred and the spiritual in their lives. In fact, the records of these councils provide valuable insight into the thinking of the Haudenosaunee and our European forebears as well. Discussion of these councils has remained outside the area of church history, however, primarily because the key officials participating in them were military rather than ecclesiastical. Though missionaries and church authorities were sometimes present at the proceedings, their direct contribution to the discussions was minimal.

In this paper I will explore some of the many dimensions of Sir William Johnson's Silver Covenant Chain speech. I will look first in some detail at the historical context and background within which the Silver Covenant Chain treaties took place. I will then consider the text itself, focusing on those to whom the speech was addressed – the Kahnawa'kehró:non and the Kanesata'kehró:non – and on Sir William's use of the Iroquois Condolence Ceremony.[3]

After 1776, once the Americans gained independence from the English Crown, the Silver Covenant Chain fell into disuse and faded from the historical record. Though colonial officials saw the diplomacy of the Silver Covenant Chain as an effective means to build a relationship with the Iroquois, neither the government of the United States nor, later, the government of Canada, found it practical or especially relevant to their aims and ambitions. The Iroquois would not be involved in the business of nation building and the Silver Covenant Chain would not figure in the new political arrangements then in the making. As we shall see, however, the Silver Covenant Chain is much more than some quaint historical curiosity; for many Haudenosaunee it is as valuable today as it was over two hundred years ago. The Mohawk Crisis of 1990 is a striking example of its potential usefulness for our time.

Trade Relations and Alliances

According to the historical record, the Silver Covenant Chain treaties began in 1677 on the initiative of Sir Edmund Andros, then the English colonial governor of New York. Indeed, Sir Edmund has been described as the "architect" of the Silver Covenant Chain.[4] These treaties were not land claim settlements, but diplomatic agreements designed to create an alliance between the English and the Five Nations Iroquois

Confederacy. In one sense the treaties were quite pragmatic. Both the English and the Iroquois wanted peace and stability for trading purposes and they needed each other to accomplish this goal. Trade was, to be sure, *the* dominant factor in the diplomatic relations between the Europeans and the Native peoples of the Northeast.

As it turns out the Covenant Chain treaties did not create universal or even lasting peace because a third party, the French, also sought a land and trade advantage and an alliance with the Iroquois. In 1684 an Onondaga chief attempted to bring New France into the Covenant Chain, but the French crown rejected membership.[5] The French made use of the Chain only occasionally thereafter preferring, instead, to cultivate a relationship based on conversion to Christianity and the close personal contact characteristic of mission life.

The political implications of the Silver Covenant Chain have been discussed at length in the scholarship. The Chain's religious side has also been mentioned. One historian notes that during the 1670s, "In the towns of the Five Nations, as support for the English and their Covenant Chain waxed, enthusiasm for the French and their religion waned."[6] Why? Part of the answer may lie in what Silver Covenant Chain diplomacy hoped to achieve. Its main purpose was not to convert the Iroquois to Christianity (though conversion was not unwelcome), but to create a meeting of minds. In this sense the Haudenosaunee and the English came together less as "heathen" and "Christian" and more as equals. Unfortunately, the ends to which the English used the Silver Covenant Chain were not always magnanimous; the English were, after all, in competition with the French for possession of a colonial empire. Nevertheless, the actual councils give us a glimpse into how the English and the Haudenosaunee communicated with one another.

"Linked Arms," "Joined Hands"

As I said at the outset, the Silver Covenant Chain councils were conducted in the way of the Haudenosaunee. The Haudenosaunee brought the traditions of the Five Nations Confederacy and the Great Law of Peace to the councils. These traditions shaped the councils and gave them their structure. "Covenant" has a very special and important meaning in the Judaeo-Christian tradition, and we will look at this in a few minutes, but the meaning of covenant in this particular context is best seen first through

the eyes of the Haudenosaunee. The word "chain" and its synonym "rope" are key to our investigations. Both are used metaphorically by the Haudenosaunee. As linguists note, "The basic principle of Iroquois metaphor is the projection of words about familiar objects and relations into the fields of politics and diplomacy."[7] Thus, "Literally translated from its roots the word for *chain* in Iroquoian language means something like *arms linked together*."[8] The concept of "linked arms" dates to the very origins of the Five Nations Iroquois Confederacy.

According to the oral history of the Haudenosaunee, the Five Nations Confederacy came into being many, many centuries ago – no one knows exactly when – when a young Huron man named the Deganawidah or the Peacemaker, travelled to the lands of the Mohawk, Cayuga, Onondaga, Oneida and Seneca, bringing to them a message of peace. A state of endemic warfare plagued the peoples of these five different nations at the time. In order to make his message more meaningful, the Peacemaker looked to the everyday world of the Iroquois and in it found many "objects" which could be transformed into powerful symbols of peace. One was the household fire around which families, clans and communities gathered daily for warmth and to cook, eat and talk. With the Peacemaker, this everyday fire became the "central fire" of the Great Council of fifty chiefs. The chiefs met around the fire to discuss matters of importance to them and their nations. Topics for discussion were passed around the council circle and "thrown" across the fire for confirmation.

The Haudenosaunee made a record of this momentous development, and that record is the Circle Wampum. "Of all the Iroquois wampum records this is the most sacred . . ." writes Mohawk author and historian Ray Fadden. He continues,

> When the Confederacy was formed, the Peacemaker had each of the fifty chiefs join hands in a circle and he ordained that all should be of equal rank and carry individual titles . . . The large circle formed by two entwined strings, means respectively The Great Peace and The Great Law . . . The fifty wampum strings [which hang from around the circle to the centre] represent the fifty Chiefs of the Confederacy.[9]

Among the Five Nations the notion of "joining hands" or "linking arms" created a relationship which can be described as "covenantal." This is to say, the relationship was personal and involved both promises and

obligations. When the fifty chiefs of the Great Council joined hands in a circle they were entering into a personal, life-relationship with one another. They were also entering into the promises of the Great Peace and the obligations of the Great Law. Just as the strings of the Circle Wampum are entwined, the Great Peace and the Great Law were intimately intertwined. No separation between peace and the law is discernable.

As the Great Peace and the Great Law took hold, the Iroquois began to join hands with their neighbours. Historian Daniel Richter notes many

> . . . of the same principles and ceremonies of peace that sustained amicable relations among the Five Nations applied when leaders . . . dealt with peoples outside the League. Indeed, treaty making was essentially an extension of the Great Peace to a broader stage. The Condolence rituals, words of peace, and exchanges of gifts mandated by the Good News of Peace and Power provided the basic paradigm for diplomatic relations with outsiders.[10]

Continues Richter, "Words of peace and gifts of peace . . . were inseparable; together they demonstrated and symbolized the shared climate of good thoughts upon which good relations and powerful alliances depended."[11]

From Iron to Silver

During the colonial era, the Great Peace was extended to yet another stage in the diplomacy of the Silver Covenant Chain. The ceremonies at these councils "were modeled upon the rites of the Great League of Peace and, for the Iroquois, helped to make the Covenant Chain a partnership much like that among the Five Nations."[12] At these councils with the English, Iroquois orators recited the history of their relationship with the Dutch of New Netherland and it is here we find explicit reference to the "chain" and "rope" metaphors. According to the historian Francis Jennings, "Iroquois traditions, repeatedly recited and recorded in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, affirm a progression of trading alliance with the Dutch from rope to iron chain."[13] One Iroquois orator described how his people had made a "General Covenant" with a Dutch trader known as "Governor Jacques."[14] Exactly when this General Covenant occurred is a matter of some discussion in the scholarship, but the treaty records indicate that by 1643 the Iroquois and "all the Dutch"

had entered into an "iron chain" alliance.[15]

This, then, is part of the historical background to and the setting of Sir Edmund Andros' Silver Covenant Chain. We do not know exactly *what* Sir Edmund Andros was thinking when he initiated the Silver Covenant Chain councils, but we now know *that* he was drawing either explicitly or implicitly, consciously or unconsciously, on the history of Iroquois relations with other nations. The Iroquois saw their relationship with the Dutch and the English in terms of the "rope" and "chain" metaphors. The idea of the Confederacy *circle* does not seem to be explicit here. The bond thus created with the Europeans was not identical to that of the Circle Wampum, but the rope suggests a certain "entwining" and the chain a kind of "linking."

The fact that the Covenant Chain became "silver" was, however, an important development and the metaphorical polishing the Silver Covenant Chain became integral to the ritual of these councils. The imagery is quite exquisite – with each exchange of wampum, with each expression of condolence and with each step toward peace, the Silver Covenant Chain "brightened." The mutual "polishing" of the Silver Covenant Chain helped deepen the bonds between our two peoples.

Covenant or Federal Theology

There is, of course, another important source of covenant thinking and that source is the Bible and the covenant theology of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Just how important was the idea of covenant during this period? In 1954 H. Richard Niebuhr published an article in which he discussed "The Idea of Covenant and American Democracy."[16] Niebuhr suggested that the idea of covenant was "a *fundamental* pattern in American minds in the seventeenth, eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries." As the religious thought of this period "is being more adequately explored," he wrote, "other studies are beginning to contribute to our knowledge of this idea."[17] Continues Niebuhr,

> The idea of covenant had many proximate sources as it was developed in the Netherlands, in England, and in America during the seventeenth century. It had roots in Calvin; it was suggested and influenced no doubt, by the development of contract law and of commercial companies; it was raised to special significance in religious circles by

> the reaction against a mechanical version of Calvinistic determinism. But its chief source in the Scripture was available to all . . . and not only available but pervasively present.[18]

During the Reformation the idea of covenant was employed in several different ways; by Zwingli to defend infant baptism; by Bullinger to justify the making of confederacies; by Calvin as a theory of history; by Olevianus and Ursinus in the Heidelberg Catechism. The church historian David Weir notes that after 1590 the covenant idea began to blossom all over Europe with such fecundity "it is impossible to keep track of the manifold uses and conceptions of the covenant motif."[19]

Several recent studies draw a distinction in covenant theology between the idea of a "unilateral" covenant (God's unconditional promise to humankind) and a "bilateral" covenant (God's conditional promise to humankind and humankind's response to it).[20] The unilateral covenant is associated with Calvin and the Genevan theologians; the bilateral covenant with Zwingli, Bullinger and the Rhineland theologians. Bullinger's covenant theology, which is also known as "federal" theology, enjoyed wide appeal, particularly in the Lowlands. In the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries clergy of the Dutch Reformed Church were advancing Bullinger's writings to congregations both from the pulpit and in publications. Covenant theology of the federal kind was taught at Dutch universities. From 1609 to 1620 these same universities gave refuge to the English Puritans before they emigrated to North America and brought covenant theology with them.[21]

All this raises some interesting possibilities for the present discussion. Were those Dutch traders who encountered the Iroquois in the first few decades of the seventeenth century familiar with the teachings of covenant theology? Did "covenant" or analogous terms figure in the charters of the Dutch trading companies as Richard Niebuhr suggests? Sir Edmund Andros, a Roman Catholic who came from Guernsey, is reputed to have made himself quite unpopular with both the Puritans and colonial Anglican church authorities. Did he nevertheless know something of federal theology? Did the concept of covenant find yet another place to flower in the Silver Covenant Chain?

In other words, did the concept of a bilateral covenant play a role in relations between the Dutch and the Iroquois and later between the English and the Iroquois? The idea seems to fit well with Iroquois notions of

exchanging gifts and words of wampum and more generally with the kind of relationship they hoped to establish with other nations. As we shall now see, the sense of a bilateral relationship goes deep, very deep into the history and traditions of the Haudenosaunee. This is amply illustrated in the Covenant Chain address delivered by Sir William Johnson to the Mohawks of Kahnawake and Kanesatake in 1762.

Sir William Johnson's Speech

Though the Mohawk people were part of the original Iroquois Confederacy, the French and the English considered the Mohawks of Kahnawake and Kanesatake as somehow separate from the Five Nations. Since the two settlements were in New France, both the Kahnawa'kehró:non and the Kanesata'kehró:non were regarded by the Europeans as allies of the French. This alliance was thought to have distanced the Kahnawa'kehró:non and the Kanesata'kehró:non from the Confederacy. Moreover, because the Roman Catholic Church operated missions at the two settlements – the Jesuits in Kahnawake, the Sulpicians in Kanesatake – both groups were viewed as Christian. Like other colonial officials Sir William Johnson frequently referred to the Kahnawa'kehró:non and the Kanesata'kehró:non as the "Praying Indians." While there is plenty of the historical evidence to support these views, we cannot presuppose the Kahnawa'kehró:non and the Kanesata'kehró:non were allied with the French to the exclusion of the Five Nations Confederacy. Also, we should not presuppose that the so-called "Praying Indians" had given up the teachings and traditions of the Confederacy for Christianity.

When Sir William addressed the Kahnawa'kehró:non and the Kanesata'kehró:non, he had a multi-fold task before him. Historically, both groups had played an active role in safeguarding the island of Montreal and its inhabitants. These two settlements were, therefore, considered strategically important to the French and to the English as well. By 1762 as the defeat of New France appeared imminent, the English looked to secure an alliance with the Kahnawa'kehró:non and the Kanesata'kehró:non. Sir William's speech was part of an ongoing alliance building project, as it were.

The very structure of the speech suggests Sir William felt he had to address the Kahnawa'kehró:non and the Kanesata'kehró:non in the way of the Haudenosaunee, their close association with the French and the Roman

Catholic Church notwithstanding. The text indicates the Kahnawa-'kehró:non and the Kanesata'kehró:non were quite familiar with the Silver Covenant Chain and with the Condolence traditions of the Confederacy. At the same time, Sir William assumed they were good Christian believers. For this reason he employed considerable Christian language along with all the customary Iroquois imagery. Interestingly, he appealed directly to their Christianity and in so doing managed to lift the discussion out of the quagmire of Protestant-Roman Catholic antagonisms.

Sir William opened his address with an apology for his absence. He had evidently been detained elsewhere on pressing business and had assigned his deputy, Daniel Claus, the important duty of delivering the speech. The council was held in Montreal. The proceedings probably took an entire morning or afternoon to complete. With each pledge and with each expression of hope, peace, and friendship, Daniel Claus "threw" a belt of wampum. A total of three strings and fourteen belts were presented to the Kahnawa'kehró:non and the Kanesata'kehró:non.

The transcript indicates the people of both communities were facing numerous difficulties and obstacles. Disease, likely small pox, had recently swept through the region taking the lives of many people. After his apology, Sir William moved immediately to Iroquois Condolence Ceremony. "As I understand by Capt Claus that you have (since my leaving Canada) lost a great many of your people to sickness, for which I am sorry, I now take this opportunity by him of condoling your loss, & wiping the Tears from your Eyes so that you may look up to the Divine being & crave his blessing . . ."[22] With this Daniel Claus threw three "Very long Strings" of wampum.

Sir William was most concerned with the Warriors and their intentions vis-à-vis the English. Would they hold to their commitment of "peace lasting" or would they act in an "unnatural" way against the English? With one belt of wampum, he reiterated promises he had made a year earlier. With another, he thanked the Kahnawa'kehró:non and the Kanesata'kehró:non for "gathering together and burying the bones" of dead English soldiers. He reciprocated by metaphorically gathering up and burying the bones of dead Warriors. With another belt, he "strengthened" and "brightened" the Covenant Chain so all would be "one people with us." He presented two more belts praising the Warriors for "maintaining peace and friendship" and for "the sincerity of their professions . . ."[23]

Lest any evil remain in their hearts Sir William, "by this belt of

Wampum," cleansed the bodies of the Warriors of any remaining "ill humours," and "washed" *all* the people "with that pure Water which your Ancestors made use of on all such occasions." With yet another belt he dispelled "that dark Cloud which hung over" the communities so the people could "enjoy the pleasant and enlivening sunshine." With still another he "newly repaired" the "Road hither" making it "level, smooth & wide," so "that you, and we may travel it with safety . . ." In so doing he removed the "many stumps" which obstructed the path.[24]

Alcohol abuse was prevalent in both communities and Sir William announced he had prohibited entirely the selling of all spirituous liquors. He then warned the Kahnawa'kehró:non and the Kanesata'kehró:non against accepting favours and support from the French and encouraged them to "follow . . . hunting, planting and Trade . . ." so they might not depend on others for their basic wants.[25]

He thanked the both communities for "delivering up" English prisoners of war and apologized for any abuse of Mohawk prisoners at the hands of the English. He also thanked them for encouraging the Abenaki (who were also considered "Praying Indians") to make peace with the English. Sir William concluded the address by noting he had met with the Six Nations in Albany. He announced "every thing relative to peace, friendship, Trade, etc. had been fully settled . . . [with them]." He expressed his hope for the Kahnawa'kehró:non and Kanesata'kehró:non to also settle in this fashion.[26]

The Peacemaker and Hiawatha

When, at the beginning of he address, Sir William 'wiped the Tears from the eyes of the Mohawks', what was he doing? What did this mean? For an answer, we must return briefly to the story of the Peacemaker.[27]

On his journey through the Five Nations, the Peacemaker met a man whom he named "Hiawatha." During their first encounter the Peacemaker helped Hiawatha change his habits (Hiawatha was a cannibal), and then commissioned him to find Atotarho, an evil wizard with seven crooks in his body and a tangle of snakes on his head. Hiawatha was to transform Atotarho's evil ways by combing the snakes from his hair. In fact, "Hiawatha" means "he who combs." No sooner had Hiawatha set out than he learned of the untimely death of his daughters, deaths caused by Atotarho's evil powers. Stricken with grief, he began to wander aimlessly through the

forest. Each night he stopped at the woods' edge and lit a fire as a sign to passers-by. He hung three strings of wampum from a horizontal pole hoping someone would take them and console him in his grief.

One day the Peacemaker saw the smoke of Hiawatha's fire and heard him speaking. "This would I do if I found anyone burdened with grief even as I am. I would take these shell strings in my hand and condole with them. The strings would become words and lift away the darkness with which they are covered. Holding these in my hand, my words would become true." The Peacemaker then

> came forward and taking the strings . . . and holding them . . . he spoke, string by string, the several Words of the Requickening Address . . . "I wipe away the tears from your face," he said, "using the white fawn-skin of pity . . . I make it daylight for you . . . I beautify the sky. Now you shall do your thinking in peace when your eyes rest on the sky . . ."[28]

Thus was Hiawatha relieved of his grief. He continued on his journey and completed his commission. He combed the wizard's tangled hair and like Hiawatha, Atotarho gave up his evil ways.

This, then, is the story of the Condolence Ceremony. For the Seneca historian John Mohawk, this ceremony delivers an important message of hope. He describes the encounter between the Peacemaker and Hiawatha as a "powerfully emotional transaction." Writes Mohawk,

> Speaking directly to Hiawatha's despair and his hopelessness, the Peacemaker uses soothing words and sincere caring . . . The message in this transaction is a very important one which needs attention in the area of political theory. The Peacemaker and Hiawatha seem both conscious of the fact that human beings reach places of psychological pain, or feelings of rage, or despairing of hope. They recognize that at such times it is difficult to reach clear thinking and they direct a considerable amount of attention to the pain which is being felt . . . By countering the grief, by showing caring and a commitment to brotherhood, the Peacemaker brings Hiawatha from a place of despair eventually to a place of hope.[29]

When, many centuries later, Sir William Johnson wiped the tears from the eyes of Kahnawa'kehró:non and the Kanesata'kehró:non he was

speaking out of this history and these traditions of the Haudenosaunee. Just how familiar Sir William was with the story of the Peacemaker and Hiawatha is unclear, but in one way or another he understood the intent of the Condolence Ceremony. He added, however, some Christian imagery to the ceremony; Sir William wiped the tears from their eyes so they could "look up to the Divine being & crave his blessing . . ."[30]

Mixed Imagery

This use of Iroquois and Christian imagery raises some delicate questions. In his landmark study on the history of the missionary-Indian encounter, *Moon of Wintertime*, John Webster Grant notes, "Any group of people belonging to a culture will inevitably interpret a message originating elsewhere in terms of familiar concepts and assumptions, for no others will be available to them."[31] Grant had Native conceptions of Christianity in mind when he wrote this, but in the case of the Silver Covenant Chain councils and Sir William Johnson's address in particular, his observation can apply as much to the English as to the Iroquois. Was Sir William himself interpreting the Iroquois Condolence Ceremony in terms of Christian concepts and assumptions?

Grant also raised the problem of "illegitimate syncretism" and "authentic Christianity."[32] Is this mixed imagery an indication of one or the other? Did the "Praying Indians" of Kahnawake and Kanesatake find relief from their suffering in the words of the Requickening Address or in craving the blessing of the Divine being? Finally, and most importantly, I think, was this juxtaposition of Iroquois and Christian imagery a way for two peoples of two very different cultural and religious traditions to speak a common language, to account for one another's beliefs? Each knew the customs and ways of the other. The idea of "looking up" was common to both – the Iroquois to the sky, Sir William to the Divine being. The Requickening Address is explicitly Iroquoian, but the idea of "seeing" and "hearing" more clearly is very much a part of the Christian tradition as well (Matt 13:15-16).

Each reference in the speech, from "gathering up the bones of the dead," to "purging the heart of evil," to "pure water," to making the road "level, smooth & wide," can be discussed in much the same way as we have just looked at the idea of covenant and the words of Condolence. Take, for example, the ceremony At The Woods' Edge which is usually

performed in conjunction with the Condolence Ceremony. In this instance, the speaker tells of rocks and fallen trees on the pathway and describes how the people "cleared the road" to ease their journey through the forest. The Hebrew prophet Isaiah wanted "clear a road through the wilderness," and "make the uneven ground smooth," (Is. 40:3-4); and like Hiawatha, he yearned to make the crooked straight (Is. 42:16; 45:2).

The Silver Covenant Chain and the Mohawk Crisis

Two hundred and thirty-five years, a lot of history, and more social, religious and political change than our forebears ever imagined possible have occurred since Sir William Johnson delivered his Silver Covenant Chain address to the people of Kahnawake and Kanesatake. Given the nature of our relations with the Haudenosaunee in the recent and not-so-recent past, interpreting this address and others like is far from straightforward. Ours is a pretty miserable record indeed! The Silver Covenant Chain councils can be interpreted as a concrete example of the imperialist intentions of the English. Critics can legitimately argue that Great Britain turned to the Silver Covenant Chain solely for utilitarian purposes: When the English required the services of the Iroquois they polished the Covenant Chain; once the war was won, so to speak, the Iroquois were quite literally pushed aside.

Not all Haudenosaunee see the Silver Covenant Chain or the councils of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in such a negative light. While some of the language (the word "children" for instance) and the explicit use Christian imagery are not acceptable today, the concepts of friendship and peace which the Silver Covenant Chain once captured and reflected are still valid. Not only are these concepts valid, they may in fact be extremely valuable for relations between our two peoples today. The "Mohawk Crisis" of 1990 is a case in hand.

In the months and weeks before 11 July when the Mohawk Crisis began, as we heard and read news reports of mounting tensions between the Kanesata'kehró:non and the Oka town council,[33] the *Northeast Indian Quarterly* (a journal published out of Cornell University) featured an article by Richard Hill entitled "Oral Memory of the Haudenosaunee: Views of the Two Row Wampum."[34] Richard Hill, Tuscarora, is an artist and historian.

Though he was very much aware of the situation in Kanesatake at

the time, Hill made no specific reference the community or to events then occurring. Instead he addressed the wider, equally pressing problem being raised by those events – public attitudes toward Native people and the state of relations between the Haudenosaunee and white society as a whole. "Oral Memory of the Haudenosaunee," addresses many interesting, sensitive concerns not the least of which is oral memory versus documentary evidence and how Native scholars interpret one and the other. A detailed discussion of this question must be left for another time, however. The role history, tradition and of course the Silver Covenant Chain play in the contemporary context is the focus of our attention just now.

For Richard Hill, Condoled Chief Jacob Thomas and others quoted in the article, the Silver Covenant Chain offers our two peoples a way through misunderstanding, false assumptions and prejudice to friendship, "good minds" and peace. In the early-seventeenth century, according to oral memory, when the Haudenosaunee and the Dutch became acquainted with one another, they came to an agreement whereby each would respect the customs, beliefs and laws of the other. Each people had a row; each row represented a river; each river contained a vessel and each vessel held the laws and beliefs of each people. These are the two rows of the Two Row Wampum. At the same time, the Dutch and the Haudenosaunee joined hands "to show the Covenant Chain that binds our friendship so that we may walk upon this earth in peace, trust, love and friendship . . ."[35] This Covenant is a three link chain. The first link stands for friendship, the second for "good minds" and the third "means there will always be peace between us."[36]

For Richard Hill, the Two Row Wampum with its ideas of mutual respect for each other laws and beliefs, and the Covenant Chain with its notions of friendship, good minds and peace, are "a reminder that at one time our nations and people coexisted."[37] Our two peoples not only coexisted, we somehow managed to address the problems and issues which confronted us in a manner acceptable to both parties. The Covenant Chain helped us overcome differences and provided the common ground for constructive dialogue. In this there is a lesson from history and, perhaps, the inspiration for our relations in the future.

Endnotes

1. I wish to acknowledge the encouragement and helpful advice of Dr. Edward J. Furcha, Professor of Church History, Faculty of Religious Studies, McGill University. Sadly, Dr. Furcha passed away on 4 July 1997.

2. Milton W. Hamilton, ed., *The Papers of Sir William Johnson* (Albany: University of the State of New York, 1951), X: 445-449.

3. Kanesata'kehró:non and Kahnawa'kehró:non mean, respectively, the people of Kanesatake and the people of Kahnawake.

4. "Persons Participating in Iroquois Treaties," in *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy: An Interdisciplinary Guide to the Treaties of the Six Nations and Their League*, ed. Francis Jennings (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1985), 229.

5. "Descriptive Treaty Calendar," in *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy*, 161.

6. Daniel K. Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse: The Peoples of the Iroquois League in the Era of European Colonization* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 141.

7. "Glossary of Figures of Speech in Iroquois Political Rhetoric," in *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy*, 115.

8. "Glossary of Figures of Speech in Iroquois Political Rhetoric," in *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy*, 116.

9. Tehanetorens (Ray Fadden), *Wampum Belts* (Onichiota, NY: Six Nations Indian Museum, 1972; reprint, Ohsweken, ON: Iroqrafts Ltd., 1983), 6-7.

10. Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse*, 41.

11. Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse*, 48.

12. Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse*, 141.

13. Francis Jennings, *The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Indian Tribes with English Colonies* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1984), 55.

14. Richter, *The Ordeal of the Longhouse*, 89.

15. "Descriptive Treaty Calendar," in *The History and Culture of Iroquois Diplomacy*, 158.
16. "The Idea of Covenant and American Diplomacy," *Church History* 25 (1954): 126-135.
17. Niebuhr, "The Idea of Covenant and American Diplomacy," 130.
18. Niebuhr, "The Idea of Covenant and American Diplomacy," 130.
19. David Weir, *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 115.
20. Weir, *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought*, 26.
21. For a discussion of Bullinger's federal theology see, Charles S. McCoy and J. Wayne Baker, *Fountainhead of Federalism: Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenantal Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991).
22. *The Papers of Sir William Johnson*, X: 445.
23. *The Papers of Sir William Johnson*, X: 445-446.
24. *The Papers of Sir William Johnson*, X: 447.
25. The Papers of Sir William Johnson, X: 447, 449.
26. *The Papers of Sir William Johnson*, X: 448-449.
27. The following is paraphrased from Paul A.W. Wallace, *The White Roots of Peace* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1946; reprint, Saranac Lake, NY: The Chauncy Press, 1986).
28. Wallace, *The White Roots of Peace*, 24-25.
29. John Mohawk, "Prologue," in Wallace, *The White Roots of Peace*, xviii.
30. *The Papers of Sir William Johnson*, X: 445.
31. John Webster Grant, *Moon of Wintertime: Missionaries and the Indians of Canada in Encounter since 1534* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), 250.
32. Grant, *Moon of Wintertime*, 251.

33. Readers may remember the Oka municipal council approved a request allowing the expansion of a privately-owned and operated golf course. The golf course is situated in the historic Commons and its expansion would have taken yet more land out of public use. The expansion project would also have infringed on the Kanesatake cemetery. In the years prior to the Oka town council decision, the Kanesata'kehró:non held several peaceful protest marches and made specific requests to halt the project. In March of 1990 when approval seemed imminent, the Kanesata'kehró:non began to occupy a small, seldom used dirt road into the Commons. This occupation continued through the crisis which ended on 26 September, seventy-eights day after it began.

34. "Oral Memory of the Haudenosaunee: Views of the Two Row Wampum," *Northeast Indian Quarterly* 7, No. 1 (Spring 1990); reprinted in *Indian Roots of American Democracy*, ed. José Barreiro (Ithaca: Akwe:kon Press, Cornell University, 1992), 149-159.

35. Hill, "Oral Memory of the Haudenosaunee," 154.

36. Hill, "Oral Memory of the Haudenosaunee," 155.

37. Hill, "Oral Memory of the Haudenosaunee," 159.

Christian Love Meets Government Regulations: From Ailsa Craig Boys' Farm to Craigwood, 1954-1970[1]

LUCILLE MARR

In December 1958, John Butterfield was invited to speak to the delegates who had come to Kitchener to participate in a meeting of the Ontario Conference of Historic Peace Churches. The 550 Mennonite and Brethren in Christ men attending the gathering must have listened carefully to this young man, for in a sense Butterfield was a protegé of the group. Now a grade eleven student at Rockway Mennonite Secondary School in Kitchener, and a baptized member of the Mennonite church, Butterfield had come a long way. He was one of the first boys to have been helped at the Conference's farm for emotionally disturbed boys, which had been established four years earlier near Ailsa Craig, about 100 kilometres west of Kitchener.[2]

Identifying with the volunteer ethos of Boys' Farm, Butterfield described himself as a "cheap" Mennonite. As he explained, "boys at the farm called the staff 'cheap' Mennonites because most staff were volunteers, and other Mennonites and Brethren in Christ from all over Ontario volunteered long hours of their time. Men came to re-build the farm's barn and women cleaned, sewed, and preserved vast quantities of food. "I personally couldn't resist the love that was shown to me by the staff and the neighbouring Mennonite communities," he concluded.[3]

The Ontario Conference of Historic Peace Churches had established Ailsa Craig Boys' Farm as a means of contributing to a society that had allowed them conscientious objection privileges during World War II.[4] The conference had represented the Mennonite and Brethren in Christ churches

in negotiations with the government and their members had been exempted from bearing arms. They were allowed instead to serve Canadian society by planting forests and building highways. These opportunities to serve beyond their own communities helped these separate people to see the world, in historian Ted Regehr's words, "less as an evil place to be avoided and more as a place of great suffering in need of the love and healing that Jesus had exemplified in his ministry on earth."[5] Further, just as their service during the war had been appreciated by Canadians, their post-war initiative was also welcomed. Ontario Social Services heralded Ailsa Craig Boys' Farm as a "pioneering" institution, for in 1954 few such services existed in that province. The Farm was unique, for it was geared especially for boys whose problems were too severe for a foster home, but who might, with the proper environment, still be able to be saved from the severe measures of the industrial or training schools. Although these institutions had been established under the Ontario Industrial Schools Act as early as 1884, they still provided the standard care for delinquents.[6]

The story of Ailsa Craig Boys' Farm is just one facet of a broader Mennonite history that was adapting and accommodating itself to Canadian society during the post-World War II era.[7] It is also an important part of the story of the developing welfare state in mid-twentieth century Canada. P.T. Rooke and R.L. Schnell have noted that the 1940s signalled a new era in Canada. With the establishment of the new federal Department of National Health and Welfare, the appointment of Dr. George F. Davidson as the first Deputy Minister of Welfare, and the passing of the Family Allowance Act, all in 1944, state welfarism became firmly entrenched in Canadian society, and the child became the centre.[8] The history of Canadian social welfare has been told largely from this perspective. But as Shirley Tillotson has pointed out, the focus on state expansion has caused historians to overlook changes in private welfare services. With the exception of certain feminist historians little attention has been paid to the impact that the public presence made on private charity. Yet during this era, public money came increasingly to augment the budgets of private charities such as Ailsa Craig Boys' Farm.[9] Indeed, eerily reminiscent of the Methodist and Presbyterian experience some fifty years earlier, when their educational and social welfare programs shifted from church to state control, this Mennonite initiative came increasingly under the direction of Ontario Social Services during the decade and a half from the farm's inception in 1954 to 1970.

By using records kept by the Conference of Historic Peace churches and its successor, the Mennonite Central Committee (Ontario), and a number of interviews of people who served in the institution during those years, I will outline the transition that Ailsa Craig Boys' Farm made during the 1960s, from a Mennonite mission farm to a government-sponsored institution. Basing my assessment on these sources, I argue that despite an increasing dependance on public support, the farm's Christian ethos remained foundational to its success. Indeed, as David Marshall has pointed out, to contend that "society is becoming increasingly secular does not mean that religious faith and institutions disappear."[10]

The establishment of Ailsa Craig Boys' Farm in June 1954 was within the context of such faith. Jack and Anne Wall, a young Mennonite couple who had found their experience working at Boys' Village in Smithville, Ohio, in their words, "a life-changing commitment," and who had brought with them a passionate desire to serve Canada's disadvantaged youth, were instrumental in starting the farm. On his own Jack had no credibility with the Ontario Ministry of Social Services for he had no professional training in social work. For Jack, what some might have seen as a chance encounter, his meeting with Mennonite Central Committee's Canadian voluntary service coordinator Harvey Taves at a youth gathering, was nothing short of providential. For Taves, the meeting must also have been auspicious, for he was looking for new service projects in which the Mennonites could invest their efforts now nearly a decade after the end of World War II. The MCC's overseas relief work had, in large part, run its course, and such a project would give the Mennonites an opportunity to serve, while at a more mundane level, it would keep the MCC's Canadian office open. Wall's vision also captured the imagination of members of the Amish Mennonite Church in Nairn, ON. A 135-acre property, including a three-story house built by Scottish pioneers one hundred years earlier, which had been purchased by that group to serve as a halfway house for a rescue mission in London, was donated to the Mennonite Central Committee in the hopes that This new project would be more successful than the former.[11]

Things moved quickly. By the fall of that year, Jack Wall and Harvey Taves had surveyed most Children's Aid Societies in Ontario to discover what need there was that the Ontario Mennonites might fill. They had also spent the summer raising funds for the project among the Mennonite and Brethren in Christ churches in Ontario and upper state New

York. The overwhelming response was in favour of "a home which could care for boys with emotional and behaviour problems ten to fifteen years of age," boys who fell between the cracks of the foster home system and the provincial training schools.[12]

In November, Wall was appointed as housefather on a voluntary service basis, while Taves took on the directorship. In reality, Taves' directing was mostly from his Kitchener office. Wall and his wife Ann were on site and they ran the home as they continued to raise funds and promote the work, while feeding, clothing, nurturing and supervising twenty boys of various classes, races and religions between ten and thirteen years of age, who had been accepted at the farm through southwestern Ontario Children's Aid Societies. Their task was a challenging one, for there was as of yet little funding for the project. This meant that Anne, who had two infants of her own to care for, also bore the brunt of the household management. Initially, she did all of the cooking and laundry for up to seventeen boys and her own family single-handedly. She found herself using tin cans to heat water for laundry and meal-making, and washing all of the boys' clothing with a wringer washer.[13]

As if these conditions were not arduous enough, managing the boys was exhausting. Many of them had come through a number of foster homes already. While not yet being categorized as "delinquents," a term denoting, in historian Susan Houston's words, "an allegation of deviant behaviour sustained by public authority" (a definition which varied from time to time, but which usually included children who were part of a "*street culture*"), descriptions of the boys accepted at the farm suggest that some were heading that way.[14] According to Taves' successor Alden Bohn, the boys manifested a variety of behaviour problems including being "disturbed," "self-conscious," "mouthy," "insecure," and "lacking ambition."[15] Only physically healthy boys with an IQ above 90 were accepted, but most boys exhibited the sorts of personality or psycho-neurotic disorders that Bohn described. What he did not mention was that anxiety symptoms such as vomiting, obesity and compulsive eating, tics, eneuresis and learning difficulties were common. But some boys were clearly suffering from more than problems in deportment. Many were used to violent ways of interacting, and staff frequently found themselves confronted with unruly actions including fist fights between the boys, truancy, pyromania, stealing, and the indiscriminate wielding of knives.[16] For all of these reasons, foster homes were no longer an option for them.

While in retrospect it seems somewhat naive to think that a largely untrained, volunteer staff could do what a normal foster home was unable to, the operating principle reflected both the environmentalism advocated by Froebel in the latter part of the previous century, and the nonresistant philosophy of the Conference of Historic Peace Churches. Indeed, a study done by the farm advisory council in 1955 clearly reflected the ideal that "a healthy and loving environment shaped the personality and lives of children,"[17] and that life in a good, middle-class family could save those working-class children who had gone bad:[18]

> The operating principle of the Boys' Farm is that it will provide an environment in which a boy will be loved, understood, coached, educated and generally helped to feel that he can become a useful member of society. The general prescription for helping him overcome his problems will be the process of living in such an environment provided by all the members of the staff and the other boys. This process of living will be merely an extension of the family principle. He will have more brothers than is normal and his parents are foster but he will still be part of a family. He will also be encouraged to make himself useful to the family, to share in its responsibilities and in the same sense, to accept its authority.[19]

In short, although the initial motivation had been simply to help needy boys, as the program developed, the ideal came to mean duplicating traditional Mennonite farm life and family and religious values. Carol Baines has observed that such ideals, common among Canadian institutions for needy children, showed little inclination to work at changing the environments from which the children came and to which they would likely return. There were no attempts made to teach the boys at Ailsa Craig how to cope in constructive ways with the inferior housing, poor sanitation, broken health, inadequate wages and frequent unemployment to which they had fallen heir. Rather, the personnel at Ailsa Craig Boys' Farm, similar to other children's institutions, seemed to work at training the youngsters who passed through its doors to aspire to middle-class values.[20] House parents, a cook, a farmer and other maintenance staff, as well as three teachers who spent mornings working on remedial education in the school established on the premises, soon joined the Walls to run the operation, reflecting what Canadian middle-class society saw as the ideal education. A `normal' family life was supplemented by the three R's and

farm living aimed to further teach the boys to be hard-working, and ultimately to train them to be the bread-winners for their families.[21]

With this emphasis on rearing working-class boys to model middle-class values, it would appear that the farm was an attempt to masculinize what Tillotson has suggested had become the feminine side of the Canadian welfare enterprise. If the 1940s had seen the transformation of child care to a public dimension legislated by numerous new social policies, this was the masculine domain and the work of the private agencies usually resembled "mothers' work more than that of fathers."[22] Institutions like Ailsa Craig Boys' Farm were responsible to socialize children, to nurse those who were infirm, to deal with life crises and to supplement the family economy. Public welfare, meanwhile, played out the masculine role by supplying the major material subsistence through public funding.

Under this schema, then, it was Jack Wall's duty as housefather to work with the boys on the farm in the afternoons. The goal was to teach these young men responsibility by having them tend a variety of animals, as well as showing them how to work the land as they hoed the sugar beets and picked the cucumbers grown on the farm. Wall was also expected to play the role of a middle-class father as he engaged his charges in healthy recreational outlets such as horseback riding, softball, volleyball and horseshoes.[23] Meanwhile, a succession of cooks provided healthy farm meals for boys who had often been nutritionally, as well as emotionally deprived. Alice Martens, who served as cook at the farm in the early years, recalls the boys telling her how good the food was in comparison to what they were used to. But here the typical feminine nurturing image ended, for the housemother Etta Horning's task was not so much to nurture the boys, as to manage the large household.

This patriarchal model of family was framed by rituals typical of Mennonite family life. Grace before meals was supplemented with devotional time, and after meals hymns were sung. At bedtime, Wall led the boys in evening prayers. On Sundays, all staff helped to outfit the twenty boys in freshly laundered clothes, and took turns escorting them to the local Mennonite church – not just in the morning, but also in the evening. This rite was replayed mid-week when the boys were taken to prayer services.[24]

In the midst of their high ideals, farm personnel often found their work to be exhausting. Whatever their role, workers were required to act

as supervisors and mentors. Like a family, most staff lived in the big house with the boys, and carried out their work running the institution, while helping the housefather care for his charges. Meanwhile, unlike a typical family, the youth were unruly and as already mentioned, used to violent ways of interacting. Dave Martens, who came to Boys' Farm as a maintenance worker in 1956, recalled forty years later that he had had no time off in his first six weeks at the farm. While time may alter memory, Martens' vivid recollections suggest the tensions felt by staff members: "You always had to watch your back," and at night you were quite likely to be woken up by some antic, such as a rooster having been thrown into a boy's bed." When Martens was finally given a week-end off, he remembers going to bed Friday evening to wake up a day and a half later, on Sunday morning.[25]

Initially, corporal punishment seems to have been an accepted way of dealing with these sorts of problems.[26] Admittedly, the romantic view of providing a loving family setting for twenty boys was not realistic. The boys who had been removed from their own homes or from foster homes because at best they were unwilling to conform to the rules, and at worst, because they were unmanageable and violent, would try the most patient of staff. Yet although the situation seemed to call for the severe measures at one time held by most middle-class Canadians as the only sure way to deal with troubled youth, "kindness and love" had been long promoted by social workers as a more humane response to the anti-social behaviour characteristic of these boys.[27] The physical approach to discipline seems to have been an anomaly in Mennonite circles as well, for the softer measures fit more closely with the Mennonite principles of love and nonresistance than did harsh methods aimed at correction. Indeed, the Boys' Farm advisory board insisted that corporal punishment be stopped, for "correction and rehabilitation" must be done "through love,"not "through fear of reprisal."[28]

The problem was, how was enough stability to be gained to create an atmosphere where more genteel corrective measures could be successfully employed? Taves, in his pivotal role as executive director of the Mennonite Central Committee Ontario office and with his infectious enthusiasm, responded by recruiting a couple who would be central to the survival and success of boys' farm as the Conference of Historic Peace Churches had envisioned it, through the 1960s.[29] Ed and Agnes Driediger came from Saskatchewan to southwestern Ontario in 1957 to serve the

institution as farmer and cook. In their early thirties, the couple had been working for the previous three years at the Mennonite Youth Farm on Rosthern, SK for physically challenged girls and boys.[30] Not long after the Driedigers arrived, the Walls left the boys' farm to start a similar program for girls in nearby Parkhill. The Driedigers would remain at the farm for the next thirteen years and despite the lack of formal training (Ed had a grade eight education), he soon became the director of the farm. It was under his leadership that alternative methods of discipline were tried. It was also during Driediger's time as director that the advisory board negotiated their on-going relationship with the Ontario Welfare Council, that staff were encouraged to train professionally, and that in the face of pressures towards secularization, religious expectations were refined, but kept foundational to farm life.[31]

Driediger, with his "big stature," his "optimistic calmness," and his "just justice," immediately engendered the confidence of the Mennonite Central Committee administration, the farm staff, and the boys themselves.[32] Driediger was able to bring unity to the community and the boys found someone whom they could trust.[33] This is not to say that there had not been trusting relationships before Driediger came on the scene, but perhaps Driediger's own recollection of what was in his mind a pivotal event that occurred shortly after his arrival at the farm, will illustrate his influence. Driediger recalled meeting Bob, who was among the regular runaways, in a field some distance from the farm house as the boy made one more escape attempt. According to Driediger, while Bob admitted that he would like to return, he was afraid of getting the strap. Driediger remembers his role as being Bob's advocate. According to him, when other staff insisted on corporal discipline, he gave his resignation to the board. Apparently "kindness and love" won the day for Driediger was asked to stay on as acting director, and violent punishment was banned.[34]

Driediger quickly discerned that major problems were the lack of physical space, the low ratio of staff to boys, and the lack of maturity and training among the volunteers. Matters came to a head in 1961 when Driediger suggested resigning as acting director to become housefather. Taves was alarmed at the prospect of losing his director, and immediately arranged a trip to Mennonite Central Committee headquarters in Akron, Pennsylvania, to discuss the matter with the Executive Secretary of the organization.[35] The upshot of the matter was the recognition that it was too difficult to expect one housefather to "keep effective control and form

meaningful relationships" with twenty boys. The board decided to go to the more costly route of cottage care recommended by social services. Two cottages were to be built which would house ten boys and a housefather and housemother in each.[36]

Further, Taves ensured that despite Driediger's lack of training, his position as leader was upheld. This was problematic, for Ontario Social Services was pressuring the advisory board to hire more professionals. Taves, on his part, was not to be dissuaded. He stressed that despite Driediger's lack of formal education, his "steadiness and his insight and ability with the boys made him the natural leader of the staff." Taves insisted that as Mennonites, they should resist being driven by society's expectations. There may have been a trend in the Canadian welfare state towards becoming more professional, but Taves held to his position, reminding the board that the church was in the program to make an important contribution to society, not to conform to secular pressures. Thus at Taves' insistence, the board formally appointed Driediger as director of Boys' Farm early in 1962.[37]

Under Driediger's leadership, and with increasing demand from Children's Aid Societies as far afield as Parry Sound and Ottawa, the two cottages originally planned became three. By 1964, with funding from the provincial government, ten boys and a set of houseparents were set up in each of the "sturdy" new brick cottages.[38] This expansion by no means solved all the Farm's problems. Driediger continued to be faced with frequent staff turnover, and applicants for open positions rarely qualified for the job. For instance in 1965, Driediger needed to replace one-third of his staff of twenty-four. Abe Willms' assessed the situation in an article published in the *Canadian Mennonite* that year: "One should enter a job like this only with strong nerves, outstanding balance in personality, and a constant willingness to `walk the extra mile for a friend' holding every boy as friend even when he is being quite unfriendly."[39]

To better prepare them for the challenges of their work, houseparents were encouraged to participate in staff conferences. In this setting they could attempt to understand the problems that the boys brought with them from their pasts. Further, although they did not always avail themselves of the opportunity, these meetings gave houseparents the occasion to express their own feelings of frustration and to share with their colleagues.[40]

Roles continued to be defined according to the traditional Mennonite approach to child rearing. In short, the housefather was to be in charge of

the house and the boys, for strong "male control" was seen to be the key to keeping the boys in line. Not only was the housefather the disciplinarian, but he was responsible also for boys during work assignments on the farm and for their religious life; further, he oversaw the boys' finances and in consultation with the housemother assigned each boy a room and a bed.[41]

What is especially striking about the job description is that there was none for the housemother. Similar to views of motherhood in the larger society, her role was assumed. Initially, as was mentioned earlier, Ann Wall took on all of the household duties. As the staff expanded to include cooks and laundresses, the housemother's role changed to that of middle-class mother of the 1950s and 1960s, except this matriarch had twenty children. She was expected to create a "homey touch" for the boys which meant encouraging all twenty to get ready for school and church, helping them with homework, supervising indoor games, making sure they took their soiled sheets and clothing to a central laundry depot, and supervising the serving of dinner to her large family.[42] Driediger recognized the great stress that this living arrangement put on houseparents, and by 1965 he had hired six married couples, three for each cottage, and three relief, to allow weekends off and summer holiday time.[43]

Meanwhile, most boys studied at the farm school, by now all day. Government funding allowed the farm to increase the staff to a principal and four teachers with about six boys in each classroom. No longer a volunteer enterprise, by the mid-1960s, both houseparents and teachers received salaries comparable to what they would have received elsewhere. Indeed, it is striking that by the latter part of the decade, the desire to voluntarily serve society motivated few of the workers. While the desire to help was no doubt part of it, similar to other young people of the sixties, most were interested in the adventure of employment in a new locale. For instance in 1969, when Driediger invited his nephew Jack Willms and his wife Audrey to come from Saskatoon, SK to serve as houseparents, Jack, a sociology and psychology major at University of Saskatchewan, saw the opportunity to experience another part of Canada, and a career opportunity. He spent the next ten years of his life at the farm, three as houseparent, then three as social worker and the last four as executive director of the institution.[44]

Back to the early 1960s, while the houseparent staff was expanding, and the school system was becoming more professional, Social Services

was pressuring the advisory council to hire trained case workers as well. Initially, this presented a problem. The institution was run by a denomination largely composed of rural folk for whom higher education still meant, for most, high school, with perhaps teacher training. In short, although there were some exceptions to the rule, it was difficult to find Mennonite social workers who were willing to serve in that setting.[45]

A solution to the problem was for the institution to fund certain workers with an aptitude for social work to further their education in the field. Thus in 1961, the advisory board appointed Howard Otterbein from New Dundee, ON, for a term of seven years, with the understanding that he would enrol in the University of Western Ontario's social work program.[46] Otterbein supplemented the houseparent's role by spending individual time with each boy, and by bringing in films and speakers to further train the houseparents.[47] Two years later, a second staff person was encouraged to pursue a social work degree. During the 1960s, in all, the advisory board sponsored six individuals in this way with a third social worker added to the staff in 1966.[48]

Young Mennonites were thus prepared to serve professionally, and positive results were seen on the farm. When Otterbein returned from his studies in 1963, he was pleased with the improved atmosphere. With added staff, he observed less "repressive measures" than formerly were needed for control; further, with their added training, houseparents appeared to garner more authority; finally, Driediger himself "sound[ed] more like a social worker everyday."[49]

Further, in the late 1960s, some of the previous patriarchal assumptions were challenged when two young women applied for social work positions at Boys' Farm. Much discussion of Anita Klassen's and Betty Kehler's merits for the position ensued at the board level. Was it a good investment to educate a woman? "The feeling was that girls should have the option of marriage." Finally, however, perhaps against their better judgement but under Driediger's and Otterbein's advice, the personnel committee of the advisory board acquiesced to a social climate that allowed women to move into professional careers.[50]

In 1964 a name change, and a halfway house which opened up in the nearby city of London, symbolized the transition that had been taking place through the first half of the decade. The Ailsa Craig Boys' Farm advisory board acquiesced to the newly trained social workers and renamed the institution Craigwood, while the London group home came to be known

as Craigwood extension. As the new professionals explained, "the term Boys' Farm denotes an institution operated along nineteenth-century Dickinsonian lines." They worried that government social services might be "prejudiced against such a name." Furthermore, they were concerned that the boys might "feel a stigma to being attached to a boys' farm." When the old guard reminded them that "the name Ailsa Craig Boys' Farm ha[d] found a warm response within the Ontario Mennonite constituency," the concern was minimized. Christian principles would be upheld, but the name change to Craigwood would become a metaphor for what the London extension made concrete. Officially, boys' farm would enter the modern world, in name and in urban outreach.[51]

Other decisions confirmed this direction, some with detrimental results in church relations. For instance, the conservative Waterloo-Markham group stopped supporting the farm when Driediger insisted on purchasing television sets for the boys.[52] No doubt the conservative element was also disenchanted with the shift in the farm enterprise. The livestock, which had previously been kept despite little profit because they were seen "to bring psychological and spiritual healing to disturbed boys," were all sold by 1964 to grow corn as a cash crop.[53] Further, by the latter 1960s the preserves contributed by Mennonite women were outlawed by the government as unsafe.[54]

Nor were the more progressive churches inclined to support the project in the way that they had done immediately after the war. To reverse this trend, Taves attempted to play on the sensibilities of the membership by making a Mother's Day appeal. "All of us feel grateful to our Mothers!" he wrote to the pastors of all the Mennonite congregations in southern Ontario. "There are many children who may have mothers, but in whose mind the concepts of `love,' `motherhood,' and `family' do not create pleasant, secure or loving images. We are speaking of the emotionally disturbed children in the homes and institutions across our country."[55] Perhaps it was to the women that Taves made his appeal, for a women's auxiliary, composed of representatives from the various Mennonite groups supporting the farm, continued to sustain the institution by furnishing cottages and decorating new and renovated buildings until 1970. General church contributions, though, continued to decline throughout the decade.[56] The result of this flagging church support was that Craigwood became increasingly dependent on the government for financial support.[57]

The Craigwood advisory board and its staff also came to rely ever

more heavily on counsel from government agencies.[58] Yet despite the increasing dependence on government, there was much ambivalence about the direction given by social services. The most contentious point of interaction with social welfare throughout the decade was Craigwood's religious principles. For instance, in 1960 the Department of Child Welfare took issue with boys being routinely taken to the local Mennonite church, insisting that they should be allowed to worship with their own denominations. Ailsa Craig responded by pointing out that for a time, the local ministerial had taken turns conducting Sunday evening services at the farm, but it did not work; the boys had become restless during services and the ministers had found it too difficult "to create a worshipful atmosphere." Years later, Agnes Driediger recalled these attempts with empathy towards the boys: "It was hard on [them . . . they] were not used to going to church at all." The solution was to take them to the Mennonite church with farm staff to supervise, and Ed Driediger to teach them in Sunday school.[59]

Initially workers saw it as their mission to see the boys "saved." But early in the decade concerns with "sin, punishment, reward," and "salvation" gave way to the foundation of "love" for "emotionally disturbed children." In Driediger's words, on the advice of a Mennonite leader whom he admired, he was able to come to the point of giving up "counting sheep" and letting "God count the sheep."[60] In practical terms, this meant allowing a boy who had run away in 1963 complaining that there was "too much religion, too few girls and too many rules," to stay in his room on Sunday mornings when he returned to the farm, until he chose to go back to church on his own.[61] It also meant staff putting up with much abuse from the boys. That same year Driediger reported a conversation with the mother of one of the boys: "How can you people take the physical and verbal abuse that you do without retaliating?" she asked him. "We certainly can't take it from our son." Putting the farm's nonresistant philosophy into words, Driediger replied that while "it is not . . . easy . . . part of our work is to show the boys that their violence is not always met with the same and that personal pride doesn't mean a thing."[62]

At the same time, Craigwood administration was more geared towards working with the boys, than with their families. In 1965, an Ontario Welfare Council study of Craigwood urged case workers to keep closer relations with the parents of their charges. Social workers did follow up by seeing that boys made contact with home two or three times a year, but Driediger preferred to continue the attempt to be family to the boys.

Perhaps the most revealing example of this is the summer cross-Canada trips on which he and several staff took their thirty charges. The facility would rent a bus and camp from Ailsa Craig to the Okanagan. A favourite stop was Manitou Lake at Watrous, SK near Driediger's former home. While it is likely a coincidence that this was near a spa resort with a history of people coming there seeking cures, it must have been restorative for the boys to show off to Driediger's nephew young John Willms, who recalls watching in awe as these adventuresome city boys performed their stunts in the local diving hole. It must have also been therapeutic for these boys to be accepted as extended family by Driediger's sister Ann and her brood. Ann Willms would serve the entire gang dinner and wash several dozen pairs of blue jeans and t-shirts, soliciting young John's help in hanging them all by hand on her clothesline.[63] Indeed, the boys were included in the circle of Driediger's western family during several summer trips during the sixties, despite such misdemeanours as stealing a car en route home one summer.[64]

With their strong commitment to the boys, the Craigwood administration refused to abide by social services' recommendation that boys be kept in an institution's charge for only two years. Craigwood insisted on keeping boys under sixteen years of age, as long as they deemed necessary; on at least one occasion, a boy remained at the farm for a full five years. Further, the whole purpose of the Craigwood extension was to allow boys who had turned sixteen and were unable to return to their families, a supervised opportunity to re-enter city life.[65] Finally, social welfare's classification of the farm as being appropriate to cater only to boys who were "mildly disturbed," seemed limiting to Craigwood's advisory board. Their application to be put under the Department of Mental Health, which helped fund facilities caring for children suffering from more severe mental or emotional disorders, illustrates that they refused to be totally shaped by the government agency.[66]

For Ed and Agnes Driediger, the increasingly close surveillance by the social welfare department meant that the era of voluntary service for the dedicated nonprofessional was over. Like the Wall's had some ten years earlier, in 1970 the Driedigers also left the farm to start their own foster home in Ailsa Craig. Meanwhile, Howard Otterbein stepped into Driediger's place, making the transition to a professional institution complete.[67] Ed Driediger, his wife Agnes, and the dedicated Mennonite personnel that had worked under them over the years, left their mark,

however. Despite the gradual decline of church support, the increased dependence on government funding, and the professionalization that took place through the 1960s, the ethos of the farm remained fundamentally Christian. In 1970, spiritual concerns remained a priority for the Craigwood board and its staff as they continued, in their words, "to rethink their relationship to [government] agencies and their responsibility for running a unique program of service."[68]

In retrospect, boys like John Butterfield who returned to the farm with his wife Betty to serve as houseparents in 1968 on one end of the spectrum, and Teddy, who returned to visit after being released on parole for killing a man on the other, made Ailsa Craig's philosophy of Christian love seem worthwhile. As John's earlier testimony had suggested, the love shown at Ailsa Craig had reached him in a personal way. But who's to say that Teddy's return did not also illustrate the success of the farm? Years later, Driediger recalled how on his visit, Teddy wanted to see pictures of himself and the other boys. "There's me, and there's me," he said. "He sat there and laughed, tears rolling down his face as if he had found some roots." Five jail terms later, upon his release, he phoned the Driedigers from Richmond Hill, BC where he was then managing a condominium building: "He told me," Driediger recalled, that "he was doing well because of what I learned from you . . . to have faith in God."[69]

The Craigwood story continues. Throughout the 1970s, the farm came increasingly under government control and by 1983, it formally severed its ties with the Mennonite Central Committee. Further research might explore whether the institution's religious foundations crumbled with this change. Other questions that beg to be answered are around the gender constructs that shaped the institution and the boys' and their parents' expectations and experiences of the farm. Did the farm make as positive a contribution to the working-class culture which it served as it did for the Mennonite church which sponsored it? These, and other questions, remain to be yet addressed in this important piece of Canada's religious history.

Endnotes

1. This paper is part of a larger research assignment, The Mennonite Central Committee (Ontario) History Project, funded by the Mennonite Central Committee (Ontario.) I would like to thank my friend, colleague and research

assistant Linda Huebert Hecht for her help in exploring the sources used for this paper. It is thanks to her long hours in the archives and her careful interviews that much of this material has been retrieved. I also appreciate her willingness to be in dialogue with me as I processed the data. Without her friendship and her support this paper would never have seen the light of day. I would also like to thank my husband Jean-Jacques Goulet, who as always, has been supportive both as best friend and as willing editor.

2. *Canadian Mennonite*, 05 December 1958, 1.

3. *Canadian Mennonite*, 05 December 1958, 8; Minutes of the Military Problems Committee, 31 March 1955, Mennonite Central Committee (Ontario) Papers (hereafter MCCO Papers), Mennonite Historical Archives of Ontario (hereafter MHAO).

4. Minutes of the Ailsa Craig Boys' Farm (hereafter ACBF) Advisory Council, 12 November 1954; and Report of a study meeting to consider ACBF held at the School of Social Work, 26 October 1954, MCCO papers, MHAO.

5. Ted Regehr, *Mennonites in Canada, 1939-1970: A People Transformed* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 125.

6. John Rose, Letter to ACBF Board of Directors, 21 September 1961, MCCO papers, MHAO; and P.T. Rooke and R.L. Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum: From Child Rescue to the Welfare State in English Canada, 1880-1950* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983), 403.

7. Regehr, *Mennonites in Canada*, 382.

8. Rooke and Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum*, 408-410.

9. Shirley Tillotson, "Class and Community in Canadian Welfare Work, 1933-1960," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 32, No. 1 (Spring 1997): 84, n.1. Tillotson identifies Christina Simmons, R.L. Schell and Patricia Rooke, Carolyn Strange, Diana Pedersen, Andrée Lévesque, and Franca Iacovetta as some who have counterbalanced this trend, 84, n.2.

10. David Marshall, *Secularizing the Faith: Canadian Protestant Clergy and the crisis of belief, 1850-1940* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992), 18; see also 249.

11. *Canadian Mennonite*, 14 December 1956, 7; Jack and Ann Wall, interview by Linda Huebert Hecht in Kitchener, ON, 7 October 1997. Report by Harvey Taves to Advisory Council of ACBF, 27 June 1958, and letter from Ed Driediger to Esther Martin, 21 December 1967, MCCO papers, MHAO.

12. *Canadian Mennonite*, 14 December 1956, 7; and Minutes of ACBF Advisory Council, 12 November 1954, MCCO papers, MHAO.

13. Jack and Ann Wall interview.

14. Susan Houston, "The `Waifs and Strays' of a Late Victorian City: Juvenile Delinquents in Toronto," in *Childhood and Family in Canadian History,* ed. Joy Parr (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982), 131.

15. Director's report to ACBF Advisory Council, 07 June 1957, MCCO papers, MHAO.

16. Dave and Alice Martens, interview by Linda Huebert Hecht in Waterloo, ON, 17 March 1997; Ed and Agnes Driediger, interview by Linda Huebert Hecht in Aylmer, ON, 22 March 1997; and ACBF "Admissions Policy," 1960, MCCO papers, MHAO.

17. Carol Baines, "The Children of Earlscourt, 1915-1948: All in the Same Boat, `Except we were in a better boat'," *Canadian Social Work Review* 2, No. 2 (Summer 1994): 185.

18. Neil Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society: Framing the Twentieth-Century Consensus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), 92-93.

19. Minutes recorded by Study Committee of ACBF Advisory Council, 12 March 1955, MCCO papers, MHAO.

20. Baines, "Children of Earlscourt," 190; see also Dennis Guest on the conditions which social welfare, as it developed in twentieth century Canada, aimed to alleviate *(The Emergence of Social Security in Canada* [Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1980], 49).

21. Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society*, 93.

22. Tillotson, "Class and Community in Canadian Welfare Work," 69; see also Rooke and Schnell on the development of the post World War II welfare state which transformed dependent child life (in *Discarding the Asylum*, 408-410).

23. *Canadian Mennonite*, 14 December 1956; Betty van der Smissen, "Report on Recreation Program for ACBF," 1956, and report of Alden Bohn, director of ACBF to ACBF Advisory Board, 21 June 1958, MCCO papers, MHAO.

24. *Canadian Mennonite*, 14 December 1956, 7-8; Dave and Alice Martens interview; report of Director, 31 March 1955, MCCO papers, MHAO; and John (Jack) Willms, interview by Lucille Marr in Edmonton, AB, 9 May 1997.

25. Dave and Alice Martens interview.

26. Dave and Alice Martens interview; and Ed and Agnes Driediger interview.

27. Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society*, 241.

28. Report of Director to ACBF Advisory Board; and "Philosophy and Operation of ACBF," December 1959, MCCO papers, MHAO.

29. Letter from John Rose to Iva Taves, 20 July 1965, Iva Taves private papers.

30. Ed and Agnes Driediger interview.

31. Director's report to the Board of Managers of the ACBF, December 1959; and Minutes of ACBF Board of Directors, 1 September 1960, MCCO papers, MHAO.

32. ACBF Board of Directors Executive committee, 23 January 1961; and Director's report to ACBF executive committee, 23 January 1961, MCCO papers, MHAO; Dave and Alice Martens interview; and Ed and Agnes Driediger interview.

33. Minutes of ACBF Board, January 1964; Minutes of Craigwood Board, 7 September 1965, MCCO papers, MHAO; and Dave and Alice Martens interview.

34. Ed and Agnes Driediger interview.

35. Linda Huebert Hecht pointed out the gravity of the situation: see Memorandum, confidential to Board of Directors from Harvey Taves, 21 September 1961, MCCO papers, MHAO.

36. Minutes of ACBF Executive Committee, 27 April 1961 and 28 December 1961, MCCO paper, MHAO; and Rooke and Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum*, 403.

37. Harvey Taves to ACBF board, 15 January 1962; Harvey Taves to Wm. Snyder, 31 January 1962, MCCO, MHAO; and Rooke and Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum*, 407.

38. Harvey Taves, "Record of interview with the Honorable Louis P. Cecile, Minister of Public Welfare of Ontario," 9 May 1962; Ed Driediger, Director, report to ACBF Board, January 1964; Mennonite Central Committee (Ontario) Annual Report (1966), 18, MCCO papers, MHAO; and *Canadian Mennonite*, 7 December 1965, 1.

39. *Canadian Mennonite*, 7 December 1965, 1; List of administration and personnel at ACBF, June 1962; and Minutes of Craigwood Board, 14 December 1965 and April 1966, MCCO papers, MHAO.

40. Minutes of ACBF Board of Directors, 29 December 1960; and Director's report to ACBF Board, January 1964, MCCO papers, MHAO.

41. Executive Committee of ACBF Board, 23 January 1961; Ed Driediger, Director's report to the ACBF Board, 8 January 1963 and Jan. 1964; and Minutes of MCCO Welfare Section, October 1970, MCCO papers, MHAO.

42. Don and Inez Uchytil, interview by Lucille Marr in Stoney Plain, AB, 19 January 1997; and Harvey and Ruth Krahn, interview by Lucille Marr in Edmonton, AB, 2 February 1997.

43. Ed Driediger, Director's report to the ACBF Board, March 1965, MCCO papers, MHAO.

44. Harvey Taves to J. Robarts, Minister of Education, 18 September 1961; Minutes, Craigwood Board of Directors, April 1966, 3 May 1966, October 1969, MCCO papers, MHAO; *Canadian Mennonite*, 7 December 1965, 1; Don and Inez Uchytil interview; and John Willms interview.

45. William Klassen, speaker at ACBF Study Conference, Nairn Mennonite Church, 9 November 1961, MCCO papers, MHAO.

46. Minutes, ACBF Board of Directors, 1 September 1960, 30 March 1962, MCCO papers, MHAO.

47. Case workers report to the ACBF Board of Directors, 30 March 1961, MCCO papers, MHAO.

48. Minutes, Executive Committee of ACBF Board of Directors, 30 March 1961; Director's report to ACBF board, 10 September 1963; and Minutes, Craigwood Board of Directors, October 1965, 3 May 1966, 1 November 1967, March 1968, 12 December 1969, January 1970, MCCO papers, MHAO.

49. Caseworker's report to ACBF Board of Directors, 19 November 1963, MCCO papers, MHAO.

50. Minutes, Craigwood Board of Directors, 10 April 1968, January 1970; Director's report to Board of Directors, March 1969; and Caseworker's report to Board of Directors, 12 December 1969, September 1970, MCCO papers, MHAO.

51. Minutes, ACBF Board of Directors of Directors, July 1964, MCCO papers, MHAO.

52. Ed and Agnes Driediger interview; Minutes, ACBF Board of Directors, March 1962, MCCO papers, MHAO.

53. Harvey Taves to Peter Bunnett, 29 March 1962; Minutes, ACBF Board of Directors, February 1964; and Director's report to Craigwood Board of Directors, 14 December 1965, MCCO papers, MHAO.

54. Ed and Agnes Driediger interview.

55. J.B. Martin to pastors of Conference of Historic Peace Churches constituency, 5 March 1962; Harvey Taves to Ontario Mennonite ministers, 4 March 1962; Harvey Taves to ACBF Board of Directors, 27 March 1962; and Minutes, Craigwood Board of Directors, October 1965, MCCO papers, MHAO.

56. Mennonite Central Committee, Annual Report (1966), 18; and Director's report to Craigwood Board of Directors, 19 March 1969, MCCO papers, MHAO.

57. Minutes, Craigwood Board of Directors, 14 June 1966.

58. Linda Huebert Hecht pointed this out: see Minutes, Craigwood Board of Directors, 13 September 1966.

59. Minutes, ACBF Board of Directors, 29 December 1960; Harvey Taves to W.A. Bury, Director of Child Welfare, 13 December 1960, MCCO papers, MHAO; and Ed and Agnes Driediger interview.

60. Caseworker's report to ACBF executive committee; Minutes, ACBF Board of Directors, 23 January 1961; ACBF study conference, 9 November 1961; "Craigwood," publicity booklet, 1968, MCCO papers, MHAO; and Ed and Agnes Driediger interview.

61. Caseworker's report to ACBF Board of Directors, 2 April 1963, MCCO papers, MHAO.

62. Director's report to ACBF Board of Directors, 8 January 1963, MCCO papers, MHAO.

63. Report on ACBF summer trip, 1961; Director's report to Board of Directors, 10 September 1964; Minutes, Craigwood Board of Directors, 14 March 1967, MCCO papers, MHAO; John Willms, interview; and Sid Marty, "Saltwater Solace," *Canadian Geographic* (September-October 1997): 70-71.

64. Ed and Agnes Driediger interview.

65. Caseworker's report to the Craigwood Board of Directors, January 1964; "Craigwood" publicity booklet, 1968, MCCO papers, MHAO; and Ed and Agnes Driediger interview.

66. Craigwood study, 1966; "Report from Child Welfare Branch by C.T. Rousell; Director's report to Craigwood Board, 15 February 1967; Wilson Hunsberger to Betty Graham, Director of Child Welfare, 5 April 1967; "The Children's Mental Health Centres Act," *Statutes of Ontario*, 1968-69; and Minutes, Mennonite Central Committe (Ontario, Welfare Section), 2 March 1970), MCCO papers, MHAO.

67. Minutes of Craigwood Board of Directors, October 1969; Craigwood Personnel List, 16 February 1970, MCCO papers, MHAO; and Ed and Agnes Driediger interview.

68. Minutes of Craigwood Board of Directors, 24 June 1970, MCCO papers, MHAO.

69. Ed and Agnes Driediger interview; and Director's report to Craigwood Board of Directors, 3 January 1969; 11 September 1968, MCCO papers, MHAO.

Religious Origins and Objectives: Canadian Standard Efficiency Tests for Boys and Canadian Girls in Training

PATRICIA DIRKS

When the federal Liberals under Wilfrid Laurier won the 1896 election the nation's evangelical Protestants were already worried about their churches' failure to hold children, boys especially, once they entered their dangerous teenage years. Sunday schools, generally regarded by this time as the chief source of church members, were losing most of their boys and many girls before they joined the church. The economic boom and increased immigration of the Laurier era intensified the problems this situation caused for Canada's Protestant leaders. They faced the challenge of perpetuating their religious, social and political values in a period when their churches' human and financial resources were being stretched beyond their limits by rapid urbanization in central Canada and the opening up of the prairie west by, among others, tens of thousands of non-Anglo Protestant immigrants. This challenge, moreover, came at a time when the Social Gospel movement was gaining strength within Canada's major Protestant churches.

Many of the nation's Protestants, including those who ran the emerging denominational Sunday school organizations, were convinced that the objective of the Christian gospel was the achievement of the kingdom of God on earth and regarded regeneration of society through social reforms as the means to that end. To ensure that Anglo-Protestant values informed this reform, they wanted religious education programming

that would produce a larger number of committed activist church members who were willing and able to assume leadership roles in every realm of society.

Denominationally controlled Sunday school organizations grew in early-twentieth century Canada partly in response to the need to improve Sunday schools as membership recruitment agencies. But so too did the efforts of Canadian branches of the American-based non-denominational International Sunday School Association and of the Young Men's Christian Association which had moved into boys' work in a big way around the turn of the century. By 1912 Canada's YMCAs had seized the initiative in boys' work programming and convinced the non-denominational Sunday School Association to join in a nation-wide campaign to win Canadian teenage boys for Christian service.[1] Denominational religious education officials had some doubts at first about whether non-denominational efforts could produce the badly needed church members. However, when studies made it clear on the eve of the World War One that even Canada's best supported church-run Sunday school systems continued to fail as membership recruitment agencies, the nation's denominational religious educators joined their non-denominational colleagues in co-operative bodies for the purpose of winning Canada's teenagers for Christ and country.[2]

As the slaughter of thousands of Canada's young men on European battlefields got underway, the nation's small band of Protestant religious educators were embarking on a co-operative effort to provide the home front with succeeding generations of Protestant leaders. The young businessmen attracted to Canada's burgeoning YMCAs along with the first generation of professional boys' workers and denominational religious educators, saw themselves as efficient achievers and "virile" nation--builders who Protestant teenagers could, and should, emulate. Their first task was to persuade the major Protestant churches that the YMCA's mid-week religious education programming for Sunday school classes, *Canadian Standard Efficiency Tests* (hereafter *CSET*), would keep teenage boys in these classes and bring them into their respective churches. This programming, directed only at boys for the first few years, was based on the premise that physical, intellectual and social training were as important elements of religious education as spiritual training. The objective was to provide Canada with Protestant leaders in all walks of life thereby ensuring that the values and norms of evangelical Protestantism would determine

the national character. Once *CSET* had been launched the men behind it encouraged the YWCA and female Sunday school workers to produce a parallel programme for Canada's teen-aged girls so that they might be trained for their equally important, but quite distinct roles, as Christian citizens. While the result, *Canadian Girls in Training* (hereafter *CGIT*), was based on the same premises as *CSET*, the original programmes differed in significant ways. As the following examination of the way in which the religious element was incorporated into the boys' and girls' programme demonstrates, one of the most striking differences comes in the way that religion was presented initially in the male and female programmes.

The Boys' Programme

Canada's early twentieth-century Protestant religious educators approached boys' programming with a view to convincing adolescent males that the church and religion generally were legitimate masculine concerns. To this end they presented an ideal of virility attainable only through symmetrical development of all four aspects of life: the physical, mental, social and spiritual phases of human nature. Religion was an integral part of this ideal but it was presented as only one of four equally important areas of development. From the outset *CSET* was promoted as "A Plan to Provide for the All-Round Development of Canadian Boys."[3] The objective was "to call to the attention of boys the fact that the ideal Canadian citizen must be an all round, well developed man." The secret of the "strong personality" which was regarded as the source of all power and something every father wanted for his sons, lay in "The Symmetry of the Four-Fold Development." The authors went on to explain that "in this twentieth century, masterful men of powerful influence possess strong bodies with sound minds and they must maintain an unselfish brotherly interest in their fellow-men and strive to be in harmony with the great will of God."[4] What is interesting is the ordering of the four elements with religion coming last and the warning that over-development of any one of the four characteristics of human life would produce "a lop-sided character with a bias that diminishes power."[5] Religion was essential to achievement of a boy's potential but over emphasis on this aspect of his nature was as dangerous as over emphasis on any of the other three components. In the words of the 1916 edition of *CSET*: "[I]t is possible to develop the

religious side of one's nature and neglect the development of body, mind and social nature. If care is not taken to avoid any of these extremes, one will fail to achieve the best type of all-round manhood." The message was clear: unless Christian men were well developed physically, mentally and socially their religious development would go to waste. Having made this point *CSET*'s designers went on to provide Biblical endorsement of their approach. Declaring that "[t]he greatest personality that ever lived was symmetrically developed in this four-fold life," they noted that four-fold programming was modelled on Jesus's development pattern as described in Luke 2:52 which read: "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature and in favour with God and men."[6]

While the designers of *CSET* did not want religion emphasized at the expense of physical, intellectual and social development, they believed that religious education had to be an integral part of any citizenship training scheme. Their reasons for rejecting Boy Scouts make this clear.

> The widespread popularity of scouting . . . has seemingly blinded many . . . to the fact that this program, which is avowedly a system of training in citizenship ... cannot and should not be permitted to take the place of other programs, such as those of training in religion . . . A church, or home, or school that does nothing for the boys or girls beyond training them in scouting is falling far short of its responsibility and merits the vigorous criticism of those who are primarily interested in the complete, foursquare, spiritual welfare of the coming generation.[7]

CSET, the mid-week training programme designed to be carried out by Sunday school classes, sought to provide boys with everything that Scouting offering plus religious education.

The men behind *CSET* realized that the programme had to be as attractive to boys as Lord Baden Powell's immensely popular Scouting for Boys. Leaders were exhorted to put together exciting series of activities and to provide lots of opportunities for adventure and fun. *CSET* leaders, however, were to involve boys in the planning of every aspect of their group's programme. In contrast to the top-down nature of Scouting, *CSET* was to be run democratically by the boys involved. Under the guidance of manly Christian mentors, the members of *CSET* were to be inspired to become self-motivated and self-regulated all-round men who would rise

to leadership positions in whatever segment of Canadian society their respective talents led them into.

Under the plan self-governing groups of 8 to 10 boys of approximately the same age would, with the help of an adult mentor, carry out an annual 32 week programme in eight successive years. By 1918 the original handbook which had gone through eight editions had been replaced by manuals that reflected the decision to divide *CSET* into three segments, Trail Rangers for boys 12 to 14 and Tuxis Boys for those 15 to 17. Those 18 and over would be involved in leadership training.[8] While the programme delivery mode had changed, the underlying premises remained in place.

At the beginning of each year a group's adult mentor would interview the boys individually and help them establish their standings in each standard according to the Four-Fold Chart. Following this a boy's personal goals for the year would be set. The group would also set goals for itself. Committees of boys would be responsible for arranging weekly sessions which would help individuals and the group to attain the goals they had set.

CSET groups, or Trail Rangers and Tuxis as they became known, all met twice a week, on Sundays as Sunday school classes, and in a mid-week evening session at which the training and testing aspects of the programme were carried out. Mid-week sessions began with a short business meeting run by the boys who had been elected to office. This segment incorporated or was followed by a devotional Bible period of about 20 minutes after which came a 20 minute training session related to one of the four standards and finally a half hour period of tests or group games. Boys earned credits by taking tests designed to meet their personal and group goals. Mentors were responsible for keeping a record of all credits earned so that they might be noted on a boy's annual diploma and on the group's record.

The war not surprisingly served to increase the importance of enrolling those Protestant "boys of ideals, intelligence and purpose" who would soon be "moulding [their] country's destiny as her national leaders in all walks of life."[9] Boys' work on the home front was identified as "A National Patriotic Responsibility," one that the nation's Protestants had to fulfill if Canada were

> to be kept inviolate for the discharge of the high mission among the

> nations of the world, then her boys . . . should be assisted to a high standard of mental, physical, religious and social life. The burden of national responsibility, which will surely be placed upon the boys of to-day within a very few years, will then not prove too heavy, but will evoke a response which shall result in the protection of our country from the calamities of materialism, social injustice, political corruption, and insure for it a national type, strong, sane, virile and Christian.[10]

To meet this challenge the YMCA's National Council shored up the co-operative boys' work movement by increasing its staff of boys' workers. Such additions had been made possible "through the interest and generous assistance of men of vision who are determined that every effort must be made to raise the standard of our growing boys, in order that "the Canada that is to be may be dominated by men of strong Christian character."[11]

In this vein the 1916 edition of *CSET* was presented as the means of putting into concrete form the new national ideal, "Prepare to live for Canada." Without in any way detracting from concentration on the necessity of four-fold development, this edition of the programme emphasized for the first time that *CSET* was "a course of training in 'The Jesus Way' of living." The roots of this emphasis can be traced to the work of Dr. H.H. Horne, Professor of the History of Education at New York University, who had given a series of lectures based on "Jesus and His Relation to this Four-Fold Life" to Canadian boys' workers in 1915 and written an introduction to that year's edition of *CSET*.[12]

Dr. Horne's stated objective in this introduction was "to show that the *CSET* [were] well designed both to promote and exemplify the ideals of complete living among Canadian boys." Beginning from the premise that man is a unity with distinguishable aspects Horne declared: "the four-fold, though unitary, life of man is physical, volitional, emotional and intellectual." He went on to explain that there was "an appropriate ideal of development" in each area. These were, in the order given, "health" for the physical, "goodness" for the volitional, "beauty" for the emotional and, finally, "truth" for the intellectual." The absence of any reference to religion or to faith notwithstanding, Horne concluded that "These ideals together, neither under-developed nor too exclusively developed, give the 'four-square' or fully developed man, the ideal of whom is found in Jesus,

who according to Luke 2:52, 'Increased in wisdom and in stature and in favour with God and man.'"

Horne went on to address the absence of any reference to man's spiritual nature or to the place of religion in a man's life. He explained that "each aspect of this four-fold life should be related to God" and that "when so related, it becomes spiritual . . ." It was when all sides of human life were related to God that one got "the spiritual man complete in all his being." To get spiritual men, therefore, it was necessary to integrate religion into every aspect of a boy's life rather than to separate it out. "[T]he spiritual nature of man is not to be thought of as a mere section of the man . . ." Rather

> this love of God . . . is expressed on the physical side when he conforms to His laws in seeking to attain the ideal of health; on the volitional side when he conforms to His will in seeking to attain the ideal of "goodness;" on the emotional side when he senses His perfection in seeking to attain the ideal of "beauty;" and on the intellectual side when he "thinks His thoughts" in seeking to attain the ideal of "truth."

Boys essentially would become spiritual by doing what came naturally to them in the right frame of mind.

The result, in Horne's view, would be success in meeting the challenge facing Christianity in 1915 which was "the spiritualizing of existence . . ." The efficiency tests presented in *CSET* programme, he asserted, "endeavour[ed] to associate the spiritual with each part of the four-fold development." They also, he continued, "in the 'Religious Standard' rightly associate religion and beauty, as the church has likewise done in her history." On this basis, Horne concluded that he must ". . . regard the *CSET*s as a wholesome and practical endeavour to develop more adequately the ideal of the complete living of Jesus among Canadian boys."[13]

The relationship between religious education and citizenship training was raised in the 1918 Tuxis manual. Noting that it had been said that "the Tuxis Program [was] a training in Canadian Citizenship," the manual continued: "It is that and more. It is a training in Canadian *Christian* Citizenship."[14] The objective was "to lead the impulses and aspirations of the boy into worth-while tasks of service for the Church, Community, and

the World."[15] Physical development, however, was key to the achievement of this objective because muscles were "the instruments of the intellect, the feelings, and the will." "Flabby muscled boys" would become "pliant men who only talk" while "[w]ell-developed boys become men who will say and act and produce results."[16] In the final standard, through "Training for Service," "Good Citizenship," and "Nation Study" a boy's life would broaden out "into social and civil goodness so much in need to-day."[17] *CSET* mentors had "no worthier task than to inculcate in the minds of boys the real meaning of Democracy and the principles that make for true national greatness."[18] To celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Confederation *CSET* organized the World's first Boys' Parliament. Elected from the ranks of enrolled older boys delegates were seen as potential national saviours whose "rich, clean patriotic Christian idealism . . . could . . . lift [Canada] into heights of National life of which it has as yet fallen far short . . ."[19]

Once the war ended returning veterans were looked to as allies in the battle for Canada's soul.[20] *CSET* was presented to a 1919 British Columbia Boys' and Leadership Conference as "doing much to meet the most vital needs of the Church and State . . . by enlisting and developing Christian leadership, thereby making Democracy safe."[21] The "supreme question" remained "Who shall lead and whither?"

> It is in large measure for the boys who will be leaders in the industrial, commercial and professional life to determine, for upon them in a few years will fall the heavy responsibilities of guiding the destinies of our land . . . Lawyers, doctors, business men, teachers and labourers may all . . . help to mould the destinies of our land that the great part which is apparently possible for Canada to play . . . may be wisely and successfully played.[22]

CSET, the religious education programme of the nation's major Protestant denominations, sought to shape postwar Canada by making the boys enrolled "stronger, braver, more honest, more manly, more loyal" who "every day were striving to build into their lives ideals that mean a better, cleaner, freer Canada. Their loyalty is finding expression in lives based on Canadian and Christian idealism which will make a Canada worthy of the sacrifices of her older sons."[23]

Having examined how religion and citizenship training were

incorporated into the *CSET* programme attention will now be directed to how these elements fit into *CGIT*, the parallel programme for girls. What is interesting here is the different way religion is presented in these two programmes. The girls' programme, like the boys', wanted to incorporate the spiritual element into every aspect of an individual's four-fold development. However, the practice of religion was much more front and centre in the girls' programme while the lengthy explanation of the nature of religion found in the boys' Religious Standard was missing entirely from the girls'.

The Girls' Programme

As mentioned earlier the Protestant designers of *CSET* had close allies among the young women active in the YWCA and various non-denominational and church-based religious education agencies. Many of these committed evangelical Protestant women were college graduates who sought to apply the teachings of modern psychology and educational theorists in such a way as to improve the quality of Canada's girls.[24] Following experience with the Girl Guide programme which led them to conclude that it would not provide Canada with the new brand of committed Christian girls possessed of initiative as well as useful skills and proper civic values, these women worked in co-operation with *CSET*'s designers and produced a four-fold training programme for girls. There was, however, markedly less commitment to the four-fold approach and much more emphasis on the importance of Canada's girls to God as well as to Canada.

It was only in the second edition of the *CGIT* programme, published in 1917, that the four-fold development model was accepted for the religious education of Canada's girls. Even then support for the model was qualified. In contrast to the boys' programme which began with a lengthy analysis of the merits and scriptural foundations of the four-fold approach to religious education, the girls' programme dealt with it in a brief paragraph of three sentences on pages 5 and 6 of the introduction. The final sentence of the three, moreover, related a girl's four-fold development more directly to her relationship with God than anything in the boys' programme did, declaring that "The only woman who is finding her true self, as God intends she should, is one who seeks to keep her body in health, as a 'temple of God,' whose mind is growing in its love of truth,

whose will is trained to right choices, whose heart is set to love God and her neighbour." This endorsement of the four-fold model was, moreover, followed two paragraphs later by a claim that "no personality can really be divided into four specified parts." Leaders using the programme were, therefore, advised that it was "in the spirit and not in the letter that it must be used."[25]

It should be made clear that what is being compared here are the ways in which the spiritual was situated in the early editions of the first twentieth-century "made-in-Canada" Protestant religious education programmes for boys and girls. Having noted the lack of privileging of the four-fold model in early *CGIT* programming compared to the *CSET* programming for boys, it is now necessary to go back and examine what *CGIT* designers highlighted in the pages preceding mention of this model.

Nationalism was as important a motivating factor in *CGIT* as it was in *CSET*. The first sub-section following introduction of the Advisory Committee responsible for production of the girls' programme was entitled "Worth of Girl Life." It began:

> No apology is needed for attempting to help those who are working among our girls, for girl life is of such infinite value to Canada today that no foresighted thinker dare ignore it. In the latent powers of teenage girls lie those faculties and characteristics which will make the foundations, good or bad, of the homes on which the Dominion is built.[26]

Having made this point the authors continued "Not only to Canada is girl-life of importance, but we dare reverentially to say, to God himself. The desire of His love is . . . to draw into the service of His Kingdom a band of earnest and great-hearted women, trained from girlhood to be His witnesses by life and word."[27]

What differentiates the girls' Religious Standard from the boys' is the complete absence of the introductory discussion of the nature of religion. Both Religious Standards endorsed the premise that "true religion will necessarily make itself known through physical, intellectual and social avenues . . ."[28] What the girls' Standard omitted was the two-page analysis of the nature of religion with which the boys' Standard opened. The *CSET* Religious Standard began with the statement: "Religion has universally had to do with cultivation of the heart life of man, i.e., the emotional

nature: too often in the past, this aspect of life has been discounted." This was followed by support for the claim that "Christ and the Bible clearly teach . . . that the affections and sentiments, the feelings and desires, are of the very centre of personality." Using Jesus as the "perfect example of fully-developed manhood on the religious and emotional side of life," the Standard explained "That the man is spiritual on the emotional side of his nature, therefore, who has brought his feelings and desires under the control of Christ and is giving them full expression in his service. The feelings and desires have a spiritual significance; the heart, too, is God's." Citing the belief that the adolescent years were those of "the largest expansion of the emotional nature and . . . the high water mark of religious awakening," the Standard declared: "No boy or young man ought to pass through these years so responsive to every emotional appeal and so sensitive to religious impulses without the privilege of coming to know and choose Jesus as his Saviour . . . and of publicly acknowledging Him by uniting with His Church."[29]

None of this discussion appeared in the girls' Religious Standard which took the nature of religion for granted and concentrated on inculcating the responsibilities associated with the spiritual aspect of life. The introduction to the girls' Standard explained that emphasis should be put on "the value of accepting both the privileges and duties of Church membership." This accounted for "the stress laid on learning to discipline one's own life in such matters as . . . giving and spending, and setting aside for God's work a regular proportion of money earned or given."[30] The girls' Religious Standard was less philosophical and more practical in its approach.

Both Standards attached primary importance to bringing adolescents into their respective churches and assigned responsibility for realizing this objective to the church and Sunday schools. In the case of Canada's girls the challenge was to ensure that the tens of thousands of girls reached by Sunday schools were "taught the things of God in the very best way." The point was made that this challenge would not have been met successfully "unless the teacher [could] also quicken the conscience so that the girl [might] see that in her home, her school, or her place of business lies the field for daily practice of all that she is learning." What girls had to be taught was "how the ordinary duties of every day life contribute[d] to [their] life-equipment and how truly Christian life means a life of full development dominated by a master-motive, to desire to be 'like Christ.'"

It was with this latter problem "of translating the Sunday teaching into week-day action" that *CGIT* sought to deal in order that "the play life, the reading, and the social service to which girls turn should all be inspired by that Sunday teaching." Mid-week programming was presented as a means of helping girls to "fuller self-development."[31]

There were clearly differences, as well as similarities, in the way religion was incorporated into the first made-in-Canada Protestant religious education programmes for boys and girls. *CSET* had to overcome the view that religion was "feminine" because it involved "the cultivation of the heart life of man." Thus religious growth is presented as one aspect of four equally important kinds of development. As *CGIT* did not face this challenge, the religious purpose of the programme could be, and was, front and centre and remained so even after a four-fold standard for girls was added to the second edition of *CGIT*.

> At the heart of the whole of our great enterprise with Canadian girls lies the intense desire to pass on to them the knowledge of God-the "life eternal" – which, taking possession of their lives and wills, shall quicken and develop in them all things good and beautiful. Such a communication of life can only come, as its ultimate source, from the very in-breathing of the Spirit of God in their souls, and should result in a conscious covenant between them and God. But, outward means and plans were never despised by our Master, Jesus Christ . . . We, therefore, dedicate to Him, our Teacher and Saviour, these plans whereby we believe He would have us reach out throughout the length and breadth of Canada to help forward our girls into the joy and fruitfulness of full Christian womanhood.[32]

An examination of the Religious Standards of *CSET* and *CGIT* demonstrates that the language and approach taken in the religious education programme for boys and girls differed significantly. In the case of Protestant boys four-fold development was the means whereby they would be won for their churches and the nation. As far as Protestant girls were concerned the four-fold training programme was to teach them to bear witness to their Lord and Saviour in all aspects of their lives.

Endnotes

1. "Report/Proceedings, Fifth Annual Boys' Work Conference of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec . . . under the auspices of the Ontario Sunday School Association and the Ontario and Quebec Provincial Committee of the YMCA," 55, Canada-Boys' Work Publications, National Historical Library, YMCA, New York (hereafter NHL, YMCA).

2. "Report of the Commission on Religious Education," 231-49, *The Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada*, 1914; and "Report of the Committee on Boys' and Girls' Work," 1-2, Board of Sunday Schools and Young People's Societies, Annual Meeting, 8-9 July 1914, *Methodist Church Records*, United Church Archives (hereafter UCA).

3. *The Canadian Standard Efficiency Test for Boys* (hereafter *CSET*), Proof Edition, cover page, Canada-Boys' Work Publications, NHL, YMCA.

4. *CSET*, Proof Edition, 2-3.

5. *CSET*, Proof Edition, 3.

6. *CSET*, Eighth edition, March 1916, 25, NHL, YMCA.

7. "Comrades to Canadian Boys and the Four Square Program," 18-19, Canadian Citizenship Series #9, Major Wallace Forgie, Military Service Department, Canadian YMCA, Canada, National Council, NHL, YMCA.

8. *The Canadian Standard Efficiency Training for Trail Rangers and Tuxis Boys*, 1918, vi, vii, Canada-Boys' Work Publications, NHL, YMCA.

9. *Canadian Boy Builder* I, No. 4 (April 1917): 3.

10. "A Challenge to Canadian Manhood for Leadership in Boys' Work," 2, Canada-Boys' Work Publications, NHL, YMCA.

11. *Canadian Boy Builder* I, No. 1 (October 1916): 3.

12. Taylor Statten, "Preface to the Seventh edition," *CSET*, Eighth edition, 6-7, Canada-Boys' Work Publications, NHL, YMCA.

13. H.H. Horne, "Introduction to Canadian Standard Efficiency Tests Handbook," August 10, 1915, *CSET*, Eighth edition, 9-10, Canada-Boys' Work Publications, NHL, YMCA.

14. *The Canadian Standard Efficiency Training for Trail Rangers and Tuxis Boys*, 1918, 3, Canada-Boys' Work Publications, NHL, YMCA.

15. *CSET*, Eighth edition, 1916, 34, Canada-Boys' Work Publications, NHL, YMCA.
16. *CSET*, Eighth edition, 1916, 44.
17. *CSET*, Eighth edition, 1916, 67.
18. *CSET*, Eighth edition, 1916, 72.
19. *Canadian Boy Builder* II, No. 3 (February 1918): 2.
20. "Comrades to Canadian Boys and the Four Square Program," Major Wallace Forgie, Military Service Department, *Canadian YMCA*.
21. British Columbia Boys' and Leadership Conferences, Victoria, October 1919, Boys' Work History – Conference Brochures, Department of Christian Education, *Canadian Council of Churches*, National Archives Canada (hereafter NAC).
22. Canadian Boy Builder III, No. 3 (January 1919): 8.
23. *Canadian Boy Builder* III, No. 7 (May 1919): 3.
24. "Report, Sept. 1918-Sept. 1919," Girls' Work Department, YWCA Records, vol. 40, NAC.
25. *CGIT*, second edition, 1917, 5-6, File: Historical Material Girls In Training, Canadian Council of Churches, NAC.
26. *CGIT*, second edition, 1917, 3.
27. *CGIT*, second edition, 1917, 4.
28. CGIT, second edition, 1917, 14.
29. CSET, Eighth edition, 1916, 57-58, Canada-Boys' Work Publications, NHL, YMCA.
30. *CGIT*, second edition, 1917, 14, File: Historical Material Girls In Training, Canadian Council of Churches, NAC.
31. *CGIT*, second edition, 1917, 4-5.
32. *CGIT*, second edition, 1917, 9.

CSCH Presidential Address 1997

History as Identity: Subjectivity, Religion, and the Historical Profession

WILLIAM KATERBERG

> [Everything] ceases to live when it has been dissected completely and lives painfully and becomes sick once one begins to practise historical dissection on it. (Friedrich Nietzsche)[1]

Relativism and subjectivity are like the skin disease eczema, the historian Oscar Handlin once remarked. They are not fatal, but rather annoying, chronic itches best ignored. They only get worse when scratched.[2]

Modern assumptions about objectivity – that reliable knowledge comes from factual evidence and reason – define this medical comparison. Ideally, history is a science, it implies. At worst, the subjective nature of history writing – that evidence is fragmentary and needs to be interpreted – is a matter of bias. As much as they can historians should overcome self-interest, blindspots, and political loyalties, and be honest and objective. At best, subjectivity is a potential opportunity. Scholars with new interests and loyalties, fresh ideas and different points of view can take history writing in innovative, exciting directions. Historians not only have learned to live with the subjectivity itch, this later attitude suggests, but many have also begun to enjoy the occasional scratch.

The acknowledgment, even endorsement, of subjectivity in history writing is a sign of "postmodern" thought and culture, a shift from the

assumptions of "old-fashioned" modernist history. On the "cutting edge," so-called postmodern scholars have rejected science and objectivity and championed history writing as interpretation, aesthetics, and politics. Yet I wonder. Despite accepting the relativity of historical knowledge – indeed, all knowledge – despite adopting subjectivity, the question still nags at most of us. *Is it true?* At very least, which perspective is closest to the truth? Few historians would throw out the obligations of evidence and honesty; few would reduce history to fiction (though they might concede that the line between fiction and history is blurred); and no historian worth his or her professional salt would do away with book reviews and Ph.D. thesis defences. To be accepted as trustworthy and of value scholarship must pass the scrutiny of peer review. So I wonder. How far beyond modernity's rules and practices have we come?[3]

Historians still do research in good fact-finding fashion. Within reason, we track down sources, avoid misquoting, put things in context, and question our interpretations. History is a "soft science," but we make it as solid as we can. In our spare time we may scratch the itch – reading cultural theory and philosophy of history – and try to decide whether subjectivity is annoying or pleasant. The question remains. *Where are we as a profession?*

What can I say today that goes beyond a banal rehearsal of subjectivity in religious history writing? Is it bias and bad? Perspective and good? A bit of both? Is subjectivity liberating? Or will the objective truth of facts set us free? Scholars have been dealing with these questions for most of this century. Much has been said since, but Carl Becker's "Everyman His Own Historian" still asks most of the right questions.[4] In 1932, he wrote, "All historical writing, even the most honest, is unconsciously subjective, since every age is bound, in spite of itself, to make the dead perform whatever tricks it finds necessary for its own peace of mind." The same can be said of individuals and groups. What has changed today is that subjectivity is much more self-conscious and generally recognized.[5] But the same questions continue to set the terms of debate. Is it true? Or, more modestly, which perspective is most true?

To navigate the time-worn but tangled paths of the subjectivity question, I propose that we look at history as identity. This approach is not arbitrary. In Maine this past year, students fresh from high school confronted me directly with history as identity. They spoke and wrote about America's past personally, using the first-person plural "we," not the

properly academic third person "he," "she" or "they." Despite my best efforts to shake them of such irresponsible habits and subvert their cherished national myths, most left History 103 with the same paradigm that they held entering it. They might agree that American history is full of oppression, tragedy and irony, but most continued to insist that it is a story of progress. Progress requires adversity, they said, using social Darwinism to fit my historical criticism into nationalist myth.[6] Myth clearly trumped academic history. As one student put it in a splendid slip, "Progress requires *advertising*." I was fighting an uphill battle. One collegiate course in history was not enough to subvert the "myth-historical" power of a national identity.

And should academic history undermine myth? Americans consume the past in great quantities – with the History Channel, A & E, on-line, in popular books and magazines, at Civil War re-enactments, historic sites, and more. Yet most people find academic history irrelevant and boring. One of the grandfathers of postmodern thought, Friedrich Nietzsche, remarked in an essay on history that little of the past survives "the systematic torture of historical criticism."[7] Non-academics agree, implicitly.

In *Lingua Franca*, a hip journal on academic life in America, reports about battles between the American Academy of Religion and the newer National American Association for the Study of Religion reminded me of the same issues. Do "non-believers" and "believers" approach the study of religion in fundamentally different ways? How do their identities compare? Which is primary? That of believer, agnostic or atheist? That of intellectual, scholar and scientist? Which should be primary? Or do religious and academic identities not have to be mutually exclusive? As my American history students had done, the AAR/NAASR debate raised questions about myth, belief and academic attitudes toward religion.[8] It dramatized the links between subjectivity, history and identity.

This address, taking some brief examples from North American religious history writing, will look at several issues. First, what is identity? Second, in what sense is history about identity? And third, what are the implications of viewing history as identity for the scholarship that we do?

Defining Identity

Concern about identity has been ubiquitous for the past decade or so in the media, politics, advertising, fiction and popular non-fiction. So to in the academy. Feminist scholarship, child psychology, studies of ethnicity and race relations, debates about citizenship, modernity, consumerism and postmodernity – all have looked at the ways that communities, institutions, cultures and people identify themselves or are identified by the powers that be. Depending on what you read, identity is about oppression, false consciousness and liberation. For some people it offers almost mystical connections to the past; for others it is a cunning creation of institutions and groups seeking legitimacy and hegemony. Defining identity is like trying to nail Jello to a wall, all but impossible.[9]

One way to begin thinking about identities is with the kinds of questions they attempt to answer for people, individually and collectively: *Where are we?* Questions about the past, how people have come to the time and place they live. *Who are we?* Presentist questions about purpose, the nature and task of people, groups, and institutions. *What is wrong?* What impedes progress towards the goals people set, what confuses their sense of where and who they are. *What is the remedy?* Future-oriented questions about how to find a path from present day brokenness and dilemmas to future consummation.[10] Defined like this, identity becomes all-encompassing, incorporating history, memory, experience, psychology, ideology, and hope. It is a search for transcendence, a religious pilgrimage. This gives a clue as to why it is a preoccupation of scholars from so many fields.

A fundamental debate has been whether the drive to find an identity is a peculiarly modern obsession or an inherent human need. Sceptics rightly point out that the term's popularity is recent, a product of the post-World War II era. Liberal and socialist scholars often have dismissed identity politics – whether in religious conflict, cultural battles, nativism, nationalism, race relations or ethnic community building – as irrational, personal and private.[11] Business cycles, social class and material needs are rational matters and thus properly public. But, as psychologists like Jacques Lacan have pointed out, the problem of identity is one of the first that every human being encounters as infant.

The newly born child, having left the warmth and security of the womb with no language and conceptual tools, confronts the new world as

a stranger. In the evolving relationship between an infant and its parents, the child slowly moves from experiencing "otherness" and difference, a sense of "I" versus "you," to an experience of togetherness, a sense of "we." This tie can be broken, of course, or never fully develop, but the social process of raising a family typically creates bonds of identity between parents, children and siblings. This process is rooted in social experience and language. In families and neighbourhoods, at work, through institutions like churches and schools, in popular culture and the media, people learn and assimilate a variety of "I-You" and "Us-Them" identities. Identities may conflict or be inter-related; some have greater consequence than others; and they may simply be "nested," held together only by the personal and social experiences of a particular individual or group.[12]

As this suggests, identity is inherent and relational. It is inherent in the need from infancy to depend on others for material necessities, emotional support and a secure sense of place in a world of countless knowns and unknowns. It is relational, as a product of experience and social interaction that teaches the instinct of identifying the known and trusted with "us" and the unknown and dangerous with "them." It takes form in culture, language, politics, ideology and provides names and categories for "us" and "them," such as citizen, stranger, alien, Christian, heathen, black, woman, gay, educated, employee, boss. People claim some identities for themselves; they identify others; others identify them; and, sometimes people identify *with* others. Sometimes "we" recognize something of ourselves in "them." Communities and institutions such as churches, nations and states use these needs and processes of identity formation to help create and legitimize themselves. Identity thus is shaped by power and social structures.

Even so, these needs and social processes, and use of them, all centre around those basic questions: *Where are we? Who are we? What is wrong?* And, *What is the remedy?* History and cultural memory provide people's stories and so help to answer these questions. But one more question should be added. *Who are they?* This question is of a different order than the other four, as it is inherent in each of them, an ever-present mirror. Identity is about both inclusion and exclusion, both remembering and forgetting. Furthermore, non-recognition and mis-recognition can be damaging and oppressive. People need their stories, need to tell them, and need others to listen and acknowledge them.[13]

The question *Who are they?* implies that identity is relational, about both difference and sameness. This is crucial for understanding how identity became a problem in the modern era. In premodern times, many scholars argue, identity could be taken for granted. People lived in cultures with social, economic and political hierarchies that they deemed natural or God-given. Though the term itself was not used, identity was a matter of descent, something people were born into (man or woman; peasant, merchant or noble; civilized or barbarian). While this may be true, it does not mean that within these assumptions identities were not fluid. People could convert to Christianity or join Christendom by conquest, for example. Jews remained profoundly ambivalent in the Christian imagination, neither quite heathen nor Christian. And merchants sometimes could purchase should be addedth nobility to their children. Because people did not view themselves as autonomous, rational individuals, in the modern sense, because identity was rooted in the gods, in customs, the laws of feudalism and assumptions of place, the fluidity of particular cultures was contained. For good or ill, accepting or disgruntled, in the midst of change, people knew that they and others belonged somewhere, even if the particulars of where they belonged and who they belonged to changed, even if they resisted a particular culture seeking hegemony.[14]

Assumptions about the naturalness of belonging disintegrated in the modern era. Though identity continued to be considered necessary, intellectuals and politicians began to recognize that particular identities had to be constructed. Belonging and place had to be made and chosen.[15] The fragmentation of western Christendom with the Reformation, the emergence of nation-states, and the rise of democratic ideals undermined the seemingly natural and God-given nature of the premodern identities that had shaped Europe. The modern individual emerged, with a conscious, reflexive sense of self, rational and autonomous, free-floating like an atom in a larger rank and bequeay became ambiguity and chaos, something to be feared. And a new, unique, and typically modern project emerged, to combat ambiguity. Rather than the natural, God-given, and often fluid boundaries of the past, modernizers sought stable, strict, constructed, predictable identities.[16]

Identity thus became a problem, how to construct what no longer could be assumed, and a source of liberty, a matter of personal and public choice. People had to choose whether to be Roman Catholic or some variety of Protestant. In society, people on the make could reinvent

themselves, succeeding as middle-class entrepreneurs or failing as labourers. In the realm of nations and politics – as revolutions in England, America and France swept away feudal hierarchies during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries – society came to depend on the will of individuals, their choices and social contracts. In effect, identity became a personal quest and a public concern. Nationalism and democracy became crucial modes of state and social legitimation. And unprecedented migration – by people in search of work, land or freedom – forced nation-states and their residents to deal with definitions of citizenship and the dilemmas of immigrants, refugees, aliens, and strangers.[17]

A matter of choice, identity could not be isolated from politics, society, the marketplace or material culture. For example, the construction of identity in nationalism and the contest for souls during the Reformation could not have happened without the printing press, which allowed for standardized languages and the rapid spread of new ideas and propaganda. Identity, I have said, is both inherent and relational.[18] We are born into some identities; we learn, choose and sometimes make others for ourselves in the marketplace and politics. These choices are private and public. In early modern England, for example, becoming Anglican, Roman Catholic or dissenting Protestant also meant legitimating or challenging the regime. People had the freedom and burden of finding personal identities because cultural boundaries no longer were natural and God-given. The personal was always political. Identity should not be reduced to social control or legitimation, but in the modern era of state building could not be separated from it either. Institutions and communities needed stable identities too.

In our postmodern or "late modern" time the locus of identity has shifted again, from the state to the marketplace. For multicultural societies such as Canada and the United States, identity has become much less a matter of descent, as in premodern times, or legitimation.[19] The modern project of constructing personal and public identities did not result in stability but fragmentation, a multiplicity of competing, overlapping, fluid, loosely-related ethnic, cultural, sexual, religious, class and civic identities. If the modern ideal was the autonomous self, able to construct or choose an identity, the postmodern self is a conditioned, fractured, volatile, multi-layered persona. The public meaning of identity is less and less centred around legitimation of nation-state regimes and more and more located in the marketplace, in a vast carnival of personalized commodities bought and sold. Even postmodern identity politics focuses more on consumption –

lobbying the state for rights, public money and services – than on shaping unified civic and national cultures. Postmodern identity thus is not a return to premodern fluidity within boundaries, but a new fluidity without any assumptions, structures, rules or boundaries, except perhaps the marketplace.

One scholar has remarked with acerbic wit that proof of existence today is not the autonomous and modern "I think therefore I am," but the postmodern "I am noticed therefore I am." People tend to reject stable boundaries, communities and institutions in favour of personal statements and casual expression of the commodified and inter-changeable identities of the multicultural shopping mall. In other words, people want identities without consequences, without restraints or responsibilities, other than purchasing power.[20]

Still relational, though now in the consumer marketplace, still inherent, though now a flight from permanence more than an anxious search for stability, identity has been reduced, or elevated, to the fundamental right of individual choice. Unlike our premodern ancestors, we are not born into the communities and hierarchies in which we live and die. Unlike the modern era, identity no longer legitimates regimes and locks us into social contracts.[21] Communities and institutions today rarely have or need ties that bind, other than non-compulsory individual associations. The nation-state's significance is reduced, though not gone.[22] A series of metaphors makes the point. In the premodern world, identity was natural and God-ordained; in the modern era, it was constructed from concrete and steel by nation-states; in our postmodern day, it is made of biodegradable plastic, sold in shopping malls, and put on interactive display at Disneyland.[23]

History as Identity

Through all of these changes in the character, meaning and purpose of identity, what has been the role of such "keepers of the past" as historians? In oral cultures in the premodern west and non-western societies some record of the past often was kept in material form, visually or in officially-written chronicles. But culture was also shaped and communicated orally, stored in the memories of prophets, bards, druids, medicine men and soothsayers. Official keepers of the past, and ordinary folk too, transmitted their stories – their identities – from generation to

generation through song, myth and legend. Have historians, have we, carried on this tradition in the modern and postmodern eras? In some ways yes. There are close connections between modern scholars, universities and the state.[24] Historians have helped to shape, critique, and legitimate nations, states and other kinds of communities and institutions. Nevertheless, the ideal of the historian as an objective scientist, above the passions and interests of the crowd, has separated scholars from non-academic "lay" audiences. Unlike bards, arguably, modern historians often have isolated themselves from the society around them, in the concrete halls and offices of academia. If this is so, what is it that historians do with the past? What roles do they play in society? And how do they identify themselves?

When modern historians began to define and organize their profession in the late-nineteenth century, they usually thought in scientific terms and spoke of "reconstructing" the past. Already in the 1920s and 1930s, however, historians such as R.G. Collingwood, in *The Idea of History*, were rejecting the notion that history is a science based on collecting evidence and reconstructing a narrative from it. Collingwood claimed that historians "reimagine" the past.[25] The past itself is gone, he pointed out, leaving behind only a "fossil" record. Only by using their imaginations, by creatively mixing something of themselves with that record, can historians breathe tenuous life into the past. Even then, it is not the past brought back to life, but a mix of present imagining and past record. A useful metaphor to describe this process, doing justice to both the collection of evidence and the subjective process of reimagining, is "translation."[26]

Translators start with a text, something objective, but translations seldom are literalistic. Literal, word for word rendering in another language typically cannot do justice to the imagery and rhythm of the original.[27] A word play in French often will have no direct English equivalent. An image such as the "Lamb of God" or "shepherd" will have no meaning to people who have never tended domesticated animals. Translations in some sense are new creations, themselves works of art and imagination. They must be "faithful" (itself a subjective notion) to the original text, but also reach out to people who speak different languages and have distinct cultural references. Not surprisingly, translations themselves can acquire great authority (e.g., the reverence for the King James Bible expressed by some fundamentalists and cultural conservatives). As with poems, novels and religious texts, history writing – that is, the telling of stories about the past to people living in other times and

places – is a process of cultural translation.

A powerful example of historical-cultural translation is the "Huron Carol." It tells the Christmas story in a way that the French Jesuit missionary Jean de Brébeuf hoped seventeenth-century natives might identify: "Twas in the moon of wintertime/When all the birds had fled/That mighty Gitchi-Manitou/Sent angel choirs instead." In place of shepherds the song has "hunter braves"; rather than swaddling cloths in a manger it has a "ragged robe of rabbit skin"; and playing the role of the wise men are "chiefs from afar" with gifts of fox and beaver skin. Most startlingly, and likely controversially in 1643, instead of God the Father the song speaks of the "mighty Gitchi-Manitou."[28]

Another useful example, more academic and formally historical in the modern sense, is the retelling of the evangelical story in North America since the 1960s and 1970s by historians such as George Marsden, Nancy Hardesty, George Rawlyk, Edith Blumhofer, Mark Noll and Nathan Hatch. Self-consciously coming out of various evangelical traditions, these scholars wrote for both the historical profession and their own religious communities. They explored the place of their religious traditions in North American society, hoping to address both present-day problems and the challenges of the future for their co-religionists. They also hoped to help the larger historical profession better understand evangelical Christianity, by taking advantage of their intuitive, insider knowledge as self-identified evangelicals. In so doing, they translated the past both for scholars and for their religious communities.[29]

Though a very different person, and writing for a different audience, much the same can be said of Perry Miller's rehabilitation of Puritanism and Jonathan Edwards for mid-twentieth century agnostics. Miller took seemingly esoteric Calvinist theology and religious debates and made them sensible, even compelling. In his imagination, the Puritans lived in a world of awesome cosmic beauty, human suffering and divine providence. With rich intellect and piety, the Puritans rigorously and profoundly confronted the mysteries and tragedies of life. Miller felt that twentieth-century American intellectuals paled in comparison, fooling themselves with sentiment and naive progressive self-confidence. His Puritans were existentialists, his Jonathan Edwards the last medieval and the first modern man, an eighteenth-century Jean-Paul Sartre. A colleague thus depicted Miller as a believing agnostic. Miller saw himself as a literary artist and interpreter whose task was to make the obscure past visible and give it a

voice in twentieth-century America. Failure by historians to "get underneath concepts," he argued, left history little more than "a mail-order catalogue" of details.[30]

As Miller suggested, a mere scientific reconstruction of the past, like a literal translation of a psalm or poem, would be no more moving than a department store catalogue – with no life, unable to speak to anyone. For people to identify with the past, it must speak to them in terms that they can understand and that have meaning for them. While history writing should not violate the past, like a translation should not violate the original text, it is inevitably creative and subjective because it is a meeting place, a melding of past and present. People find much of their identity in the past – however narrow or broad, personal or communal – but only if they can connect with it. History writing, like identity formation, like translation, is product of relationships. The spirit in which it is done is at least as important as the brute recovery of facts.[31]

This is an ideal. Historians are translators of the past, for themselves, their communities and institutions, in all their rich variety of identities, from nations, classes, religious communities, genders, ethnic and racial groups, to professional intellectual elites. History as translation, as identity, can bestow near mystical significance on the past and on what historians do.

Why then do historical monographs not sell? Why are historians not held in high esteem like the storytellers of the past? Questions like these suggest that the heart of the subjectivity dilemma is not *Is it true?* Or which story is true? If history writing is a process of cultural translation – neither meaninglessly objective not completely relative, but rather identity-forming and relational – then the most crucial subjectivity questions is *Whose stories and truths are being heard?* Whose identities do historians help to form? And, for whom do historians, for whom do we, translate the past? The heart of the matter is questions of voice.[32]

Voice is crucial because academic historians act as "gatekeepers" to the past as well as "keepers" of the past. In Nietzschean fashion, Michel Foucault once observed that their is no "Truth," only "regimes of truth," with "ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements." Remembering and forgetting is a process, one rooted in social relations and power. Because of relativity and subjectivity scholars cannot reconstruct the "Truth" about the past. But through their profession – its graduate programs, historical societies,

funding agencies, university presses, the tenure process and technical jargon – they can exercise significant control over access to the past. Society's designated experts can legitimate, condemn and suppress stories of the past. Like academics in the other disciplines, in practice historians exercise a kind of "legislative" role in society.[33]

Not a product of malevolence or some conspiracy, this power results from connections during the modern era between universities, the professionalization process, and the evolution of society and the state. Ironically, society today no longer needs academics as it once did. The state has been built and now is being "downsized." And scholars have become critics of the state (as well as a financial burden to it). Yet the identities of academics, as academics, and the practice of their profession remain defined in modern terms. The historiographic revolution of the 1960s made it almost impossible to write master narratives of the Canadian or American past. With the explosion of topics and methods, from women's history, to class and race, to religious history, and much more, there simply was too much complexity and too many stories. As Peter Novick quipped in his study of the American historical profession, "there was no king in Israel."[34]

There was no king or queen left in the historical profession by the 1970s, but "bureaucrats" with designated sub-topical portfolios survived. History from the "ground up" meant that the lives of ordinary people, once ignored in the nationalist "colony to nation" narratives, could be reclaimed. Women explored their past, immigrants and their descendants did ethnic history, and evangelicals and catholics wrote their religious histories. African Americans, natives, and other minorities did so too.[35] What history from the ground up did not mean was that history writing would be comprehensible or compelling to non-academics, at least not very often. History from the ground up was written "of" and about "the people" but seldom "for" them or "by" them. It is easy and often unfair to pick on scholars, as journalists and politicians regularly do, but there is some truth to the stereotype of the "tenured radical." Insurgent historians too, many of them at least, become professional academics. As a result, and in short, the professional "medium" all too often has become the historical "message."[36]

Ironically, though rejecting the "master" nationalist narratives of earlier generations of scholars, and though trying to recover the identities of ordinary people by writing their histories, historians continue to

reinforce one master identity, that of the professional scholar. The problem is not one of intent or historical content but academic form and professional structure. Three words may well summarize the dilemma, even if a little too simply: "Publish or perish." Whatever an idealistic historian's goals – and recognizing the worth of peer review, the tenure process and professional standards – the discipline of history and academia in general subtly shape an identity. The results have not been all bad. Far from it. The research and writing of recent decades has made scholarly understanding of the past, religious and otherwise, much deeper and richer than modernist. The influence of professional historians on non-academic, "lay" audiences remains narrow. The state has less and less use for historians. Historical articles and monographs rarely enter the marketplace of culture, secular or religious. Grants and fellowships mean that historians do not need to reach non-academic markets, in effect ensuring that most scholarship does not. Furthermore, in good modernist fashion, most scholars see themselves as de-mystifiers, as historical critics, rather than as bards or poets addressing public identities and narratives.[37]

Even postmodern scholars, in good modernist fashion, tend to see themselves as de-mystifiers. Postmodern *isms and methods* usually are anti-narrative. Along these lines, the prominent French postmodernist, Jean-François Lyotard, has said, "Simplifying in the extreme, I define the postmodern as incredulity toward metanarratives." The arcane jargon of most postmodern scholarship reinforces the elitist character of academia and rejects story-telling, whether local or "meta" narratives. But postmodern *culture*, especially popular culture on television and in movies and books, is profoundly narrative oriented. Many of these stories are desperately religious. Non-academics perhaps recognize something that scholars have forgotten. Furthermore, and ironically, postmodernism assumes and tells its own story, the death of narratives.[38]

These are harsh and impertinent judgements perhaps. My point is not to denigrate individual scholars or their work. Most of us admit the inevitability of subjectivity and relativism in our scholarship; some of us self-consciously work within postmodern frames of reference. But the structure of our profession, the institutions that socially, politically, and materially shape our work, are still modernist. This essay thus is a call to move beyond individual intellectual recognition of such issues and towards sustained critical reflection on and change of the structures of academic intellectual life. This is essential because those structures inevitably shape

our scholarship. More immediately, it is imperative because many academic institutions are suffering from an obvious financial crisis and a waning sense of purpose. Departments find themselves unable to replace retiring faculty; libraries cannot afford to buy books and journals; scholars, academic societies and university presses compete for ever-thinner and hard to acquire grants and fellowships; and cost-cutting politicians, administrators and scholars too often wonder about the purpose of the humanities and social sciences. Modernist and older religious visions of truth are gone or at least under suspicion, and the legitimizing functions of the university are less and less relevant. The public space of academia thus has been shaken.

This is not all bad. A crisis can be an opportunity. As the Canadian poet and singer Leonard Cohen has said: "There is a crack in everything/That's how the light gets in."[39] The cracks may be more obvious, but there is some evidence of light. For example, the CSCH has members from history and religious studies programs, from seminaries, "lay" people and clergy – a rich mix of professional academics and non-academic intellectuals.

Implications

History writing is in part, large part, about identity formation. Even critical, self-consciously demythologizing scholarship promotes an identity, if only that of the scientific-minded, illusion-free, critical, objective scholar. The intellectual above the crowd. In that sense, all historical scholarship is about myth-making as well as myth-subverting. William McNeill once observed that one scholar's "history" is "myth" for another.[40] If so, then the boundaries that academic historians often draw between history, propaganda, statements of belief and fiction blur. There is a growing pluralism of topics and methods in academia today, but at some level most scholarship still reflects the modernist canons of the past. Scholarship needs to admit and recognize a greater plurality of "criteria of knowledge."[41] Two examples from religious history point this way.

In a recent study of the Dene people of northern Canada, *Drum Songs*, Kerry Abel tried to deal seriously with both Dene accounts of their origins in North America and anthropological analysis. Ethno-historians contend that the first ancestors of North America's native peoples arrived some 14,000 years ago. The archaeological record suggests that the first

settlers of regions historically occupied by the Dene arrived about 2,000 to 3,000 years ago. Abel also treats Dene legends as a historical source. These stories, about "When the earth was new," speak of magic and giants and dwarfs and a great flood. The Dene did not migrate to North America, their stories insist, they were created here.[42] The difference is not one of antiquarian interest or academic debate but fundamental spiritual identity for the Dene, a people who consider themselves part of the land. Their gods created them here; they always were here, from the time "when the earth was new." Will people recognize and remember their stories? Similar questions can be raised about archaeological digs of grave sites. To whom do the graves belong? To whom does the past belong? Who has the right to dig up and root around in the past and subject it to historical criticism? There are no easy answers. Pluralism is not only about topics and methods, but metaphysics and spirituality. Can different kinds of knowledge find a place in the academy? Is the past sacred territory?

Similar questions apply to the history of Christianity. In a post-modern climate, if we truly consider truth relative and scholarship subjective, should we take seriously accounts of revivals that cite the work of the Holy Spirit? Should Jonathan Edwards's *Some Thoughts concerning the present Revival of Religion in New-England* and *A History of the Work of Redemption*, or a twentieth-century equivalent, be put alongside Paul Johnson's *A Shopkeeper's Millennium* and Nathan Hatch's *The Democratization of American Christianity*?[43] Should scholars today who think and write like Edwards be given a hearing during meetings of the history and religious studies organizations of the Canadian Congress of Learned Societies? Whose identities should be privileged? Can pluralism extend to "criteria of knowledge"?

These are not questions of truth but power and voice. They get to the heart of the university's place and the academy's purpose. Is scholarship best set apart in ivory towers and academic publishing networks? Or should it take place, along with other kinds of remembering, in the hurly burly of shop floors, union halls, women's shelters, ethnic associations and church sanctuaries?

No narrative can be complete or total, though some pretend to be. To be comprehensible and have structure and meaning, narratives must both include and exclude. This is the fundamental, enduring insight of post-modern thought. If all knowledge is socially constructed, then like any system of thought metanarratives are "particular moral visions dressed up

in the guise of universality." As Brian Walsh and Richard Middleton explain in *Truth is Stranger Than It Used to Be*, by "falsely claiming universality while being blind to their own constructed character, metanarratives inevitably privilege unity, homogeneity and closure over difference, heterogeneity, otherness and openness." This leads to a second problem, that "metanarratives are inevitably oppressive and violent in their false claims to 'totality.'"[44] More simply, but fairly, people or institutions that claim to see the big picture cannot help but try to impose their views on others. As individuals, most academics no longer claim to master the big picture; indeed, they often promote intellectual specialization, fragmentation and pluralism. But as a social, political and material structure the academic world still tends to homogenize. The challenge can be stated most clearly by asking which criteria of knowledge, which stories, have a voice in the academy in today? Which will have a place in the future?

In religious history writing, what relationships should be fostered between various communities of scholars, academic and church institutions, and individual believers, agnostics and atheists? Is the separation of institutions more of a strength or a weakness? Separation may contain divisiveness and bad manners; it may also inhibit creative scholarship; it clearly reflects a struggle for power, as George Marsden argued in *The Soul of the American University* (1994).[45] This point brings us back to the debate between the American Academy of Religion and the National American Association for the Study of Religion. Can the methods and metaphysics of various intellectuals be respected? Can people with conflicting "criteria of knowledge" speak to each other in creative, comprehensible ways? Can they at least listen with civility? And what are the limits of pluralism?

Conclusion

In his reflections *On the Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life*, Friedrich Nietzsche observed that history writing, like personal and cultural memory, is a process of remembering and forgetting. Historians build monuments to the past and through historical criticism tear them down. We are creators and destroyers; the question is not whether we create and destroy, but what and whom. Nietzsche portrayed the burden of history writing powerfully:

> History, so far as it serves life, serves an unhistorical power. While so subordinated it will and ought never, therefore, become a pure science like, say, mathematics. But the question to what degree life requires the service of history at all is one of the highest questions and concerns affecting the health of a man, a people, a culture. For with a certain excess of history, life crumbles and degenerates, and finally, because of this degeneration, history itself degenerates as well.[46]

History writing thus is a mystical, even religious endeavour, a search for transcendence. Natalie Zemon Davis made this point when describing her passion for social history. "I want to show how different the past was," she said.

> I want to show that even when times were hard, people found ways to cope with what was happening and maybe resist it. I want people today to be able to connect with the past by looking at the tragedies and the sufferings of the past, the cruelties and the hatefulness, the hope of the past, the love people had, and the beating that they had. They sought for power over each other, but they helped each other too. They did things both out of love and fear – that's my message. Especially I want to show that it could be different, that it was different; there are alternatives.[47]

Deconstruction, cliometrics, and other forms of historical criticism are tools. The purpose is encourage people, "lay" people and academics alike, to establish a relationship, an identity, with the past. Historians should be careful lest the means subvert the end.

"Every living thing," Nietzsche wisely observed, "needs to surrounded by an atmosphere, a mysterious circle of mist: if one robs it of this veil, if one condemns a religion, an art, a genius to orbit as a star without an atmosphere: then one should not wonder about its rapidly becoming withered, hard and barren. That is how it is with all things great indeed, 'which without some madness ne'er succeed.'"[48] True of religion, true of identity, the same is true of the writing of history.

Endnotes

1. *On the Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life*, trans. Peter Pruess (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1980), 40.

2. The simile is Oscar Handlin's, from the 1950s (see Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988], 410-411). Novick's study touches on postmodern issues, but focuses on modernist notions of objectivity and history as a science. Relativity and subjectivism are not the same, but are part of an inter-related dilemma.

3. Modernity continues to define postmodern debates in academia today (see Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence* [Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991], 231-79). Postmodern can accurately be described as "late" modern.

4. A presidential address to the American Historical Association, the essay appeared in the *American Historical Review* 37 (1932): 221-236.

5. The quote is from Becker, *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1932), 44. The argument is similar to "Everyman His Own Historian." Another change in the language of subjectivity is greater attention to groups. Becker called his essay "Everyman His Own Historian," while Novick's *That Noble Dream* has a chapter on recent scholarship called "Every group its own historian."

6. My impressions come from final exams, which asked students to reflect on American history from European contact to Reconstruction. Is American history a story of progress, tragedy, or ambivalence?

7. Nietzsche, *On the Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life*, 40. On people's dislike of the academic history, see James Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong* (New York: Touchstone, 1995). Loewen indicts school teachers for feeding students bland nationalist myth. University academics usually are anti-nationalist and intellectually rigorous, but they might be charged for using obscure jargon, trading narrative for analysis, etc. In my limited experience, even history majors often find academic studies of the past tedious. Their devotion to the past survives despite history programs. Only a small minority join the literati of grad school.

8. See Charlotte Allen, "Is Nothing Sacred?" *Lingua Franca* (November 1996). For a few letters to the editor in response, see the February 1997 issue.

9. I can only begin to cite the literature: Zygmunt Bauman, *Life in Fragments* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995); Madan Sarup, *Post-Structuralism and Post-modernism*, 2nd ed. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1993), and *Identity, Culture and the Postmodern World* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1996); Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, rev. ed. (London: Verso, 1991); Cynthia Enloe, *Ethnic Conflict and Political Development* (Boston:

Little Brown, 1973); Michael Ignatieff, *The Needs of Strangers* (New York: Penguin, 1985); Charles Taylor, *Multiculturalism and "The Politics of Recognition"* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992); Werner Sollers, *Beyond Ethnicity* (New York: Oxford, 1986); Philip Gleason, *Speaking of Diversity* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1992); John Higham, *Send These to Me*, 2nd. ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1984); W. Brueggemann, *Abiding Astonishment: Psalms, Modernity, and the Making of History* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991); and, Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988). For more material, see Katerberg, "The Irony of Identity," *American Quarterly* 47 (1995): 493-524.

10. See J. Richard Middleton and Brian J. Walsh, *Truth Is Stranger Than It Used to Be: Biblical Faith in a Postmodern Age* (Downer's Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1995), chapter 1.

11. I have commented further on this in "The Irony of Identity."

12. On childhood, language and identity, see the work of Jacques Lacan. For a brief but helpful introduction, see Sarup, *Post-Structuralism and Postmodernism*, chapter 1.

13. My point is to avoid reductionism, making identity a mere tool and product of people, groups and institutions that have power. The Foucaultian question of how identity has been conceptualized and used historically does not go far enough. Metaphysical questions – "What is identity?" and "Is it an inherent need?" – also must be asked. Identity can not be separated from questions of power, social process and legitimation, nor reduced to them. The search for identity has its own dynamics, partially independent but never autonomous from politics and social structures (see Miroslav Volf, *Exclusion and Embrace* [Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996]).

14. See Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence*.

15. There is ambiguity here, as modern attitudes towards identity could be framed in terms of both "creation" and "discovery." By intellectuals, I mean the narrow sense of scholars and thinkers and the broader Gramscian "organic intellectuals," purveyors of culture and ideology – doctors, lawyers, clergy, academics, teachers, political leaders, experts, journalists, literati, etc. (see Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Smith, eds., *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* [New York: International Publishers, 1971]; and, T.J. Jackson Lears, "The Concept of Cultural Hegemony," *American Historical Review* 90 [1985], 567-93).

16. See Anderson, *Imagined Communities*; Katerberg, "The Irony of Identity"; Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence*; and, Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1989).

17. Categorizing people was fundamental to modernity, both as an intellectual task and a social-political program. Zygmunt Bauman has used the metaphor of "gardening" to describe modernity, the pulling and destroying of weeds and the carefully planned cultivation of flowers and edible plants. The violence and power associated with identity formation are no accident. The Holocaust and Nazism stemmed from the logic of modernity rather than departed from it. As a science and policy, racism was a particularly modern phenomenon, not a premodern, irrational throwback (Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence*, and *Life in Fragments*).

18. This point needs to be kept in mind. The literature focuses on how identities are constructed and used to legitimate a society, nation, or regime, but neglects the human need for an identity. Eric Hobsbawn and Terence Ranger, eds., *The Invention of Tradition* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983) is a good example. As correctives, see Taylor, *Multiculturalism* and Sarup, *Identity, Culture and the Postmodern World*.

19. I mean, historically, in cultural terms: premodern (to 1500), early modern (1500-1750), modern (1750-1950), postmodern or late modern (1950-near future).

20. For the analogy, see Bauman, *Life in Fragments*. On the commodification of identity, think of religion--in place of authoritative religious communities you can find religious apparel, weekend seminars, crystals, bumper stickers, mega-churches and tapes. This is not uniquely postmodern, and indeed is rooted in modern developments, but it is characteristic of postmodernity (again, the postmodern is "late modern") (see Laurence Moore, *Selling God* [New York: Oxford, 1995]; and Colleen McDannell, *Material Christianity* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995]).

21. This is a somewhat bold generalization. Identities in the western world still do play a legitimizing role, but less and less so. In the United States, for example, less than half of voters typically vote in elections. People today are defined less by being good or bad citizens and more by being good or bad consumers (i.e., spending significant amounts of money in the marketplace or not). In politics, public debate and civic participation are less important than consumption of rights through courts, interest groups and lobbies. See Bauman, *Life in Fragments*, and Barber, *Jihad vs. McWorld* (New York: Ballantine, 1996) on the decline of democracy and the reduction of citizenship to consumer rights. Also note David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity*

(Cambridge: Blackwell, 1990), and Jean Bethke Elshtain, *Democracy on Trial* (Concord, ON: Anansi, 1993).

22. See Barber, *Jihad vs. McWorld*; Sarup, *Identity*; and Bauman, *Life in Fragments*.

23. The second two parts of the metaphor are from Bauman, *Life in Fragments*.

24. On scholars and the modern state, see Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity* (New York: Routledge, 1992).

25. R.G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, rev. ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993, 1946), 231-249, 282-302.

26. My use of "translation" is from Andrew Walls, *The Missionary Movement in Christian History* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1996). He argues that the key to the spread and variety of Christianity is a process of cultural translation. Bauman, in *Intimations of Postmodernity*, uses the term "interpretation" in a similar way.

27. On translation, see "Breakthrough Books--Literature," *Lingua Franca* (February 1997): 18-19.

28. This quote is an English version of the song, from the 1918 Canadian Anglican *Book of Common Prayer and Common Praise*.

29. See Leonard Sweet, "Wise as Serpents, Innocent as Doves: The New Evangelical Historiography," *Journal of the Academy of American Religion* 56 (Fall 1988), 397-416; and, Douglas Sweeney, "The Essential Evangelicalism Debate," *Church History* 60 (1991), 70-84. The best example of this scholarship is Mark Noll's *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994). On women and religion, see David G. Hackett, "Gender and Religion in American Culture, 1870-1930," *Religion and American Culture* 5 (Summer 1995): 127-51.

30. Quoted in James H. Moorhead, "Perry Miller's Jeremiad Against Nineteenth-Century Protestantism," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 86:3 (1987), 312-326. On Miller, see Robert Calhoun, "Perry Miller," *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, ed. Clyde N. Wilson (Detroit: Gale Research Co., 1983), 17: 272-285.

31. More examples could be given. Nancy Hardesty's recovery of the history of evangelical women in leadership roles spoke to contemporary women fighting for leadership in churches and illuminated the religious roots of feminism for many secular women's studies scholars. Religious practice and scholarly debates over goddess worship and the existence of pre-historical matriarchal societies is another example (see Marci McDonald, "Is God a Woman?"

Maclean's, 8 April 1996, 46-51).

32. In *Tangled Memories: The Vietnam War, The AIDS Epidemic, and the Politics of Remembering* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), Marita Sturken distinguished "personal memory" (rooted in individual experience), "cultural memory" (shaped by popular and political culture), and "history" (professional, academic accounts of the past). Sturken argued that formal history writing has a limited impact on personal and cultural memory. Why this is so is at issue for me. We should not idealize the bards and storytellers of the past, making memory and identity *then* wholly unproblematic or uncontested. But academic historians in the modern and postmodern eras, as keepers of the past, do seem uniquely separate from the "lay" audiences they presumably would like to influence. On recognition and oppression see Volf, *Exclusion and Embrace*, 19; and, Taylor, *Multiculturalism*.

33. This role is not uncontested by amateur history buffs and writers, the popular media, the state, etc. On scholars as "legislators," see Foucault, *The Order of Things* (New York: Pantheon, 1970), 38; and "Truth and Power," Paul Rabinow, ed., *The Foucault Reader* (New York: Pantheon, 1984), 74. Generally on this theme, see Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity*. On whether the internet and easier access to archival sources makes this less true today, see Michael O'Malley and Roy Rosenweig, "Brave New World or Blind Alley? American History on the World Wide Web," *Journal of American History* 84 (1997): 132-155.

34. Novick, *That Noble Dream*, chapter 16.

35. On the explosion of religious history, see Jay Dolan, "New Directions in Catholic History," in *New Dimensions in Religious History*, eds. Jay Dolan and James P. Wind (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 152-174; R.L. Moore, *Religious Outsiders and the Making of Americans* (New York: Oxford, 1986); Jon Butler, "The Future of American Religious History," *William and Mary Quarterly* 42 (1985): 167-183; and Mark Noll, "Christianity and Canada: Good Books at Last," *Fides et Historia* 23 (1991): 80-104.

36. This is not new. Already during the 1930s, historians complained that they spoke and no one listened (see Novick, *That Noble Dream*, chapter 7). Not all historians can be painted with the same brush, of course. Women's history, for example, often is closely connected to political movements. Whether scholars are connected to the majority of non-academic and non-politicized women is another issue. Some religious historians, too, may reach non-academic audiences, for example, clergy. The generalization stands, I think. In gnostic fashion, most academic history is written for fellow illuminati –

student "initiates" and professorial "priests." To be fair, note that non-academics and politicians also often reject historical scholarship because it challenges contemporary historical orthodoxies. But many academic heresies do exist in splendid isolation from "lay" people.

37. See John Higham, "History in the Culture Wars," *OAH Newsletter* 25, No. 2 (May 1997): 1, 4. Arguably, this trend is similar in form to the fine arts, notably visual arts, which have become self-referential, losing and even self-consciously rejecting a broad public audience.

38. These are big generalizations, based on my impressions of academia and popular culture in North America. Lyotard is quoted in Middleton and Walsh, *Truth Is Stranger Than It Used to Be*, 70. On religion and popular culture, see "God and Television," *TV Guide* (US version), 29 March-4 April, 1997.

39. Cohen, "Anthem," *The Future* (Sony CD, 1992).

40. William McNeill, "Mythistory, or Truth, History, and Historians," *Mythistory and Other Essays* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 3-22. The essay is also in the *American Historical Review* (February 1986). It was an AHA Presidential Address.

41. The phrase is Bauman's (see *Intimations of Postmodernity* and *Life in Fragments*). I mean plurality of epistemologies and even metaphysics.

42. Abel, *Drum Songs: Glimpses of Dene History* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993), chapter 1.

43. Jonathan Edwards, *Some Thoughts* (Boston, 1742), and *A History of the Work of Redemption* (Edinburgh, 1774); Paul Johnson, *A Shopkeeper's Millennium* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978); Nathan Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale, 1989).

44. Middleton & Walsh, *Truth is Stranger Than It Used to Be*, 70-71. Note also Sarup, *An Introductory Guide*.

45. Marsden, *The Soul of the American University* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994). Note also his new book, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

46. Nietzsche, *On the Advantage*, 14. Most scholars read Nietzsche as having contempt for history; I read him in a somewhat more ambiguous fashion, as both having contempt for it and longing for a meaningful past.

47. Davis, quoted in Alvin Finkel, et al, *History of the Canadian Peoples* (Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, 1993), 2: xxi.

48. Nietzsche, *On the Advantage*, 40.