HISTORICAL PAPERS 1996
Canadian Society of Church History

Annual Conference
Brock University
27-28 May 1996

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. l. 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 Lawrence Nixon, Paul Friesen, Keith Fleming, Norman Knowles, Preston Jones, Barbara Murison, David Seljak and Marguerite Van Die were not made available for publication. At the time of publication of this collection, verification had been received that several of these papers had been submitted and accepted for publication elsewhere: see Paul Friesen, "Successes, Crises and Adaptation: The 1880s to the 1930s," forthcoming in *A History of St. James' Cathedral, Toronto: 1797-1997*; and Lawrence Nixon, "Changing Trends in Manitoba Religion," forthcoming in *A Geography of Manitoba: Its Land and People*, eds. John Welsted, John Everitt and Christoph Stadel (Winnipeg: Univ. of Manitoba Press).

Stuart Robinson: A Pro-slavery Presbyterian in Canada West[1]

KEVIN KEE

On a February Sunday evening, a crowd of men and women crammed into a meeting-hall to hear a stocky, balding, square-jawed man[2] preach from Leviticus 25:

> Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids shall be of the heathen which are round about you: of them shall ye BUY BONDMEN and bondmaids. And they shall be your POSSESSION (property), and ye shall take them as AN INHERITANCE for your children after you to INHERIT THEM FOR A POSSESSION; they shall be your bondmen forever.[3]

It was a perfect text for a congregation of planters in antebellum South Carolina. But the scene unfolding in the crowded building was far removed from that slave-holding Southern state. Many in the audience were students at the University of Toronto. The meeting-hall stood in Canada West's premier city. The year was 1864.

The pro-slavery preacher on the platform was Reverend Stuart Robinson, a Presbyterian from the border state of Kentucky. Robinson had fled his home state in 1862. Shortly after his arrival to Toronto, a former student had rented the "Mechanics Institute Hall" and had invited his mentor to preach there on Sundays. The quasi-church soon boasted an organized choir, and on several occasions the auditorium was filled to overflowing. Some of those in attendance were Southern exiles. Many, how-

ever, were British North Americans.

Anti-slavery activists were less welcoming. Speaking from the pulpit of Toronto's Wesleyan Methodist Church, Reverend W.F. Clarke ridiculed Robinson's biblical defense of slavery, then ruminated that he had "little patience and charity for people trained in a free land, and instructed in a gospel of liberty, who leave their own pastors and churches to sit under the ministrations of one who is an avowed slaveholder." Letters to the Toronto *Globe* echoed Reverend Clarke's consternation. According to one concerned Torontonian, Robinson was "undermining the principles of our young men . . . and poisoning our youth."[4]

Controversy was nothing new for Robinson – it was almost a constant in his career as a Presbyterian minister. But Robinson's story is interesting for other reasons. A study of his life provides a partial understanding of the way in which some Protestants portrayed God as an advocate for the bondage of a people. Robinson's success in Toronto also indicates that a mix of biblically fundamentalist Calvinism and pro-slavery resonated with some citizens of Canada West. Despite their instruction in a "gospel of liberty," Torontonians left their own ministers for a preacher who endorsed slavery. The theology that drew them was not original. Robinson's views followed those of the American South's foremost theologian, James Henley Thornwell. His scholastic, biblically fundamentalist version of Presbyterian Calvinism pervaded the American slave states. But this theology, and its promoters, did not go unopposed. A fellow Presbyterian, Robert Breckinridge, argued forcefully with Robinson, and declared that emancipation was more in keeping with the Scriptures. As a result of their quarrel, Robinson left his home in Kentucky for temporary refuge in Toronto. To his surprise, he found a welcoming audience for his views. Evidently, some mid-nineteenth-century Canadians held much in common with some Americans in general, and Southerners in particular.[5]

Looking back from the late-twentieth century, it is difficult to comprehend how clergy could defend the enslavement of a people. Scholars have provided several explanations regarding the motivation of pro-slavery preachers. Some have posited that "personal greed" was the reason. Others have referred to "hegemony," portraying pro-slavery ministers as "servants of the social order" who simply followed the dictates of the planters in their congregation. But recently these facile explanations have been shown to be simply wrong. According to historian Larry Tise, personal avarice and the influence of wealthy slaveowners were negligible factors in

determining whether ministers would pen formal defenses of slavery.[6]

At the same time it is difficult to deny that pro-slavery clergy were influenced by their culture. Taking this into account historian James Oscar Farmer has elucidated a middle way between cultural and religious explanations. In *The Metaphysical Confederacy*, an award-winning study of the renowned pro-slavery Presbyterian professor and preacher James Henley Thornwell, Farmer contends that "Southern theology in the nineteenth century was the product of a dual impulse: it reflected both intellectual commitments and social compulsions."[7]

Thornwell was the South's foremost pro-slavery apologist, and the theology he articulated had a tremendous influence on ministers like Stuart Robinson. As Farmer points out, Thornwell helped develop methods by which Calvinist pro-slavery clergy, following the dictates of their scriptures, argued against egalitarianism and attempted to prove that hierarchical society had been the historical norm. Thornwell called for trust in the biblical revelation that approved of slavery, and decried faulty human reasoning against the institution.

Central to Thornwell's theology were the writings of John Calvin. In fact, claims Farmer, "the view of Thornwell as the nineteenth-century's Calvin is not unreasonable." He notes that "his identification with the Great Reformer of Geneva was recognized both by himself and by his colleagues, all of whom were Calvinists." It was not lost on his pupils either. Leaving one of the professor's lectures, an exasperated student was overheard complaining, "that man, Jimmie Thornwell, finds in Calvin's *Institutes* what John Calvin himself never thought of."

The remark reminds historians that Thornwell's theology was a distinctly nineteenth-century Presbyterian interpretation of the thought of John Calvin and the reformed ministers of Geneva. It also incorporated the writings of the Scottish and Westminster divines, and as a result, was informed by Baconianism and Common Sense philosophy, though these were mitigated by his recognition of the Bible as ultimate truth. But what, present-day observers might ask, made Thornwell's contemporaries view him as the nineteenth-century successor to the sixteenth-century Reformer?

According to Farmer, the "world was, for Thornwell as for Calvin, an evil place." The theologian placed little faith in humanity's "goodness," and less in its reasoning. Disregarding the Enlightenment emphasis on humankind's capacity for knowledge, Thornwell believed that the "mysteries of God's providence would . . . remain mysterious to fallen

man." Of course, humanity still had an obligation to search for truth. But for Thornwell this journey was less a voyage of future discovery than an excavation of the past. As Farmer notes, he "was a Calvinist in his attitude toward theological study. He had a conservative's reverence for the great minds of the past and recognized the importance of grounding modern scholarship on their foundations." As a result, Thornwell indicted contemporaries who in his opinion, "made the error of bringing to theology a preconceived system and trying to harmonize the Scriptures with it." His guide, he maintained, was that of the Reformers: Scripture alone.[8]

Farmer is virtually alone in his implicit emphasis on the importance of scholastic, biblically fundamentalist Calvinism to pro-slavery theology. In general, historians have failed to note the connection. For instance, when Larry Tise compiled and analyzed the writings, formal defenses, and sermons of 275 pro-slavery ministers in the North and South, he concluded that there was "exceedingly little that even a majority of the ministers who published defenses of slavery held in common." He appears to have overlooked the theology of the American Presbyterian church, one of the most Calvinistic of American denominations. Tise alluded to "the continuing predominance of northern Presbyterian seminaries" in educating pro-slavery clergymen, and considered "the presence of so many [pro-slavery] Presbyterians" strange, but he did not attempt to account for their strong showing. It is notable that, despite their limited population, Presbyterians boasted a disproportionate number of pro-slavery ministers. Furthermore, when pro-slavery clergy are listed by denomination, Presbyterian churches have the dubious distinction of placing first on the roster.[9]

Of course, this does not prove that nineteenth-century Presbyterian Calvinism was the sole reason motivating theologians and clergy to defend slavery. After all, ministers of Arminian persuasion, like Methodists, were equally adept at employing Christianity in their defenses of the South's "peculiar institution." And a small number of committed Calvinist clergy were devoted to emancipation. Furthermore, Presbyterians were divided on the issue, and the official policy of the denomination changed with the intellectual environment. For instance, at the end of the eighteenth century, ideology influenced the Presbyterian attitude to slavery. Immediately after the American Revolution, the vast majority held abolitionist views. But by the 1830s the Presbyterian Church's support for anti-slavery societies had dwindled. Among those challenging the church's role in the abolitionist

movement was Thornwell who argued that operating the societies was clearly outside the church's mandate because they were not prescribed in the Bible. Opponents of Thornwell and company disagreed, and pushed the Presbyterian church to support further the abolitionist movement and benevolent societies in general. Convinced that these "liberal" Presbyterians were too corrupted to save, northern conservatives engineered a split from their New School brothers and sisters, and many southerners joined them in the formation of the "Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Old School)."[10]

However, some Presbyterians with anti-slavery sympathies remained in the Calvinist Old School. Robert Jefferson Breckinridge was one. An occasional anti-slavery activist, he would prove to be Stuart Robinson's nemesis. The son of John Breckinridge, a Jeffersonian of national stature, Robert was a member of the Kentucky legislature before an intense religious experience in 1832 led him to set free his slaves and enter the Presbyterian ministry. According to historian Louis Weeks, Breckinridge soon became, "without doubt the most important pastor during the period." At the same time, however, "he also proved the most irascible, the most frequent party leader in whatever fight divided Kentucky Presbyterians." His position on slavery afforded him ample opportunity for conflict. He became a spokesman for the American Colonization Society, but decided to abandon the sinking colonization ship when it foundered in the 1830s. From this time after he "vociferously advocated" what Weeks describes as "a rather moderate, anti-slavery position."[11] But, like many who opposed slavery, Breckinridge appears to have been more concerned with the corrupting influence of the institution on white Americans than with the injustices suffered by the slaves.[12]

In Kentucky abolitionism was a difficult principle to defend on any grounds. Although inhabitants of a border state, and home to a vocal anti-slavery minority, the vast majority of Kentuckians were pro-slavery and anti-abolitionist in sentiment. They followed the leaders of the third largest slave-owning population in the nation, and this group dominated Kentucky politics. However, while sympathetic to slavery the citizens of the border state were also committed to the Union, and their sentiments were properly reflected in the congressional election of 1861 that ensured that Kentucky would remain in the United States of America. But this decision could not close the rift that had grown among the border state's citizens. The issues leading to the Civil War and the war itself were perhaps more disruptive

there than in any other state. Cities, villages, churches and families were divided.[13]

Kentucky's Presbyterians could not avoid being torn in two. Breckinridge was central to this rending. Obtaining a position at Louisville's Danville Seminary, he remained active in Kentucky society. But his penchant for speaking out on political issues quickly brought him into conflict with those who emphasized the separation of church and state including his colleague at Danville, Stuart Robinson. Their personal battle typified the struggle in the border church, and the nation. Their clashing personalities proved to be a major source of the tension. According to Weeks, "both men were long on dedication and certain of their points of view, both short on tolerance of divergent views and open-mindedness."[14] As a result, the common ground was lost and their ideological positions hardened. Firmly anti-slavery, Breckinridge attempted to ally Kentucky Presbyterians with the Union, and a continuation of (the original) Old School affiliation. Resolutely pro-slavery, Robinson sought to lead them in a neutral position through the Civil War, and into the Southern Church afterward.

Born in Strabane, County Tyrone, Ireland, in 1814, Robinson emigrated as a child to the United States, and grew up the son of a parson in the Valley of Virginia. He was introduced to the slavery debate at an early age, witnessing confrontations between abolitionists and conservatives while studying at a northern school. After graduating from Amherst he attended Union Seminary in Hampden Sidney, Virginia. In his initial pastorates, observes Weeks, "he quickly established himself as a community leader as well as a powerful preacher." He also proved to be a noted author.[15]

In 1858 Robinson took a position as professor of "church government and pastoral theology" at Danville. Here he published his first book, *The Church of God as an Essential Element of the Gospel*. Following Calvin, he viewed the "church" not as a human institution but as representative of God's covenant with humanity. Tracing the contemporary church back to antiquity, he portrayed it as the extension of the Old Testament nation of Israel and the New Testament Christian community. While Robinson appraised optimistically the American prospect for the future of the church, its separation from the secular state was of central importance. "They are the two great powers that be," he noted, "and are ordained of God to serve two distinct ends in the great scheme devised for man as

fallen." He did not let this point rest. With the increasing conflict between the North and South undoubtedly on his mind he urged church leaders to stay clear of the fray. Concluding, he reiterated Jesus' command to "render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's distinct from rendering to God the things that are God's."[16]

Breckinridge's vision for the church was quite contrary, of course, and when the war began the two professor-pastors' differences reached a zenith. Their battle had dissipated with Robinson's move in 1858 to the pastorate of Louisville's Second Presbyterian church. But the truce proved short-lived. The tension was exacerbated by Breckinridge's Lexington speech delivered on the National Fast Day in January 1861. He declared that the duty of Kentucky was "First, To stand by the Constitution and the Union of the country, to the last extremity. Second. To prevent . . . all attempts to terrify her, into taking of any step inconsistent with her own constitution and laws." The following year he monopolized the meeting of the Old School Assembly with his proposal that it adopt his paper "On the State of the Church and the Country." Robinson could contain his anger no longer. Breckinridge's staunch Unionism had no place in the Presbyterian Church, he charged, accusing his nemesis of taking "advantage of the pulpit or theological chair as a politician." The Assembly, however, sided with Breckinridge, asking that he withdraw his proffered resignation and continue as a seminary professor.[17] Temporarily defeated, Robinson returned to Louisville and penned his observations of the Assembly in his journal, insolently titled the *True Presbyterian*. Soon after, copies found their way into the hands of Federal troops. Within a matter of days, Robinson wisely decided to depart for Toronto, ostensibly to visit his invalid brother. Friends warned him that should he return to Louisville, he might be incarcerated for sedition. He would remain in exile for three years.

In Toronto, he preached from the pulpit of his quasi-church and published two books, *Slavery, As Recognized in the Mosaic Civil Law*, and *Discourses of Redemption as Revealed at Sundry Times and in Diverse Manners*. The latter work became widely read and much-quoted in the Presbyterian Church.[18] The book was a compilation of lectures that had proved "profitable to hearers;" apparently they appreciated "the benefits which they considered themselves to have received from the exposition of the gospel in the order of the successive revelations, under the several covenants in the history of redemption." According to Robinson, the themes examined were "destined to be the great questions of the next ten

years both in the British and American Churches."

Perhaps the greatest question of all, at least to Robinson, was the place of the Bible in the Protestant church. His answer was concise, Calvinist and conservative. Echoing theologians like Thornwell, he contended that the Scriptures were "the only source of saving knowledge." Echoing his previous work, he emphasized the importance of God's covenants as the foundation of the Bible. Understanding those covenants was of the utmost importance, and for this reason he argued that the Old Testament was the key to the New. The central figure of the Old Testament was Abraham, and the central event was God's "covenant with his Church [at Mt. Sinai] as a *representative* body, standing for the Church of all succeeding ages." Delivering this charter was God's first act of revelation and redemption. Robinson contended that from that time until the arrival of Christ, God slowly unveiled his heavenly plan for humanity by progressive revelation.[19] Redemption through Christ marked the final covenant.

If *Discourses of Redemption* brought Robinson respect, *Slavery* brought him notoriety. It was published in Toronto by "Rollo and Adam" in March of 1865, one month before the end of the Civil War. According to Robinson, *Slavery* was inspired by the letters of "a large number of intelligent Canadian gentlemen" who had appreciated his "admirable discourses on slavery" and requested that they be distributed "in a form that would reach the mass of the people in the province and abroad." Remarkably, the lifelong pro-slavery crusader had never considered this option before. In his preface, he attempted to convince his readers that, "though not thus coming before the public by any design or forethought of his own, it seems to the author that he should have been called upon, just at this time, to show the people 'what saith the Scriptures' concerning the relation of master and slave."[20]

"Just at this time" was a rather unusual moment to publish pro-slavery material. While the lectures were undoubtedly the result of work that Robinson had completed long before the tide of the war had turned against the Confederacy, his decision to go ahead with their publication just days before Lee's April 9 surrender at Appomattox is remarkable. Robinson must have realized that the institution of slavery was finished in the border states and the South. His book was thus a stubborn rebuttal of the events as they had unfolded. It was a vow: political defeat would not dissuade him from declaring what was right.

As Robinson saw it, this was his duty to God: to preach the truth re-

gardless of the consequences. Like a persecuted prophet who stood steadfast to his message, he self-righteously vowed not to allow "the consideration that I must here run counter to the almost universal popular prejudices of the country so to restrain me that I should shun to declare the whole counsel of God." That "counsel" was wholly contained in Scripture, "the infallible word of God."[21] It was not Robinson's purpose to consider the "ethical justice" of the institution, nor to list all the other arguments that might support American slavery. He was not oblivious to these explanations – he often alluded to them in passing. But as a committed Calvinist, he would not proclaim doctrines based on philosophy or science that only appeared to be true. As far as Stuart Robinson was concerned, Scripture embodied the only plenary rule for humanity.

Robinson's method, in his view, was essentially scientific. He gleaned the pro-slavery "facts" from the Bible, compiled the data, and rationally presented his argument. His plea for the supremacy of Scripture in all questions might have been self-serving, but it was consistent. In his *Discourses of Redemption* he referred to the Bible as "the religion of Protestants,"[22] made it the central focus of his analysis, and defended its unique authority in the church. The Bible, he speculated, was making a steady come-back, despite the resistance of those who found their inspiration in contemporary philosophies. For several years its principles had languished in neglect. But the times were changing. Robinson rejoiced in "the sober second thought of Christian people," who were, he observed,

> beginning to suspect the dogmas of the noisy, canting, infidel philanthropism whose prophets have seduced them temporarily to follow the pretended revelations of natural reason, "spiritual insight," and "universal love," instead of Jehovah's prophets whom their fathers followed.[23]

For Robinson, as for Thornwell[24] and pro-slavery clergymen in general, the conflict between the anti-slavery school and the pro-slavery theorists reduced itself to a clash between those who accepted the Bible as absolute truth, and those who followed the rationalism of the age. The latter's declamations about a "'purer and higher' ethical law of the gospel" warned Robinson, are "practically, a preparation of the soil for receiving the germinal seeds of infidelity from the first plausible apostate who may rise up, ambitious of a distinction in destroying the church, which he

cannot obtain by faithful toil in edifying it."[25]

Robinson's mission was thus to defend his interpretation of the word of God and thereby preserve true Christianity in America. His chances of saving Protestantism were slim, but he persevered nonetheless. He had witnessed first-hand the chaos the "apostasy" had apparently wrought, dividing his once peaceful state and many of its families, exiling him to Canada, inciting war. He now embraced his task with a zealot's intensity and devotion. He realized, of course, that God's ways were not always the ways of humanity, and God's thoughts not always the thoughts of humanity. To those who doubted his divinely-ordained dictates on slavery, Robinson had a simple answer: even when God's judgements seemed unfair, they were to be followed. Following Calvin closely, he maintained that the mysteries of God's providence would remain mysterious to fallen humanity. Robinson expressly stated:

> it is the part of a sincere and truly rational Christian man to bow reverently to the plain teaching of God's holy word. And even though these judgements given by Moses and Jesus seem to him "past finding out," and occasionally repugnant to the teachings of his natural heart, he but applies to Moses and Jesus the admired maxim of Coleridge concerning Plato, "When I cannot understand his ignorance I confess myself ignorant of his understanding."[26]

But Robinson had no intention of languishing in ignorance. To augment his understanding and bolster his arguments, he followed "not only the ancient critics, but also the best and most generally accepted British and Continental biblical scholars of the new anti-slavery era, who cannot be suspected of partiality to my theories." Like Thornwell and other conservative Calvinists, he looked to the past for inspiration and direction. And just as those scholars viewed all scripture as "inspired by God," so Robinson determined to treat both the Old and New Testaments equally. "I believe that all Scripture," he stated, "Moses just as much as Jesus – David just as much as John – Isaiah just as much as Paul – is the inspiration of God."[27]

According to Robinson it was the emphasis on Jesus' ethics at the expense of Old Testament mandates that had led many abolitionists to declare that the Bible supported the anti-slavery cause. Robinson contended that "nothing has tended to obscure and confuse the views of Christians on

this whole subject more than the current fashion of partial examinations of the Scriptures – the Old Testament without reference to the New, or the New Testament without reference to the Old."[28] Robinson's emphasis on the equality of all Scripture would prove to be the linchpin to his pro-slavery argument.

With his Bible at hand, his enemy identified, his methods justified and his purpose clear, Robinson went on to point out, in eight chapters, how God had ordained slavery through his "spoken word." Beginning with God's covenant with Noah, Robinson contended that "it was a purpose of God, revealed at the very origin of the present race of men, that one portion of the race should be doomed to servitude." In subsequent "revelations" God reiterated his initial purpose. Through Abraham, a slaveholder, God set apart the Church as a separate society. Second to Abraham in importance was Moses, who organized "the Hebrew patriarchy into a free, constitutional commonwealth," according to the legal code dictated by God, and recorded in the Old Testament book Leviticus. As Robinson explained it, this "code" contained certain germinal principles, one of which was the right to hold slaves. He contended that "almost all of its fundamental points are precisely the same with the slave-codes of the American Southern States." Thus the constitution of the Confederacy was simply a reincarnation of God's own charter given to Moses. As Robinson declared, "there was in the civil code of Moses the recognition of a system of perpetual servitude, just as clearly and distinctly, though in less detail, as in the laws of Virginia, or Kentucky, or South Carolina." As if this was not proof enough, Robinson pointed out that the fourth and tenth commandment mentioned slavery, and therefore "recognized the propriety of the relation of master and slave within the church itself." Remaining with Moses, he reached what may have been the climax to his argument. Robinson cited Numbers 31:28, in which "Moses, by special command of Jehovah, took three hundred and fifty-two of the 'persons,' [slaves captured in a battle] and turned them over to Eliezer, the High Priest, as the 'Lord's tribute.'" For Robinson, there was no better justification of slavery than that in taking slaves as a payment to his temple, God himself had become a slave-owner.[29]

Moving to the New Testament, Robinson showed that Jesus Christ (conducting himself as the son of a slave-owner should) "did not anywhere, in like manner, expressly and specifically repeal the toleration of slavery." Following a notion initially advanced by pro-slavery theorist

Richard Fuller, Robinson considered the Old Testament sanction of slavery valid given the absence of any New Testament condemnation. Therefore, he noted, "slavery is left in the New Testament precisely as it stood in the Old."[30] There remained, however, Jesus' "Golden Rule," the foundation of the abolitionist critique. Robinson dispatched of it handily. When Jesus uttered "the great law of Love – 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart . . . and thy neighbour as thyself,'" he was but quoting "the sum of duty to God thrice repeated in the law of Moses," in which slavery "was distinctly recognized and allowed." Jesus' words were in fact Moses' words, and were contained within God's law, a constitution that had specifically recognized slavery.[31]

Robinson's goal was the modelling of the United States after the hierarchically ordered society of the Old and New Testament. Each person had a station and a calling, and it was their duty before God to accept it with joy. Slaveholders would think, slaves would work. This did not mean that slaves could be treated with contempt. They were, after all, human beings.[32] But to say that slavery was wrong and slaveholding a sin made no sense to Robinson. Had not the Apostle Paul, in his letter to Philemon, fully recognized his rights over his runaway slave Onesimus? In general in the early church, he pointed out, "the Apostles not only admitted slaveholders and their slaves together into the church, but enjoined the Christian duties of masters and slaves, precisely in the same manner as the duties of ruler and subject, husband and wife, parent and child."[33]

To be sure, many of Robinson's unoriginal interpretive assumptions were questionable. In the decade preceding the Civil War, anti-slavery apologists, including Presbyterians like Albert Barnes and John Rankin, had exposed leaks in the pro-slavery advocates' allegedly water-tight biblical defense. They pointed out that the words "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren" (Genesis 9:25) were uttered by a drunken Noah, not God, and were a prediction, not a decree. Turning to Abraham, they pointed out that if Abraham's "servants" were slaves, then his wife, Sarah, and his nephew Lot must also be his slaves, because they too appeared on his property list. Regardless, they continued, patriarchal morality was no example for mid-nineteenth-century Americans, because Abraham also lied and practiced polygamy.[34]

Focusing on the New Testament, commentators challenged the pro-slavery argument that Jesus' silence in condemning slavery proved his support for the institution. Pointing out the fallacy of this logic, one theologian

noted that "as we have no account whatever of any public preaching by Christ and the apostles against forgery, arson, piracy, counterfeiting . . . we are to presume from this supposed approving silence . . . that the whole of those crimes are morally approbated and licensed in the New Testament."[35]

Robinson obviously remained unmoved by this reasoning. Nearing the end of his text, he summarized his defense:

> If therefore this argument, laying its foundations in the great covenant of God, which organized a Church visible as a separate society on earth, and woven out of the successive revelations made to that Church, age after age, through Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and the Apostles – acumulating at every step – and crowned at last by the solemn denunciations of an inspired Apostle, against all who pretend to find a contrary argument and doctrine in the Scriptures, as unworth the fellowship of Christ's true ministers – then it is my bounden duty – a duty laid upon me by the solemn responsibilities of my office, to warn the people of God against approaching unbelief and apostasy in the Church.[36]

The church was going to hell if it remained on its present course. Of this Robinson was sure. He closed with a plea to others of similar mind: "let those who have made the oracles of God their guide and their study, instead of the 'glittering generalities' of modern 'illuminati,' speak to the people the word of truth and soberness, and with God's blessing they may return from their backsliding and be healed."[37] If those who shared his beliefs could only take courage, and speak the truth, the church might be rescued.

Of course his pleas for help fell on deaf ears. No evidence exists to show that any of his listeners in Toronto took up his cause. Those Southern exiles who agreed with Robinson and who held influence in the United or Confederate States were powerless to effect change. The South capitulated a month after his words were published, and slavery was destroyed. For Robinson, this was a tragedy. Americans, he believed, had made a colossal error in turning their back on an institution sanctified by God himself. At no point, it appears, did he recognize that he may have been in error. In his defense of slavery, he had contradicted himself on at least two counts. First, he had damned the likes of Breckinridge for using the pulpit for political purposes, only to spend his Sundays in Toronto defending slavery to hundreds of listeners. Second, while he castigated anti-slavery Chris-

tians for reading their theology through abolitionist glasses, he had interpreted the Bible through a pro-slavery lens. He refused to see that the Scriptures gave mixed signals on the issue of slavery, and discarded anything that might abrogate his interpretation.

All the while he insisted that he was considering the Bible, and only the Bible. His scholastic, biblically fundamentalist Calvinism seemed to justify this approach. Robinson turned this theology into an ideology that buttressed his defense of slavery. The process was not inevitable of course. After all, Breckinridge remained loyal to both the Calvinistic Old School and abolitionism. But for those who took offense at the militancy of the abolitionist movement, or worried about the instability free slaves might cause, or who had much to lose with emancipation, the theological foundation was there. It is important to reiterate that Robinson's method of justification was in no way novel. According to James Henley Thornwell's biographer, "the mind" of the South's foremost pro-slavery professor and preacher "epitomized the Calvinist outlook . . . of his region."[38]

Robinson may have felt more comfortable in Toronto than in his own region in 1865. While many pro-slavery ministers were able to quietly reestablish themselves at the conclusion of the war, peace provided no rest for Robinson. In a military court in Washington, DC, he was accused of plotting and supporting a conspiracy to infect the Capital and several Northern cities with yellow fever.[39] Soon the alleged conspiracy was confused with another – the plot to kill Lincoln.[40] The tale may have been spun by Breckinridge who once again had managed to establish himself among the powerful. After Robinson was forced to leave Kentucky in 1862, Breckinridge retained his staunch commitment to the Union. Though he had lamented the election of Lincoln and the secession of the six cotton states in his journal, *The Danville Quarterly Review*, he quickly changed his opinion of the President. Ascending rapidly the ranks of power in the Republican party he became, according to one appraisal, "Lincoln's chief counsellor and advisor in Kentucky."[41] At the same time, he maintained his influence in Danville Seminary and in Kentucky Presbyterianism.

When the mists of confusion surrounding Robinson's trial finally cleared in April 1866, he returned to Louisville a hero and a "martyr" to many Kentucky Presbyterians. He started where he had left off delving into controversy with a zealot's intensity, this time refusing to state his loyalty to the Federal Government in bold defiance of the General Assembly. Elected to the General Assembly meeting of 1866, Robinson was

confronted by Breckinridge's supporters, who were determined to punish him. Robinson and all who had defied the Assembly were denied their seats. In response, Robinson's Louisville Presbytery renounced the authority of the Assembly, and formed its own Synod. Kentucky Presbyterians divided again. The vast majority followed Robinson and his presbytery into the Southern Assembly, and it gradually increased its territory beyond the original states of the late Confederacy.[42]

Robinson was reinstated as one of Kentucky's foremost Presbyterians, in a part of the Republic where support for a biblical defense of slavery was widely acknowledged. But Robinson's biblically fundamentalist Calvinist theology was embraced by many outside the South and border states, garnering support in the North, and in Canada West as well. According to both Robinson and his critics he had found a "welcoming" audience among students and professionals who chose to leave their own churches to sit under Robinson's make-shift pulpit.[43] Indeed, in Canada West too were some Protestants who held a hierarchical view of society, were predisposed to Calvinist theology, believed in an arbitrary God and were alarmed that the Bible was not being read literally or taken seriously. They also supported the notion that God was an advocate for the bondage of a people.[44] However much Canadians emphasize differences with Americans common Anglo-American cultural assumptions stand out as well. In the era of the Civil War and confederation Canada was not just the God-ordained terminus of the underground railroad, it was also a land that shared theology and ideology with the slave-holding South.

Endnotes

1. This paper was written with the financial support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. I am also indebted to William Katerberg and Gary Miedema, whose suggestions helped improve this essay.

2. See the picture of the Reverend Stuart Robinson in Louis B. Weeks, *Kentucky Presbyterians* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983), 78.

3. Reverend Stuart Robinson, *Slavery, As Recognized in the Mosaic Civil Law* (Toronto: Rollo & Adam, 1865), 23.

4. Toronto *Globe*, 6 March 1865; 29 February 1865.

5. In the last twenty-five years, historians have laid to rest the myth that Canada was a prejudice-free haven that welcomed slavery's victims. In *The Blacks in Canada: A History* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1971), Robin Winks presented a catalogue of racism in British North America. In *Unwelcome Guests: Canada West's Response to American Fugitive Slaves, 1800-1865* (Millwood: Associated Faculty Press, 1985), Jason Silverman showed that racism in mid-nineteenth century Canada was comparable to that in the northern United States. In *The Light of Nature and the Law of God* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1992), Allen Stouffer drew on an analysis of church periodicals to point out that many Canadian churches responded to the antislavery cause with silence. Yet, while the racism of many Canadians has been acknowledged, little attention has been given to Canadian support for slavery, and none to how religion was used to justify the so-called "peculiar institution" north of the border.

6. See Larry Tise, *Proslavery, A History of the Defense of Slavery in America* (Athens: Univ. of Georgia Press, 1987), 172-177.

7. James Oscar Farmer, Jr., *The Metaphysical Confederacy, James Henley Thornwell and the Synthesis of Southern Values* (Macon: Mercer Univ. Press, 1986), 124.

8. Farmer, *The Metaphysical Confederacy*, 131, 126, 134.

9. Tise, *Proslavery*, 177, 144, 134.

10. Farmer, *The Metaphysical Confederacy*, 185. It is clear that the issue of abolition was not the only question dividing the Old School from the New. As George Marsden points out in *The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1970), Northern Old School Presbyterians viewed abolition as only one of the New School's many digressions from true Presbyterianism. The New School, for its part, was far from united in its support of emancipation. Indeed, not wanting to offend slaveholders in the South while avoiding the loss of the more liberal (anti-slavery) members to the Congregationalists, the New School decided to remain neutral in 1837, giving power to local judicatories to decide the issue and not to the Assembly (see Eugene Genovese, *The Slaveholder's Dilemma* [Columbia: Univ. of South Carolina Press, 1992], 35, 36, and Marsden, *The Evangelical Mind*, 97). A synopsis of the causes of the division can be found in Marsden, *The Evangelical Mind*, 66-87. New School Presbyterians experienced their own schism in 1858, when southern New School churches withdrew to form the "United Synod of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A."

11. Weeks, *Kentucky Presbyterians*, 59-61.

12. Andrew E. Murray, *Presbyterians and the Negro – A History* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Historical Society, 1966), 80, 81.

13. Fred J. Hood, "Kentucky," in *Religion in the Southern States* (Macon: Mercer Univ. Press, 1983), ed. Samuel S. Hill, 114.

14. Weeks, *Kentucky Presbyterians*, 66.

15. Weeks, *Kentucky Presbyterians*, 84.

16. Quoted in Weeks, *Kentucky Presbyterians*, 85.

17. Weeks, *Kentucky Presbyterians*, 83-86.

18. According to Weeks, "numerous reviews give evidence that the book received good publicity," in Kentucky (*Kentucky Presbyterians*, 173, note 39).

19. Reverend Stuart Robinson, *Discourses of Redemption as Revealed at Sundry Times and in Diverse Manners* (Toronto: Rollo and Adam), v, vi, 37-56, 125.

20. Robinson, *Slavery*, iii-v.

21. Robinson, *Slavery*, 4, viii.

22. Robinson, *Discourses*, iii.

23. Robinson, *Slavery*, v.

24. Bringing to theology a pre-conceived system and trying to harmonize the Scriptures with it was, for Thornwell, the error of the "New England theologians." As the theologian put it: "they have made it an appendix to their shallow and sophistical psychology, and to their still shallower and more sophistical ethics" (Farmer, *The Metaphysical Confederacy*, 134).

25. Robinson, *Slavery*, 43.

26. Robinson, *Slavery*, 42.

27. Robinson, *Slavery*, 5, 71.

28. Robinson, *Slavery*, 14.

29. Robinson, *Slavery*, 8, 15, 24, 22, 13, 28.

30. Robinson, *Slavery*, 41. "WHAT GOD SANCTIONED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, AND PERMITTED IN THE NEW," Fuller instructed Brown University president Francis Wayland, "CANNOT BE SIN" (quoted in H. Shelton Smith, *In His Image, But . . . , Racism in Southern Religion, 1780-1910* [Durham: Duke Univ. Press, 1972], 133).

31. Robinson, *Slavery*, 37, 38.

32. Robinson, like many of his colleagues, saw no contradiction here. As Joyce E. Chaplin has pointed out, the principle of humanity "in this era, was perfectly compatible with social control and exploitation." This principle, defined in Southern slave-holding terms, "stated that all persons were similar in terms of their common needs, but were not *equal* in terms of social or political rights" ("Slavery and the Principle of Humanity: A Modern Idea in the Early Lower South," *Journal of Social History* 24 [1990]: 300, 301).

33. Robinson, *Slavery*, 44-52.

34. See John Rankin, "Letter XI," in *The Antislavery Argument*, eds. William H. Pease and Jane H. Pease (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc, 1965), 120; and Willard M. Swartley, *Slavery, Sabbath, War and Women, Case Issues in Biblical Interpretation*, (Kitchener: Herald Press, 1983), 40.

35. Quoted in Swartley, *Slavery, Sabbath, War and Women*, 44.

36. Robinson, *Slavery*, 61, 62.

37. Robinson, *Slavery*, 88.

38. Farmer, *The Metaphysical Confederacy*, 6.

39. Reverend Stuart Robinson, *The Infamous Perjuries of the "Bureau of Military Justice"* (Toronto: s.n., 1865), 2.

40. *Reverend Stuart Robinson to President Lincoln* (S.l.: s.n., 1865).

41. Quoted in Weeks, *Kentucky Presbyterians*, 86.

42. Weeks, *Kentucky Presbyterians*, 91, 98, 99.

43. They came from a variety of different denominations. Many were probably adherents to Wesleyan Methodist, High Church Anglican, and Kirk Presbyterian churches, which generally espoused conservative political and social opinions (see Stouffer, *The Light of Nature and the Law of God*, 142-170). Robinson's biblical defense of slavery might have meshed with their view of society.

44. Winks has concluded that there was relatively little prejudice in Toronto during the war, compared to the Western part of the province, because Toronto was prosperous and there was little competition between the blacks and Irish immigrants for labour (*Blacks in Canada*, 251). This point needs to be qualified for two reasons. First, Robinson's acceptance by some Torontonians indicates the prevalence of racism. Second, the racism existed not only

amongst the poorest of the city but also amongst its educated and established.

Issues of Church Governance from a Cross-border Perspective: The Case of Lay Trusteeism in Mid-Nineteenth Century Buffalo, New York

W. BARRY SMITH

The story of lay trusteeism in the Roman Catholic Diocese of Buffalo, NY is a story of many characters, most notably the first Bishop of Buffalo (1847-1867), John Timon, CM.[1] Trusteeism should not, however, be interpreted solely as a "Timon" issue. Long before the first bishop's arrival, trusteeism in Buffalo was confronted by Bishop John Dubois of New York and Bishop, later Archbishop, John Hughes, his successor.[2]

For many reasons, the problem of trusteeism can be summed up by acknowledging that even a structure as traditional and staid as the Roman Catholic Church, when translated to the American states during their National period, would face tensions of identity and continuity. In fact, the Roman Church, once allowed to grow in the United States, faced an interesting problem. While it had been at best ignored and at worst persecuted throughout colonial times, with the passage of the Bill of Rights to the United States Constitution, freedom of religion was, like it or not, extended even to Catholics! What this meant for the church was freedom of worship and an opportunity for growth during a time when immigration was causing church membership to increase notably in a new land. At the same time, it meant that lay members of the church who maintained the faith through years of non-acceptance and who sometimes were the sole presence of the church in missionary territories, found themselves faced with an interesting challenge. Governance of the land was based upon

democratic principles. Geographical and attitudinal distance from the European church had fostered an acceptance of those principles. However, during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the European structures of hierarchy and governance were being imposed upon a people who had begun to redefine the way in which church ought to exist in America. This was particularly true because of regular interaction with Protestantism which Roman Catholics were experiencing in the United States. As familiarity grew, so did a sympathy for the manner in which the Protestant churches in the United States were governed, i.e., by the *people* who built the churches and called their clergy to serve them and determined their length of service. Thus, while Catholicism was still suspect at best in most Protestant minds, it learned from the very people who were its supposed enemies.

Trusteeism, as it developed through the second and third quarters of the nineteenth century in the United States, addressed a number of interrelated issues: first, there was the question of lay involvement in ecclesiastical affairs. The Roman Church in Europe would not have considered the sort of adaptation which was proposed for its brethren in the United States. Principles of Jacksonian democracy were among the reasons that the adaptation was even proposed. Second, not unlike Canada to the north, the people of the United States were confronting a number of challenges based on ethnic rivalries. In Buffalo, trusteeism was a case of German immigrants, led by a wealthy Frenchman, confronting the Irish-American hierarchy of the Diocese of New York.[3] Third, there is no doubt that the anticlericalism of post-Revolutionary Europe had been translated in some form to the United States. While the clergy sought, for example, to control education in Canadian lands, in the United States they sought to control the buildings, and the progress of the church. This created built-in reasons for tension. Fourth, trusteeism would never have been able to come to the fore to the extent that it did, lacking the anti-Catholicism which was still prevalent in the United States in the mid-nineteenth century. The trustees were not only able to present themselves as champions of democratic principles, but were able to enlist the assistance of many who were more than willing to challenge the power of the Pope and his priests in the political and economic arenas.

It is interesting, in the process of contextualizing the trusteeism problem in the Roman Catholic Church of the United States, to note certain social and political events in Canada which, when seen in the back-

ground of the times, provide insight into the attitudes of people. Significant, for example, is the fact that the ill-fated Rebellion of 1837 in Upper Canada is accepted by some historians today to be a prime example of the ". . . classic struggle between 'democracy' and 'privilege.'"[4] This was at a time, as we will see, when the trustee question was coming to the fore in the reign of Bishop John Hughes of New York whose authoritarian ways were thought to be a poor example of European attitude in an American context especially by those many miles away.

Moreover, the Union of the Two Canadas in 1840 can be seen as a sign of the times on both sides of the border. Not only was the Union of itself important, but for our purposes, the move toward "responsible government" adds an interesting focal point. Responsible government was opposed in Britain (and by some in Canada) out of fear of an independence movement based on the provision for greater voice by the people and their representatives. While it can be interpreted as anti-British bias which caused support for responsible government, it can also be ascribed to a "home rule" attitude growing in Canada, an attitude which was evident among Canada's neighbours to the South.

The issue of trusteeism, while regularly couched in ecclesiastical terms, may be seen in retrospect as symptomatic of a wider movement. Above the anti-clericalism which it reflected (something certainly shared with neighbours across the border), trusteeism marked a breakthrough in attitude: those citizens fostering the movement were concerned with the implementation of democracy in all aspects of their lives. They felt that those on the scene were best able to reflect the needs and priorities of a congregation or a diocese, not a bishop many miles away. Even with the advent of a resident local bishop, the attitude of trusteeism remained. The bishop (John Timon in our example) reflected the imposition of values from a far away institution confronting the values of the people who had donated the land, built the church and kept the faith alive when no bishop was around and other clergy visited only sparingly.

Another parallel can be seen in the attitudes which were in evidence during the debate surrounding the Canadian School Act of 1853. The rhetoric employed in the north reflected attitudes similar to those expressed by the lay trustees across the lake. The establishment of a separate school system, which was nonetheless subject to provincial inspection, its curriculum to be examined by the government on a regular basis, was analogous to the parochial structure which the trustees in Buffalo were

attempting to establish. They had organized a parish incorporating it under the laws of the State of New York. They next sought to apply those laws to their advantage, demanding that the statutes of New York be allowed to supersede the precepts of canon law in matters of ownership and control of church property. Their preference was for a parish much like the Protestant churches in the neighbourhood: incorporated under state law, controlled by local laymen, exempt from complete control (but not completely exempt from control) of the ecclesiastical authority under whose jurisdiction they lived. This, I believe, should not be interpreted solely as anti-clericalism. It was a stab at freedom in the way in which they wished to worship and to administer their parish on a day-to-day basis. It was also an example of decentralization.

At this point it is well to outline the details of the trusteeism controversy. Western New York at the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century was an American outpost as well as a connection with the west. The Erie Canal, both in its construction and its sequelae, brought growth to the area and transformed Buffalo from a frontier-type town to an emerging metropolitan area. The Irish canal worker and the German businessman who followed began to bring about growth of a Roman Catholic presence in the area. Missionaries on their way west stopped to care for the spiritual needs of the residents, who hoped at some point in the not-too-distant future to have a clergyman of their own to care for their spiritual cravings. In order to accelerate the process of acquiring a resident spiritual leader for the Catholic population, a wealthy, landed French emigre, Louis LeCouteulx, donated to the bishop of New York, John Dubois, some of his property for use as a Catholic church and cemetery. This gift to commemorate the New Year in 1829 was rewarded with the assignment of a resident pastor to the area, a German named Nicholas Mertz.[5] Within two years, however, the German members of the congregation had begun to act as dissidents. They met with Bishop Dubois in 1931 and complained the Mertz was refusing to allow them to handle the financial matters of the parish. Here it should be noted that while trusteeism was experienced in many dioceses in the United States in the early-nineteenth century, Buffalo was unique in this sense: the clergy never worked in league with the trustees. Whereas in New York, Philadelphia and other sites of similar turmoil, sympathetic priests were found to support the trustees in their arguments with the bishop, in Buffalo the trustees were on their own. The clergy remained aligned with the bishop and served as intermediaries, as

the occasion warranted, to interpret ecclesiastical law and its application.

When the Buffalo parish – originally a chapel called Lamb of God because of the ornamentation on the front of a tabernacle brought by Mertz from Europe – constructed a more notable place of worship, it was renamed to honour the patron of its patron: St. Louis, king of France.[6] It was, nonetheless, a German parish by reason of the preponderance of communicants who were of German origin. So much was this the case that the Irish members of the congregation, who were outnumbered and thus outvoted in parochial matters, removed themselves from St. Louis by 1837 and petitioned Bishop Dubois to send another priest to minister to their needs as well.

In 1838 the trustees of St. Louis parish incorporated themselves under the property laws of New York State as established in 1784. This gave the trustees a controlling interest in running the parish because it was in their names that the parish land and structures were primarily held. This produced a negative reaction from the administering bishop of the diocese of New York, John Hughes, who was assisting an ailing John Dubois. When cajoling and threats produced no positive results, Hughes called a diocesan synod in 1841 to deal with the problems of church property ownership which were posed by St. Louis and a few other parishes in the vast diocese under his jurisdiction. Six anti-trustee canons emerged from the synod, basically establishing, as was the Roman custom, that the pastor, as the appointed representative of the bishop, was to be acknowledged as the ultimate authority in matters which dealt with the temporal as well as spiritual well-being of the parish.[7]

John Hughes pursued the implementation of his synodal decrees with a pastoral letter to St. Louis parish in 1843. He challenged the trustees to abandon the exaggerated notion of their own importance and rights and to submit to the synodal legislation. The trustees replied that, with regret, they would not be able to comply with his request.[8] (Hughes was no doubt surprised that his order was interpreted as a request.) By this time the trustees, although predominantly German, had as their chief spokesman William B. LeCouteulx, son of Louis, the benefactor of the church property. The trustees' regret was no doubt accentuated by Hughes' reply. On 4 April 1843, the Bishop withdrew the pastor and placed the parish under interdict – no ecclesiastical services were sanctioned to be performed there.[9] Only when the trustees, at least outwardly, agreed to submit to the authority of the bishop did Hughes lift the interdict (10 August

1844), but even then they proved recalcitrant. The German translation describing the events which brought about the lifting of the interdict, authored by the trustees, announced a capitulation on the part of Bishop Hughes.[10]

When the Diocese of Buffalo was created on 23 April 1847 with John Timon designated as its first bishop, the trustee issue at St. Louis was far from over. Upon Timon's arrival in Buffalo and because of initial good relations with the trustees, the new Bishop set up residence in the rectory of St. Louis parish. By late December of that same year, relations were deemed sufficiently cordial that, at the request of the trustees, Timon agreed to consecrate St. Louis church. However, the good relations were evidently only on the surface, for two days after he performed the ceremony of consecration, Timon was invited by the trustees to find another residence![11]

The continuing struggle between Bishop Timon and the trustees became even more acrimonious shortly thereafter. The trustees wished to construct an addition to the church. Timon refused permission but while he was on a fundraising visit to Europe in early 1849 the walls for the addition were erected much to the surprise and chagrin of the bishop upon his return. After a verbal agreement was achieved, which created temporarily peaceful conditions, the trustees rendered an account of the events, in German, and to their own benefit, as had been their practice on previous occasions.[12] Finally, in 1851 the Jesuit pastor who had been installed at St. Louis by Timon was driven out by the trustees and Timon, as had John Hughes before him, placed the parish under an interdict.[13] The interdict provided an interesting and revealing comment in the secular press: ". . . it looks a little like taking us back to the ages almost forgotten, when such things occur in a free country, where all religions are equally acknowledged and tolerated."[14]

In 1853 now-archbishop John Hughes lobbied the Senate of the State of New York to grant relief to Catholic parishes by passing an ecclesiastical property law which would provide for clerical ownership of church lands. At the encouragement of the St. Louis trustees, Senator Stephen Babcock spoke against the measure on the floor of the State Senate; the legislature, dominated by the anti-clerical Know-Nothing Party, easily defeated Hughes' proposal.[15] That same year, an intervention from Rome took place. Archbishop Gaetano Bedini, ostensibly on a journey from Rome to the government of Brazil, made a convenient stop at various

America cities at the suggestion of the Roman Secretary of State, Alessandro Cardinal Barnabo, to investigate the trusteeism question which was affecting Buffalo among other dioceses.[16] Although the St. Louis trustees both in a letter and personal interviews attempted to win Bedini to their side, they were unsuccessful.[17] Once it was clear that all ecclesiastical avenues were closed to them (William LeCouteulx had since moved to Paris, and lobbied both from there and directly in Rome as well), the trustees agreed to accept the prescriptions of Canon Law and abide by the decisions of the local bishop. While the trustees still owned the property (a condition which maintained until a resolution was consummated within the past decade) they agreed that the parish would be run with the bishop, and the pastor as his representative, having ultimate authority. Only then would Timon agree to lift his interdict of the parish (27 May 1855)[18] and reconsecrate the church eight years after the original consecration in December 1855.[19]

Thus, concluded an unfortunate but significant chapter in North American church history. As in other situations where trusteeism was a problem, in Buffalo the question was resolved by the fact that ultimately it could be nothing other than an ecclesiastical issue. While the trustees had certain laws of the state on their side, the clergy were armed with the prescriptions of Canon Law. Thus they had what became the ultimate "trump card." When all the discourse and acrimonious dialogue was completed, and despite whatever principles of fairness might have been violated, the bishop could hurl an interdict upon a recalcitrant parish, remove the pastor, and basically deny the parish its basic spiritual sustenance. In Buffalo it was easier to accomplish, for the laymen were alone in their opposition, without clergy support. Beyond the ill feelings and necessity for healing which remained after the struggle was at least outwardly resolved, Buffalo and other dioceses which had experienced trusteeism became exemplars for those opposed to lay involvement in church affairs up to, and including, the time of the Second Vatican Council and its reform of church governance.

Returning now again to an analysis of the events surrounding the trustee controversy and the similarities of attitude which transcended national boundaries, a few conclusions and observations can be drawn: first, trusteeism, while not peculiar to the Western New York area of the United States, possessed a unique character, including the most noteworthy – trusteeism in Buffalo was unable to gain the support of *any* clergy. Anti-

clerical in its inception, trusteeism was a lay activity.

Second, it was on the surface a division caused by the question of land ownership. However, its roots went much deeper. The trustees realized that control was hard to come by in the Roman Church, whether in the States or in Europe. They found, however, that the laws of the United States, unlike those encountered by the European Church, did not automatically favour the cause of the clergy. Thus they were able to incorporate and maintain control of church property against the will of the bishop or the pastor.

A third point is indicative of the cross-border interests which I believe assisted in creating the "problem," of lay involvement in church affairs. Buffalo was an outpost in the mid-nineteenth century. While notable as a gateway to the west and growing as a port for the Great Lakes, it was far removed from New York and even farther (both in miles and in attitude) from Europe, Rome in particular. Canada, similarly, was far from England and southern Ontario as we know it today was removed from a good deal of the mainstream of the day-to-day functions of government. This allowed the residents of Lower Canada and the residents of western New York to begin to think, and to act, independently of those who considered themselves in control of these areas. Canadians, especially those who worked the land and built the economy, wished for a greater voice in governmental affairs. Catholics in western New York wished to govern a church which they had constructed and maintained when clergy were rarely to be found in the vicinity. In Buffalo, it was an emerging new ecclesiology: a self realization of its potential when examined in relation to the world around it on the part of the church. Resolved by ecclesiastical law, trusteeism along with the questions and issues it raised remained in the minds of the people.

Attitudes die hard despite Canon Law or Parliamentary opposition. The seeds of democracy which led American Catholics to adopt trusteeism encouraged Canadian citizens to opt for responsible government. In both cases the mid-nineteenth century was a watershed. What had begun would not easily cease. We see its results even today, but that is another story.

One bit of information is lacking and probably lost forever. The diary left behind by Timon is written with virtually no reference to the neighbours to the north.[20] Timon was consumed with the affairs of his far-flung diocese and travelled extensively and regularly within it. It encompassed an expanse of territory which today is administered as two

dioceses, Buffalo and Rochester. Timon also spent a good deal of time in Europe where he solicited donations from various missionary benevolent societies which were known for their generosity toward American bishops. We cannot conclude, however, that Timon had no direct interest in Canadian affairs. He had, in fact, a number of Canadian connections. In October of 1850, possibly to allow him jurisdiction should the bishop of Buffalo sojourn in Canada, John Timon was designated a vicar general of the Archdiocese of Quebec by the ordinary Peter Flavian Turgeon.[21] In April of 1867, Timon's last hours were spent in the company of two Canadian prelates: fellow-Vincentian John Joseph Lynch, then Archbishop of Toronto, and John Farrell, Bishop of Hamilton, who attended to the Bishop of Buffalo on his death bed. Especially in Lynch we might assume some mutual interest in affairs political and ecclesiastical since Lynch was a member of Timon's religious congregation. Lynch had been present in the Buffalo diocese at the foundation of what is now Niagara University. Timon wrote extensively to his fellow bishops in America. We can reasonably assume that he followed the same practice with his confrere across Lake Ontario.

The deathbed scene may provide us with some imagery for future study. The Archbishop of Toronto, the Bishop of Hamilton and the Bishop of Buffalo shared more than episcopal consecration. Friendship and mutual concerns no doubt brought them together on other, more pleasant circumstances. It is reasonable to assume that on such occasions Canadian and American Bishops discussed what was crucial to their ministry: how would a church of European origin identify itself within a society of frontier democracy and how could the people whom that church served express their new-found freedom at both the ecclesiastical and governmental level?

Endnotes

1. Timon was a member of the Congregation of the Mission or Vincentian Fathers. Previous to his appointment as Bishop of Buffalo, he had served with fellow Vincentians in the Texas mission.

2. The Diocese of New York was created in 1808 as a suffragan to the primatial See of Baltimore. At the time, it encompassed the entire State of New York. In 1850, after the creation of the Dioceses of Albany and Buffalo in 1847, New York was designated an archdiocese. Its bishop, John Hughes, thus

became an archbishop.

3. In the interest of brevity, I have confined my references to Canadian history to a single work: R. Douglas Francis, Richard Jones, and Donald B. Smith *Origins: Canadian History to Confederation*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1992).

4. Francis, Jones, and Smith, *Origins: Canadian History to Confederation*, 239.

5. John Timon, *Missions in Western New York and Church History of the Diocese of Buffalo* (Buffalo: Catholic Sentinel Print, 1862), 207-212.

6. Thomas Donohue, *History of the Diocese of Buffalo* (Buffalo: The Buffalo Catholic Publishing Company, 1929), 48.

7. John R.G. Hassard, *Life of the Most Reverend John Hughes, D.D., First Archbishop of New York* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1866), 257.

8. Hassard, *Life of the Most Reverend John Hughes*, 261.

9. Timon, *Missions in Western New York*, 229.

10. Timon, *Missions in Western New York*, 229.

11. Timon, *Missions in Western New York*, 239.

12. Charles G. Deuther, *The Life and Times of the Rt. Rev. John Timon, D.D.* (Buffalo: by the author, 1870), 126.

13. "Documents and History of the Affairs of St. Louis Church," *Miscellanea in Catholica America*, IV, 4 (Special Collection, Catholic University of America, Washington, DC).

14. *Buffalo Morning Express*, 21 June 1851.

15. Bishop Timon sent a text of the Senate activities and speeches, along with personal commentary, to Rome in September 1853 (Timon to Propaganda, Buffalo, 22 September 1853, Archives De Propaganda Fide (hereafter APF), Scritture, vol. XVI, ff. 678rv-741rv.

16. The Bedini visit to the United States is well-covered in James F. Connelly, *The Visit of Archbishop Gaetano Bedini to the United States of America* (Rome: Typis Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae, 1960).

17. APF, Scritture, vol. XVI, ff. 742r-748v.

18. Deuther, *The Life and Times of the Rt. Rev. John Timon, D.D.*, 211.

19. Bishop Timon's Diary, 27 December 1855, Archives of the Diocese of Buffalo (hereafter ADB).

20. Bishop Timon's Diary, ADB.

21. Turgeon to Timon, 8 October 1850, ADB.

God in the Centennial: Religion and the State in the Canadian Interfaith Conference, 1965-1967

GARY MIEDEMA

"The experience of 100 years as a modern political state *Canada*, is as a milestone on our national journey," spoke Peter Aykroyd to the assembled delegates. "Our passage up to and *past* that milestone is inexorable. We *must* prepare for the day when we will reach it. It cannot be moved. We cannot turn aside. It will not go away." The group to which he spoke, he argued, was "in a position of influence . . . of power and of responsibility, of a kind not represented by any other Centennial group . . . and potentially exercisable to a degree not possible by secular oriented organizations."[1]

So argued Aykroyd, Director of Public Relations for the Canadian Centennial Commission (CCC), to a unique audience indeed. From the podium, he looked out into the faces of representatives of 28 different faith groups in Canada, gathered on that day to discuss, plan and listen. Catholic bishops and Pentecostal laymen, Jewish rabbis and Muslim officials, followers of Ba'ha'u'lah and followers of Buddha all sat quietly, side by side, gathered as members of one organization: the Canadian Interfaith Conference (CIC).

Begun in 1965, the CIC was established to plan for and encourage participation in Canada's 1967 Centennial celebrations, without doubt the largest, most comprehensive, nationalist project in Canadian history. From a total of 24 different faith groups at its first meeting in July of 1965 the membership of the CIC grew to 28 by April 1966, and to 34 by its third and final meeting in 1967. In that span of less than two and one-half years, the participating representatives would organize and complete a number

of nation-wide projects, including the writing of a religious declaration, a bilingual anthology of prayer, and an anthem and hymn. They would also send a conference publicity kit, including all of the above and more, to 19,000 ministers of every known organized religion in Canada.

In this essay I would like to take a specific angle on the CIC. Peter Aykroyd's words, quoted above, and the title of office which he then carried, suggest the importance of a major theme in the history of the Conference. Aykroyd, as the Director of Public Relations for the CCC, represented the government of Canada to the CIC on that April day in 1966. John Fisher, Chairman of the CCC, also gave glowing opening remarks. More importantly, the funding for that gathering, for the others which came before and after it, for the administrators who ran it, and for the publications created by it – all monies required over the course of the life of the conference were paid for, not by the member faiths but by the government of Canada. A study of the CIC, therefore, has something to say about the relationship between religion and the state in the years leading immediately up to, and including the centennial year in Canada, 1967.

At the roots of the CIC were the interests of the Canadian government. Called together by the initiative of the federal government of Canada in 1965 and completely funded by the government for its two and one-half year existence, the CIC was organized to help coordinate and plan a national celebration of the 100th anniversary of Canada. The founding principle of the religious conference was, put simply, the desire for participation in a massive state project for Canadian national unity.

These statements can easily be supported through the contextualization of the CIC, and of its parent body, the CCC. Brought to life through an act of legislation in 1963, the CCC was the main governmental body working to plan the centennial celebrations in Canada. Unfortunately for its officials, it was born into uncertain times for Canadian society, and therefore, for the Canadian state. In J.L. Granatstein's words, the decade between 1957 and 1967 saw Canada "changing rapidly from an entity that had seemed to understand the verities of life to one that was uneasily adrift on a sea of conflicting choices and too rapid change."[2] Politically, this confusion was reflected in the poor health of Confederation, then in its tenth decade. Regionalism had appeared once again in the federal election of 1963, an election which awarded Lester B. Pearson's Liberals the first elected minority federal government since 1921, and which saw the Liberals nearly shut out of the west, and the Conservatives soundly de-

feated in Quebec. Indeed, Quebec itself, home to the increasingly vociferous proponents of the Quiet Revolution, was becoming a major focus of national unrest. As the decade progressed, some Quebeckers became more determined in their quest for self-determination, as expressed by the Union Nationale's "Egalite ou Independence" platform in the election of 1966.[3] If regionalism was dividing the country politically, then separatism, by the Centennial year, was actually threatening to destroy it.

That the federal government of Canada was concerned about national unity was made obvious by its actions. In 1963, the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism was formed. In 1965, a new national flag replaced the old British ensign. And in 1967, Canada received a new official national anthem. In that same year, it is little wonder that the federal government looked also to a national celebration of the centennial of Confederation to strengthen love and devotion towards Canada.

The CCC, in this context, can be seen as one of several attempts to attain the elusive cultural and social unity of the "Canadian nation." According to the Canadian Secretary of State in 1964, Maurice Lamontagne, the centennial was one part of "the overall plan of the government to foster unity in this country."[4] This objective was boldly voiced throughout the CCC's existence. The Chairman of the CCC, John Fisher, for example, argued in May of 1965 that "the centennial year is our never-to-be-seen-again chance to achieve unity in diversity . . . This has been the philosophy underlying centennial preparations from the very beginning."[5] And Professor Cornelius J. Jaenen, in a paper presented to the National Conference on the Centennial of Confederation in Toronto in November 1964, made perhaps the boldest declaration on this point. "The impact of the centennial," he contended,

> ought to be a meaningful, constructively oriented NATIONALISM . . . which gives to a people a sense of organic unity, and separates it from the rest of mankind. We must employ all means of propaganda available in a mass media society in order to stir up latent national feeling, in order to direct into productive channels the emotional response aroused.[6]

If the CCC's goal was the somewhat ethereal one of fostering national unity through a reinvigorated nationalism, it had practical ways of achieving it. The Act of Parliament which had created the CCC stated that

it was to "promote interest in, and to plan and implement programmes and projects relating to, the Centennial of Confederation in Canada in order that the centennial may be observed throughout Canada in a manner in keeping with its national and historical significance."[7] One way to accomplish this, the minutes of the Board of Governors stated, was to "engage the services of organizations or agencies already established in specific fields to . . . conduct programs under grant or subsidy, on behalf of the Commission."[8]

Enter the organized religions of Canada. If the Canadian government, through the CCC, was looking to enlist established organizations in its quest for national unity, the national religions were excellent candidates. The mainline Christian denominations had a congregation in nearly every community in Canada. That institutional capability, combined with their moral force, clearly convinced CCC officials that organized religions in Canada were desirable junior partners. Aykroyd's words about the "power and responsibility" of the churches certainly reflect this. So do the words which John Fisher spoke to the CIC's first meeting in 1965. "[C]ertainly there is no sounder approach to the 20 millions living in this vast land than through their places of worship," he stated. "The enthusiasm you see created in building a new house of worship, paying off a mortgage, building a school or helping the less fortunate is the same excitement that can make centennial year one to be remembered by Canadians forever."[9] The religions of Canada, Fisher and Aykroyd realized, had the organizational means, moral influence, and determination to aid the government in its centennial project.

It is a testimony to the patriotism and initiative of some faith groups in Canada that they were noticed by the CCC only after they had begun to plan their own celebrations. In October of 1964, Robbins Elliot, the Director of the Planning Branch of the CCC, wrote a memorandum on "Church Centennial Participation in 1967."[10] Apparently, a number of newspaper articles dealing with church plans for centennial activities, as well as "a few isolated inquiries to the Commission," had made him aware of involvement in the centennial "on the part of some individual church organizations." This prompted him to try to bring these religious groups under the umbrella of the government body. "Because the Commission should either be cognizant of activities planned for 1967 by large organizations or should be fostering activities where none exist," he wrote, "it is considered that some form of liaison with the churches should be established as soon

as possible." Besides, the resources of organized religions made them very attractive partners. Elliot continued, "It is distinctly to our advantage to endeavour to enlist the support of organizations so well prepared in every way to do a fine effort on any undertaking they can be persuaded to accept."[11]

Elliot's message of the potential of church involvement for the planning of the centennial was positively received. A month later, a panel discussion on the topic took place, and the panelists, too, were clearly enamoured with the idea of church participation, suggesting that "the time was right to bring together the religious leaders of Canada and to get them involved in a common task. To this effect," they wrote, "the Commission is *strongly* urged to organize a meeting . . . to bring together religious leaders in order that, together, they can decide for themselves what they should do and can do best for 1967. The Commission should simply act as a catalyst."[12]

To make a longer story short, it was decided that "a conference should be called by the Commission to which the churches would be invited to send one or two official delegates."[13] That conference, entitled the Canadian Interfaith Conference, was convened in Ottawa on 5 July 1965. It was completely funded by the CCC. During that first gathering of representatives from 24 different faith groups in Canada, each personally invited by the Chairman of the CCC, committees were formed to brainstorm about possible plans for religious centennial events, and to report back to the entire conference at the end of the weekend. Ideas for Interfaith Library shelves, for Interfaith religious services, for a "Religious Declaration" by the member faiths, a Centennial Anthem and Centennial Hymn, and, most ambitiously, a Centennial Anthology of Prayer were bandied about and developed over the period of two days.

In the months following the first CIC, the CCC and the Steering Committee worked closely together to implement the initial decisions and plans made over the two days of discussions. The CCC's role as a "catalyst" for the CIC, apart from requiring its financial support, also resulted in the use of CCC personnel and office space to handle the administrative tasks for the CIC. The CCC became a crucial factor in the every day existence of the CIC by preparing agendas for meetings, writing and sending correspondence to participating religious groups, and handling publicity through its own personnel and press releases.

Indeed, the influence of the CCC in the early days of the CIC went

even beyond this close involvement. When the Steering Committee chose to set up a Board of Directors and, within that body, an Executive for the CIC alone, it significantly appointed Andre LeBlanc, the Director of the Historical Division of the CCC, to an Executive position. Along with Lavy Becker, a representative of the Canadian Jewish Congress and future Chairman of the CIC, LeBlanc was given full powers to appoint a further three persons to the Executive.[14]

The beginnings of the CIC, then, reveal heavy involvement with the CCC. They also reveal hints that some were not entirely comfortable with this situation. Although this discomfort was likely felt for a number of reasons, several interesting episodes in the life of the CIC, when linked together, suggest one reason of particular interest. If the institutional and moral resources of the religions of Canada made them excellent candidates for partnership with the state in the centennial celebrations, their existence as religious institutions may have created tensions in a number of places. A close look at the rhetoric and agreements surrounding the CIC's relations with the CCC suggests that the direct involvement of the state in religious affairs was perceived by some to be a sensitive issue.

Such sensitivity was already revealed in the language of the Church Panel's original recommendation for the formation of the CIC quoted above. The caveats in the Panel's report that the religious leaders "should decide for themselves" what they would do for the centennial and that "The Commission should simply act as a catalyst" indicate some consternation on behalf of the writers. If nothing else, they significantly suggest that this was to be a carefully articulated relationship between state initiative and church involvement.

A sensitivity to the close involvement of the state in religion was also revealed in the creation of the financial and administrative structure of the CIC. The minutes of Executive Committee of the Interfaith Conference on 22 July 1965 already betrayed, at that point, a CCC that was concerned about maintaining some distance from the religions of Canada. In discus-sing the formation of a Secretariat to handle the administrative duties of the CIC, for example, LeBlanc, representing the CCC, suggested that it would provide a grant of over $20,000 a year to cover the expense. But he also made it clear that "funds for actual projects would be another matter, and presumably would be raised by participating religious groups."[15] A look at the balance sheet of the CCC suggests its financial situation was likely not the issue here.[16] Instead it seems that,

though the CCC was prepared to fund the administrative portion of the religious CIC, it was not as comfortable paying for actual projects of a religious nature.

The CCC's perception of itself as a "catalyst" was also strongly voiced in that meeting. Lest any of the members of the Executive had begun to consider their close relations with the CCC permanent, LeBlanc served notice that "the Commission foresaw itself gradually withdrawing from the picture, leaving the Inter-faith Conference and its executive on its own, with the Commission maintaining a liaison."[17] On this point, the CCC kept its word. Though the CCC served as headquarters for the CIC, hosting its Executive meetings in its building and handling all correspondence and administrative tasks which it required, it only did so until December of 1965, when the CIC established its own secretariat. And Andre LeBlanc's position on the Executive of the CIC, perhaps the most obvious representation of the CCC's involvement, was quite suddenly terminated in May 1966. The members of the CIC were indeed to "decide for themselves" what to do for the centennial.

Again, such withdrawals from direct involvement in the affairs of the CIC may have been due to any number of reasons. A closer look at the rhetoric and correspondence surrounding the CIC's move from the CCC's headquarters and the resignation of LeBlanc suggests, though, that among others, perceived tensions due to state involvement in religious affairs were a likely factor. When the Secretariat was finally formed in December 1966, and a $60,000 grant was negotiated with the CIC, the formal contract signifying this formation and grant reflected some uneasiness on the part of the CCC in being too closely tied to the religious CIC. It included as a stipulation for the approval of the grant that the Secretariat would "be located outside Centennial Commission Headquarters."[18] This qualification was also contained in a memo from Robbins Elliot to the Board of Directors of the CCC. His wording suggests that, though space in the CCC offices may have been limited, space was not the only issue. The *appearance* of distance between the two bodies was just as much a factor. The Secretariat should be located outside the CCC's headquarters, Elliot wrote in an key phrase, because it should "be independent of the Centennial Commission."[19]

The resignation of LeBlanc also implies this motivation. A letter from Lavy Becker to LeBlanc, written three days after LeBlanc's letter of resignation, makes clear Becker's surprise and dismay concerning

LeBlanc's apparently unexpected decision. But as we have already seen, the CCC had long planned for this change to take place. After listing "the pressure of work" as his first excuse, LeBlanc went on to explain that his resignation was necessary due to "the fact that it is preferable that the Centennial Commission be represented by an observer rather than a member of the board."[20]

Some members of the CCC, then, appear to have considered its involvement in the CIC a sensitive issue. But though this concern seems to have led to a lessening of direct and formal links between the two bodies, it did not lead to a complete cutting of less formal ties. Throughout the life of the CIC, the organization of Canadian religions relied completely on the Public Relations Department of the CCC for all of its publicity needs. And though the original plan of the CCC was to give just over $60,000 to the CIC to cover only administrative costs, by the end of the CIC's existence it had granted a total of close to double that amount to cover all costs of the organization, including all publications, conferences, and promotional materials. The Canadian government completely funded, for example, the creation and publication of a *Centennial Anthology of Prayer*. The member faiths, it turned out, did not contribute any funds over the entire two and one-half years of the CIC's operations.

In the light of the close involvement between religious groups and the state and the apparent tension it caused, it is telling to note how the officials of the CIC viewed those close links. Their comments paint a rather different, enthusiastic picture of their cooperation with the state. In their opinion, the Executive bodies of both organizations, even after LeBlanc's resignation, remained in close contact, both asking and seeking advice of the other on a regular basis. The minutes of a Board of Directors meeting of the CIC in September 1966, stated that "the CIC has mushroomed into one of the most active planning branches of the Centennial Commission and has become an info centre and clearing house for Provincial and National bodies."[21] Eve Gilstorf, the Executive Director of the CIC, wrote in a summary of the CIC's activities, that "In all our efforts, we kept our parent body, the Centennial Commission, constantly informed, for it was our bridge to the government departments concerned . . . We were . . . the resource office both for the Centennial Commission and various other government agencies."[22] This close relationship with the CCC is what prompted Becker, Chairman of the Board, to write to Fisher in 1966, "How warmly you [have] encouraged us at every moment."[23]

In brief, the officials of the CIC did not see anything to cause tension in their close involvement with the CCC. They openly recognized that involvement – at times even trumpeting it. And in the midst of that trumpeting, the vast majority of Canadian citizens apparently did not take issue either, let alone a great deal of interest. During its existence, the CIC met with very little public criticism,[24] and though the CCC appointed a person to write and release articles on the CIC to the press, officials of the CIC were continually disappointed by the poor level of press coverage their organization received.[25]

Such a high level of government involvement in Canadian religious affairs, when matched with this lack of controversy, is suggestive. Most officials of Canadian faith groups, at least, were apparently not concerned about the separateness of religion and governmental institutions. Such a conclusion is not without support. John Webster Grant has argued, correctly it seems, that "the term 'separation of Church and State' has never aptly described the Canadian situation." The Canadian churches, in his view, had long considered themselves "closely integrated into the national life," the moral conscience of the nation.[26] Recently, Michael Gauvreau and Nancy Christie have added weight to this argument, showing how in the inter-war period, Christianity was intricately and significantly involved in Canadian public and political life.[27] In this context, the CIC appears not as a controversial aberration for members of at least the larger Christian denominations of Canada, but as a kind of fulfillment of long-held dreams. Many Canadian citizens calling themselves Christian in the 1960s may have simply assumed that religion had a natural place in political and public life.[28] Those of non-Christian faiths, judging from their involvement in the CIC, apparently felt the same way.[29]

To suggest, however, that no conflict took place whatsoever in the short history of the CIC would be to misrepresent the facts. As the CIC began to push harder to reach every house of worship in Canada in its preparations for the centennial year, it became clear that some Canadians, though a minority, felt uneasy with it. Even these episodes of conflict, though, serve more to support the apparent contentment of Canadians with the mixing of religion and the state than to refute it.

One such episode of discord involved a member of the Atlantic Baptist Convention, the Reverend Lloyd Leadbeater. Much to Eve Gilstorf's dismay, Leadbeater kept returning, unopened, the CIC's mail. To get to the bottom of the problem, Gilstorf sent a letter to the Baptist

Federation of Canada, the national body of which the Atlantic Baptist Convention was a member, asking for an explanation. Although brief, the General Secretary of the Federation's response spoke volumes. "We have a native reluctance for involvement in anything which savours of a state church or movement towards structural unity,"[30] he explained.

At first glance, this small declaration of resistance on the part of Leadbeater seems to argue that the separation of religion and the state was, indeed, being compromised in the CIC in the minds of some. A second glance, however, qualifies this. Leadbeater refused to participate personally in the CIC, but the General Secretary's letter suggests that a distrust of ecumenism may have been as much the cause as the joining of church and state.[31] Indeed, the vast majority of Convention Baptists, even though they presumably shared the common "native reluctance" to the mixing of church and state in the Baptist tradition, remained involved in the CIC throughout its existence. The Baptist Federation of Canada, an organization which represented nationally the Baptist Conventions across Canada, was a proud participant in the CIC. Leadbeater, at least as far as the records of the CIC go, was very much on his own.

Leadbeater's resistance was minor in its impact compared to that expressed by many of the clergy and press in Quebec. In a political and cultural environment which was both rapidly secularizing and highly sensitized to any influence of the federal government, it is telling that many Quebec clergy were apparently leery of weakening their already strained positions by supporting the CIC. Its foundations, they felt, were more political than religious. In Quebec, two authors have suggested, the CIC was seen "as an unjustified utilization of ecumenism for political aims."[32]

This understanding of the CIC predictably led to poor showings of support for its efforts in Quebec. In an angry letter to the Public Relations director of the CCC, Eve Gilstorf wrote that a recently held Interfaith Conference in Montreal "was doomed from the start." "The whole conference down there reeked of separatism," she wrote tersely, "and there is no other way of saying it."[33] Clearly, the CIC represented to many clergymen in Quebec, not an opportunity for ecumenism, but another government program to inspire a Canadian nationalism which they had no interest in feeling. Gilstorf wrote to Becker,

> Even people who have been welcome in Quebec in the past no longer enjoy this relationship, regardless of how fluent their French is, if they

> do not consent with the thinking that Confederation is not a happy occasion and Quebeckers have no reason to feel grateful to those who shaped our country . . . Many great men in Quebec have fallen at the hands of the separatists. Some of the most prominent religious leaders have also suffered and the hate propaganda is building all the time.[34]

The lack of support by Quebeckers for the CIC suggests again that the direct involvement of the federal government in the affairs of the CIC was no secret.[35] The Quebec episode also shows, however, that Quebeckers were essentially more concerned about the intrusion of the federal government into their province than about the right of the state to be involved in religious affairs. They were not concerned about *a* government being involved in religion. If, for example, the CIC had been the result of cooperation between the provincial government of Quebec and religion for the betterment of that province, one can imagine that the Quebec clergy's response would have been different. In essence, the CIC was too closely linked to the *federal* government to be accepted in the volatile environment of a modernizing Quebec. Quebec's challenge to the hegemony of the federal state in Canada evidently translated into a challenge to the CIC as a part of that hegemony. Because of their heightened sensitivity to intrusions of the federal government, Quebeckers perceived the CIC as just one more government body attempting to persuade them to put aside their concerns and to just be good Canadians.

Even these two episodes of conflict, then, can be interpreted as evidence for the lack of importance that was placed on maintaining distance between religion and government by Canadians in the early to mid-1960s. A cautious perspective on relations between religion and the state was apparently one of a small and discreet minority. An examination of the termination of the CIC confirms this conclusion.

Since the CCC was the sole provider of the CIC's funding, it held the fate of the CIC completely within its own hands. As the year 1967 was drawing to a close and the work for the centennial neared completion, it became ever more apparent to the Board of Directors of the CIC that government funding would be removed, and its existence ended.

That was an eventuality that, not surprisingly, they fought. Already in the spring of 1966, voices were raised to suggest a continued existence of the CIC beyond the centennial year.[36] Rationale for this hope varied. Though national unity was a clear concern of the CIC, the ecumenical

movement was, for many of its participants, an equally important motivating factor in their involvement that led them to look beyond the centennial year. Towards the end of 1966, the CIC was also finding opportunities for involvement in other distinctly non-centennial events, prompting Lavy Becker in February 1967 to suggest that "there is definitely a need for the existence of the Interfaith Conference beyond centennial year, judging from various requests from different Ministries, especially the Secretary of State and External Affairs, who have used our address for guidance."[37]

If the CIC was enthusiastic about the continuing role it could play in the religious and public life of Canada, the CCC was considerably less interested, remaining focused on the centennial. Hence, when the CIC requested continued financial support beyond the centennial year, it was bluntly turned down. At its meeting on 13 March 1967, the Executive Committee of the CCC instructed the CIC to terminate its existence by 1 December 1967. A push by the CIC for its continued survival resulted in a reappraisal of the issue the following August, but the outcome did not change. The minutes of an Executive Committee meeting of the CCC recorded its decision:

> It is suggested that while it was justifiable for the government on the occasion of the Centennial of Confederation to be directly involved in Church Activities, no such justification will exist after 1967 . . . It is recommended that no action be taken to perpetuate the Canadian Interfaith Conference.[38]

The Executive of the CIC took the final news quietly, but were deeply disappointed that an institution in which they had seen so much potential would not continue. For a short time, they had been enamoured with the possibilities which state funding and official status had offered them. For the larger Christian denominations who had always been interested in being the moral gaurdians of the nation, the CIC had been a welcome addition to their long history of church/state relations. Because of its interfaith character, it had also been a near perfect match for its time, reflecting not only the growing concern for ecumenism in religious circles, but also the growing emphasis on pluralism in Canada in the 1960s. As long as each participating faith group had been willing to accept and listen to the others, the CIC existed in peace.[39] Under such conditions most

religious groups in Canada were more than happy to take their place in the national sun. And most Canadians, being members of one these faith groups, had been happy to follow along.

But from the very beginning of the CIC, that time in the sun had had strict limitations. The decision of the CCC Executive, while again suggesting discomfort with the close relations between religion and state in the CIC, finally made those limits clear. It openly acknowledged that through the CCC the government was "directly involved in Church Activities," implied that this was abnormal, and that it therefore required a "justification" which only existed during the centennial year.

That involvement, on the one hand, is a testimony to the perceived power and stature of religion in Canada in the 1960s. Religion was important enough to the people of Canada that it was very naturally included, even in a relatively new pluralistic form, in the public celebrations of the centennial. Ignoring it would have been unthinkable. On the other hand, the direct involvement of government in the CIC is a testimony to the power of nationalism and the perceived contribution it could make to a fragile and apparently disintegrating Canadian nation. That, of course, was the CCC's driving force. For a short time, the CCC implied in its reasoning for the cessation of funding, the totalizing, even, in Aykroyd's words, inexorable nature of the nationalist drive for Canadian unity had overridden all other concerns. The "direct involvement in Church Activities" was justifiable, if only for a few years, to ensure that the ultimate goal of national unity was achieved.

For government officials, those who seemed most sensitive to this unusually direct union between religion and state, it was not unlike the situation of a country at war. So, at least, would their rhetoric suggest. The drive for national unity through the centennial celebrations was, for them, like a drive for national survival in the midst of armed conflict. Broadly speaking, the threat compelling the two drives was similar: national dissolution, apparent chaos, the loss of something dearly loved. The cure was too: the threat of national dissolution, whether coming from within or without, required an all-encompassing nationalism that would mask all differences and allow a strong, unified struggle for survival. In this context, Peter Aykroyd's speech to the second CIC seems almost alarming. The centennial, he argued, would "seize our country." It was an event which was "bigger than any one platform, dogma or custom," and which would bring "forgiveness of each others peculiarities, God given differ-

ences of opinion, attitude and view."[40] In John Fisher's words, the centennial was a "never-to-be-seen-again chance to achieve unity in diversity." To Professor Jaenen, it called for the employment of "all means of propaganda available in a mass media society in order to stir up latent national feeling." With the stakes so high, all the stops had to be pulled.

Fortunately for them, the gamble paid off. "Suddenly," wrote Granatstein about the centennial year, "Canada was fun."[41] The country was overwhelmed by what another author has dubbed the "Whoopee-we're-a-hundred-years-old-spirit."[42] In the midst of that fun and national euphoria created by the nationalist celebrations many must have wondered: who but the cold of heart would criticize the state's attempt, through religion, to foster joy and unity in a struggling land?

Endnotes

1. Address to the Canadian Interfaith Conference, 27 April 1966, file 6, MG 28 I 76 vol. 4, National Archives of Canada (hereafter NAC).

2. J.L. Granatstein, *Canada 1957-1967: Years of Uncertainty and Innovation* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1986), xiii. Though it is selective in its coverage, Granatstein's account conveys a good feel for the period, and contains a very good presentation of its political malaise. See also Robert Bothwell, Ian Drummond and John English, *Canada Since 1945: Power, Politics, and Provincialism* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1981).

3. R. Douglas Francis, Richard Jones and Donald Smith, *Destinies: Canadian History Since Confederation* (Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Limited, 1988), 364. Daniel Johnson, the leader of the Union Nationale when it took power in 1966, published a pamphlet before the election entitled, "Egalite ou independance." In it, "he warned that if French Canada could not achieve equality within Canada, there would be no choice but to seek independence."

4. "Proceedings of the Fourth Meeting of the National Conference: Toronto, 25-26 November 1964," file 5, RG 69 vol. 386, NAC. These are actually the words used by John Fisher, Chairman of the Centennial Conference, in a synopsis of Lamontagne's speech.

5. "Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the National Conference: Regina, 11-12 May 1965," file 5, RG 69 vol. 386, NAC.

6. "The Impact of the Centennial of Confederation as a Factor in Canadian Unity," file 5, RG 69 vol. 386, NAC.

7. *Centennial of Canadian Confederation Act*, 9-10 Elizabeth II, 1960-61, c.60 as amended by 1963, c.36, sec. 9 (1).

8. "Basic Objectives or Guidelines for the Centennial Commission", approved by the Board of Directors on 27 November 1964, RG 69 vol. 389, NAC.

9. "Report on the Inter-Faith Conference Activities Held in Ottawa on 5 July 1965," file 2, MG 28 I 76 vol. 3, NAC.

10. Robbins Elliot to Management Committee, 14 October 1964, "Memorandum to Management Committee On Church Centennial Participation in 1967," file 2, MG 28 I 76 vol. 11, NAC.

11. Robbins Elliot to Management Committee, 14 October 1964, "Memorandum to Management Committee On Church Centennial Participation in 1967," file 2, MG 28 I 76 vol. 11, NAC.

12. "Minutes of the Third Meeting of the Standing Committee on Historical Activities of the National Conference on the Centennial of Confederation," file 5, RG 69 vol. 386, NAC.

13. "Inter-Faith Steering Committee: Minutes of a meeting on Tuesday, 9 March 1965 at the Chateau Laurier to discuss Church Participation in the Centennial of Confederation," file "Church Participation," MG 28 I 76 vol. 11, NAC.

14. "Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee, 20 October 1965," file 5, MG 28 I 76 vol. 1, NAC.

15. "Memo to Father Mathieu [et al] . . . RE: 22 July 1965 meeting of Executive Committee of Inter-faith Conference . . ," section 4, file 1, MG 28 I 76 vol. 1, NAC.

16. First, Richard Kicksee clearly shows that the CCC was happy to fund events from other distinct groups within Canadian society including native pow-wows ("'Scaled Down to Size': Contested Liberal Commonsense and the Negotiation of 'Indian Participation' in the Canadian Centennial Celebrations and Expo '67, 1963-1967," M.A. thesis, Queen's University, 1995, Appendix A). Second, expressed in 1967 dollars, the total expenditures of the CCC from 1963 to 1968 was close to an astounding $85 million. Within that sum, a total proposed grant to the CIC of $60,000 over three years was negligible. These figures are taken from Peter Aykroyd, *The Anniversary Compulsion* (Toronto: Dundurn Press Limited, 1992), Appendices I-L. Aykroyd presents the sums in 1992 dollars. I have worked them back into 1967 figures, using the inflation rate of 4.2% which he borrowed from Statistics Canada. In 1992 dollars, the CIC recieved some $459,000: that compares with $604,202 spent on "Historical Re-enactments," $489,632 on "Student Involvement," and

$835,724 on "Participation by Indians."

17. "Memo to Father Mathieu [et al] . . . RE: 22 July 1965 meeting of Executive Committee of Inter-faith Conference . . ," section 4, file 1, MG 28 I 76 vol. 1, NAC.

18. "Memorandum of Agreement Entered Into Between The Canadian Inter-Faith Conference and the Centennial Commission," file 1, MG 28 I 76 vol. 1, NAC. This is the official document signed by both parties on 14 December 1965.

19. "Memorandum to the Board of Directors of the Centennial Commission on Interfaith Centennial Activities," 14 October 1964, file 2, MG 28 I 76 vol. 11, NAC.

20. Letter from LeBlanc to Becker, 6 May 1966, file "Centennial Commission, general correspondence," MG 28 I 76 vol. 13, NAC.

21. "Minutes of Meeting of Board of Directors of the Canadian Interfaith Conference, 19 September 1966," file 5, MG 28 I 76 vol. 2, NAC.

"Minutes of Meeting of Board of Directors of the Canadian Interfaith Conference, 23 November 1967," file 6, MG 28 I 76 vol. 2, NAC. These comments are taken from a summary report by Gilstorf within the minutes.

23. Letter from Becker to Fisher, 6 December 1966, file 1, MG 28 I 76 vol. 6, NAC.

24. These conclusions, based on the papers of the CIC and press clippings from across Canada, are tentative. Judging from Gilstorf's sensitivity to both the Leadbeater and Quebec cases, it is highly unlikely that any noteworthy criticism of the CIC would have escaped her attention and, therefore, her very complete records. Some of this lack of interest may have simply been due to the overwhelming level of cultural activity in 1967, including, of course, the dazzling Expo '67 in Montreal. But even in 1965 and 1966 when the cultural pace of the nation was not as rushed, very few criticisms were aimed at the CIC. The only episodes of conflict or disagreement found were those involving Reverend Lloyd Leadbeater, some citizens of Quebec, the Fellowship of Evangelical Baptists of Canada, and the Jehovah's Witnesses. Of these, only the Jehovah's Witnesses and Leadbeater seemed possibly concerned about the relationship between religion and the state.

25. On the amount of interest in the CIC at the local level and amongst the press, Lavy Becker's closing comments at the last meeting of the Board of Directors are revealing. Becker complained that "it was difficult to understand why the only good Editorial was one we planted in the Province of Ontario." As he

understood the movement of interfaith," the whole country would have moved together but the masses didn't respond. The Press can be criticized . . . we missed out on getting this across through the Press" ("Final Board Meeting, Canadian Interfaith Conference – 23 November 1967," file 11, MG 28 I 76 vol. 2, NAC). Again, the cultural activity in 1967 may have provided too much competition for the CIC. Nonetheless, the fact that it was not often deemed newsworthy by a press that, during the 1960s, had been anxious to indulge in political scandal, suggests that the press saw no scandal in it. This point is reinforced even more strongly by the fact that the CIC tried hard for the interest of the press, and were not hiding their relations with the CCC.

26. See John Webster Grant, *The Canadian Experience of Church Union* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1967), 23.

27. For their interpretation see, *A Full-Orbed Christianity: The Protestant Churches and Social Welfare in Canada, 1900-1940* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1996). Christie and Gauvreau do a thoroughly revisionist reading of a significant number of the "who's who" of this period, including Beatrice Brigden, J.S. Woodsworth, William Ivens, and Samuel Chown, to prove, among other things, "the instrumental role of Protestant clergymen in formulating social legislation and transforming the scope and responsibilities of the modern state." On the churches' sense of responsibility for the moral health of the nation in the Presbyterian Church, see Richard Vaudry, *The Free Church in Victorian Canada, 1844-1861* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Univ. Press, 1989); and Brian Fraser, *The Social Uplifters: Presbyterian Progressives and the Social Gospel in Canada, 1875-1915* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier Univ. Press, 1988). For its continued influence in the United Church, see Mary Vipond, "Canadian National Consciousness and the Formation of the United Church of Canada," *Bulletin of the United Church of Canada* 24 (1975). For a more broadly sweeping but equally convincing account, see John Webster Grant, *The Church in the Canadian Era* (Burlington: Welch Publishing Company, Inc., 1988).

28. During the 1950s and 1960s there was still evidence to support this assumption. Judging from Canada's love-affair with hockey, it was not insignificant, for example, that a Catholic priest, Father David Bauer, was coach of the Canadian national team for a number of years. Nor was it strange that the CBC show, "This Hour has Seven Days," did a considerable amount of religious programming, or that a Reverend Georges-Henri Levesgue was a member of the Massey Commission. (These examples are taken from the Prologue of William Kilbourn, ed. *Religion in Canada: The Spiritual Development of a Nation* [Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968].) Finally, it was only in the early 1960s that the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec began to give up its control of education and social services in Quebec. Up to

that point, and perhaps for some time after, the separation of church and state would have made no sense in Quebec. For the Quebec situation, see John A. Dickinson and Brian Young, *A Short History of Quebec*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman, Ltd., 1993). William Kaplan's *State and Salvation: The Jehovah's Witnesses and Their Fight for Civil Rights* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1989) also provides numerous examples of the provincial government of Quebec's cooperation with and protection of the Roman Catholic Church.

29. The only notable exception to this rule that I have discovered was the negative response of the Jehovah's Witnesses to requests for involvement in the CIC in 1965 (see "Inter-Faith Conference Announces Centennial Plans," *The Montreal Star*, 16 December 1965, "Canadian Centennial Interfaith, printed materials," file 767e, box 77, CA, Canadian Jewish Congress Archives, Montreal). The article notes that of 25 faiths invited to the first CIC, the Jehovah's Witnesses was the only group to refuse to attend. Their reasons seem clear. Since the Witnesses have always very publicly separated themselves from nations and nationalisms by refusing to salute the flag and sing national anthems, it is little wonder that they also refused to link themselves directly to the Canadian state through the CIC. For an informative account of the trouble that their lack of national fervour has caused them in Canada (see Kaplan, *State and Salvation*).

30. F. Bullen to Gilstorf, 26 October 1967, file entitled "Baptists," MG 28 I 76 vol. 9, NAC.

31. This was certainly the case for the Fellowship of Evangelical Baptist Churches of Canada. Along with the Jehovah's Witnesses, they were one of the few organizations to reject involvement in the CIC, although they had originally been supportive. They withdrew their membership in December 1966, not because of the church/state issue, but because of their rejection of the ecumenical movement which, on the basis of statements condoning ecumenism by CCC officials, they felt the CIC was forwarding: "For the Centennial Committee to claim that religious aspects of the centennial represent a 'coming together' of the different faiths is not only misleading but untrue to the facts," they argued in their letter of resignation to Eve Gilstorf (C.A. Tipps to Eve Gilstorf, 30 December 1966, "Evangelical Baptists," MG 28 I 76 vol. 9, NAC).

32. See Philip LeBlanc and Arnold Edinborough, eds., *One Church, Two Nations?* (Don Mills: Longmans Canada Limited, 1968), 176.

33. Gilstorf to A. Macdonald, 5 October 1966, MG 28 I 76 vol. 6, NAC.

34. Memorandum from Gilstorf to Becker, 11 October 1966, MG 28 I 76 vol. 6, NAC.

35. One can correctly argue, of course, that persons in public positions in Quebec were much more sensitive to any such involvement than those outside of that province due to their unique political and cultural context. The point remains, however, that if they detected and rejected the intimate relations between the federal government and the CIC, anyone outside of that province who was concerned about the issue could have done so as well.

36. Speaking of the value of the interfaith dialogue that had been facilitated by the CIC, a committee recommended that "continuing such dialogue beyond the centennial year 1967 should be given considerable study" (Report of the Small Group Dialogue Committee, "Minutes of 'After Conference Planning' Meeting of 27 April 1966," file 6, MG 28 I 76 vol. 2, NAC).

37. "Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Board of the Canadian Interfaith Conference, 15 February 1967," file 16, MG 28 I 76 vol. 1, NAC. Significantly, Eve Gilstorf also shared these sentiments, and for concrete reasons. Already in 1966 she had been representing the CIC in discussions with other groups about the planning of the International Year on Human Rights in 1968. In her report to the Board of Directors of the CIC on September 19, 1966, Gilstorf included the following proclamation by the National Consultation for International Year on Human Rights: "The Canadian Interfaith Conference has proven to be an effective vehicle in furthering human rights in the religious field and should be extended beyond 1967." Gilstorf and others thought that the CIC could play a major role in planning for the Year of Human Rights in Canada ("Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting, 19 September 1966," file 5, MG 28 I 76 vol. 2, NAC).

38. Executive Committee document EC 67-52, RG 69 vol. 392, NAC.

39. Any conference bringing together members of such diverse religious beliefs and traditions had its own potential for controversy, expecially when Christian religious groups clearly dominated in number. Throughout the history of the CIC, though, no significant controversy arose. The Executive worked hard to make sure that this was the case, carefully choosing their language and avoiding favouritism. It is significant, on this point, that the Chairman of the Conference, Lavy Becker, was a member of the Jewish faith.

40. Address to the Canadian Interfaith Conference, 27 April 1966, file 6, MG 28 I 76 vol. 4, NAC. Keep in mind that Aykroyd was speaking to religious delegates who may have disagreed with his suggestion that national identities overrode religious ones.

41. Granatstein, *Canada, 1957-1967*, 304.

42. Bothwell, et al, *Canada Since 1945*, 424.

Mysticism and Religious Modernism: Lily Dougall (1858-1923)

JOANNA DEAN

"The religions of authority are tottering to their fall," the Dean of St. Paul's, W.R. Inge, said in 1905, "but the religion of Spirit is still near the beginning of that triumphant course which Christ foretold for it . . ."[1] Three decades later, slightly chastened about the "triumphant course," he continued to distinguish between the faltering religion of authority and the resurgent religion of experience: "It became clear to me, as soon as I began to think seriously about the foundations of belief, that the centre of gravity in religion has shifted from authority to experience."[2] Historians in Canada have largely focused on one side of this shift, and the loss of religious authority has been variously lamented, debated and discussed.[3] Very little attention, however, has been paid to the corresponding rise of the religion of experience, the expansive spirituality that appeared in the margins or the "borderlands" of the major churches, in spiritualism, in metaphysical movements like Theosophy, New Thought and Christian Science, in the holiness and higher life movements, and in the popular interest in mysticism. Secular and religious historians alike have given little credence to the spiritual claims of the practitioners of many these movements. While some of the more esoteric expressions of this spirituality provide an easy target, as Ramsay Cook has shown in *The Regenerators*, they deserve closer attention, in part for their own sake, and in part for the light they shed on Inge's tottering religions of authority.[4]

The focus in this essay will be on the most respectable of these religions of experience, the popular interest in mysticism that emerged in

the early-twentieth century in a veritable flood of books by such modern and liberal figures as W.R. Inge, Evelyn Underhill, Baron Friedrich von Hugel, Rufus Jones and William James. I will approach mysticism through the eyes of a Canadian writer and Anglican modernist, Lily Dougall (1858-1923). Dougall's life work, a corpus of ten novels, eight theological works and innumerable stories, articles and papers, is best understood as an ongoing attempt to understand a deeply-felt religious experience. She was not a mystic, but an examination of her understanding of mysticism, her brief adoption of the term and subsequent rejection of it, will not only suggest the power of experiential faith but also reveal the changing ways that faith could be interpreted and defined through the tumultuous freedom of religious liberalism at the turn of the century.

Dougall is a particularly useful lens because of her exclusion from the circles of ecclesiastical authority. The emphasis by historians on the collapse of the church has in large part been a result of their perspective. We have viewed religious history through the eyes of those with the most to lose: those clergymen and theologians who embodied religious authority. (And even then we have focused on their professional debates rather than their personal faith.[5]) Historians have rarely approached religion from the perspective of the members of the congregation who are too often assumed to be the passive recipients of the message from the pulpit. The study of a woman like Dougall, however, excluded by gender from the pulpit and the lectern in spite of her learning, brings a different perspective to bear on the decline of the church. Speaking from the pews, Dougall condemned the "tyranny of ecclesiastical authority."[6] Ministers, she suggested in her novels, had been imprisoned by their doctrines and blinded by their creeds, and it was the laity, frequently intelligent single women, who were the most spiritual members of the church.[7]

The historical focus on religious institutions has also been a result of methodological difficulties with the experience of faith as a historical construct. Religious experience, particularly mystical experience, has been understood as a universal and unchanging phenomena, a core that exists at the heart of every religious tradition and thus outside the purview of history. It is ironic that it is the philosophers of religion, rather than the historians, who are now calling for a historicized and politicized understanding of religious experience. Scholars like Bernard McGinn, drawing upon the work of Steven Katz, have argued that mysticism cannot be unravelled from either the traditions from which it emerges, or the interpre-

tive framework in which it is expressed.[8] McGinn argues that mysticism is not a pure experience or a "perennial philosophy" but needs to be understood contextually, and that the mystical text – rather than the mystical experience – and its place in tradition are the primary objects of study. Language and symbol are no longer impediments that obscure the central experience, but are inescapably enmeshed in, and inform, that experience. It is not just that our interpretation of the divine changes over time and place, but that experience itself is altered by the historical context. Mysticism, and by extension all religious experience, thus becomes implicated in culture and historicized. Grace Jantzen has taken the contextualization of mysticism one step further and politicized it in powerfully gendered ways arguing from a Foucauldian perspective that the modern interpretation of mysticism has served to marginalize women's spirituality. By understanding mysticism as a private, ineffable and subjective experience, she says, we have taken the power out of a spirituality that prior to the modern period presented a potent alternate discourse.[9]

Jantzen's analysis is focused upon the work and influence of pragmatist William James. The study of Lily Dougall reveals, however, that Jamesian interpretations of mysticism had to compete, in the early-twentieth century, with other modern constructions of mystical experience. As a young girl, Lily Dougall brought the language and symbols of her family's evangelical faith to bear upon her religious experience. Her father, John Dougall, was the publisher of a number of liberal evangelical papers, including the *Montreal Daily Witness* and the *New York Witness*. Correspondence between their two homes in New York and Montreal reveals that the Dougall family lived with a constant sense of the presence of God. As Lily explained when she was nineteen, "We believe He is close beside us always, not only as a God and King, but as a friend."[10] She wrote,

> When I sought God with my whole heart I *found Him* . . . my whole life has been transformed. It is a happier, holier, deeper truer thing than it ever was before, not because I am changed, but because "there is a Friend who sticketh closer than a brother." And this friend is not mythical or vague, or even a sometimes-reality, but a *tangible* (touchable) constant reality; One who (I say it reverently) answers when I speak to Him, and who grants always when I ask.[11]

She rebelled against evangelicalism as a young woman. In a difficult and prolonged crisis she rejected what she felt to be the irrationalities, the rigidities and the vulgarities of evangelicalism, and turned instead to a broad Anglicanism. "[Evangelicals] see the panorama of the universe painted in monochrome only, in the light and shadow of right and wrong," she wrote. "But to those who are not thus colour blind this code of the monochrome is a torturing and deforming thing."[12] The loss of an evangelical experiential faith, however, left her groping with words to express her faith. As she noted, faith needed the imaginative constructions of symbol and language to stay alive: "When increasing knowledge shatters the traditional pictures of the unknown, it is better to build these up again that seek to live by a faith unaided by imagination, always bearing in mind that all words and images are merely symbols of the truth."[13]

Leaving her family home in Canada, Dougall engaged in a wide-ranging course of study, including classes at the University of Edinburgh, lessons in Greek, private study of the Bible, and a persistent and critical examination of the religious phenomena. She settled permanently in Britain and cultivated friendships with such eminent figures as idealists Edward Caird and William Wallace. Hegelian idealism provided a new way of understanding her faith, an interpretation that was compatible with the legacies of her evangelical childhood, and was conducive to mystical experience.[14] She initially explored this outlook through a series of popular melodramatic novels. Her novels kept straying awkwardly into religious terrain, however, and in 1900 Dougall found a new vehicle with a provocative work of liberal religious thought, *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*.[15] The book brought her acceptance into the elite clerical and academic circles of Anglican modernism, and she established a reputation as a religious gadfly, prodding the Anglican and Free Churches through a series of books, articles and speeches, to become more liberal, more socially aware and more spiritual.

Her fellow modernists represented the fighting edge of liberal Anglican theology; they retained belief in a personal God, personal immortality and a historic revelation in Christ, but insisted that beyond these things, "there is a great deal of hay and stubble that has simply got to be cleared away."[16] Dougall described an immanent God who worked in and through nature, and rejected the orthodox belief in an intrusive supernatural as a primitive theology. Neither the virgin birth nor the physical resurrection of Christ were essential to her Christianity, nor did

she have much faith in the creeds, doctrines or the ministry of the church. But, unlike the more combative members of the Modern Churchman's Association who caused a national controversy in 1921 with their degree Christology, Dougall was diplomatic, even evasive in expressing these ideas. She felt it dangerous to remove the symbols and myths that propped up the faith, at least until a new imagery could be found.

The early literary intimations of Dougall's adoption of mystical terms of reference lie in three novels published in 1895. In *The Madonna of a Day* Dougall describes the conversion of a sceptical free thinking New Woman. The outrageously melodramatic plot is typical of Dougall's fiction: a young woman sleepwalks off a train in the Canadian Rockies on Christmas Eve and finds herself at the mercy of a rough camp of loggers. She narrowly escapes rape and forced marriage by playing upon their superstition that she, struck dumb and wearing a blue gown on Christmas Eve, is a vision of the Madonna. The experience transforms the brash young woman: her worldly cynicism is shattered by her recognition of the power of an ideal, however false, over the men, and at the same time a series of mystical experiences awaken her spirituality and lead her to realize that there is a higher reality behind symbols like the Madonna. The mystical experiences are found in nature, in the height and grandeur of the Rocky Mountains.

> As her eye travelled upon the snow clad declivities of this high mountain she felt her mind lifted into a different class of thoughts and sensations . . . What did it mean? She found herself struggling with the belief that it meant something to her, just as words spoken from another mind to hers would have had meaning . . . The meaning came to her in a flash of thought that seemed like sunrise in her soul. The mountain sang of an inspiration toward an impossible perfection, the struggle for which was the joy, the only joy of the universe.[17]

Later, when locked into a mountain cabin, she sees a light flashing in the waterfall. Dougall always explained her melodramatic devices, and this one, we later learn, is a leak of coal gas that is kept lit so as to burn off the smell, but for the captive it takes on spiritual significance:

> It was, in short, a physical salvation that she had something in her which responded to that appeal which nature is always making to the human mind to find rest in the contemplation of her loveliness . . . Our

> help comes not from without but wells up from the depths within us. Beneath that depth what is there? It was said by one of old that underneath the soul is the hand of God.[18]

The imagery of the mountain, the light, and the corresponding depths in one's being are familiar ones to mystic accounts.

Another book, *The Zeit-Geist*, also places a transformative mystical experience at the climax of a melodramatic story. A young evangelical is struck on the head and left for dead in a dark and foreboding swamp. As he recovers he has a religious experience which Dougall describes in the language of mystic Meister Eckhart as the "eternal now": "Something of the secret of all peace – the *Eternal Now* remained with him as long as the weakness of the injury remained."[19] He realizes the power of an immanent and pantheistic God:

> . . . his heart in its waking felt after something else around and beneath and above him, everywhere, something that meant light and comfort and rest and love, something that was very strong, that was strength; he himself, Bart Toyner, was part of this strength and rested in it with a rest and refreshing . . . it came to him he had made a great mistake . . . he had thought, he had actually thought that God was only part of things; that he, Bart Toyner could turn away from God; that God's power was only with him when he supposed himself to be obedient to Him! Yes, he had thought this; but now he knew that God was all and in all.[20]

A third novel written at the same time describes another young man, Caius, who is woken out of a self-righteous creed by the sight of a mermaid swimming in the sea. Caius' first sight of the mermaid is described in language drawn in part from evangelical conversion narratives, and in part from descriptions of mystical experience:

> In the procession of swift winged hours there is for every man one and another which is big with fate, in that they bring him peculiar opportunity to lose his life, and by that means find it. Such an hour came now to Caius. The losing and finding of life is accomplished in many ways: the first proffer of this kind which Time makes to us is commonly a draught of the wine of joy, and happy is he who loses the remembrance of self therein.[21]

To lose one's life in order to find it is an image familiar to evangelicals, but the situation, even apart from the bizarre appearance of the mermaid, lacks any of the other hallmarks of a conversion narrative. Caius does not experience an extended period of anxiety, a conviction of sin, then repentance and a sudden assurance. The loss of self, however, in a joyous experience of the divine, is characteristic of a mystical experience.

> For it must all have been a dream – a sweet fantastic dream, imposed upon his senses by some influence, outward or inward; but it seemed to him that at the hour when he seemed to see the maid it might have been given to him to enter the world of dreams, and go on in some existence which was a truer reality than the world in which he now was.[22]

In conformity with both the conversion and mystical narrative, this moment is a transformative one. Caius struggles to fit her appearance into his understanding of reality: "He realized that some new region of life had been opened to him, that he was feeling his way into new mysteries of beatified thought and feeling."[23] The mermaid is discovered, quite unbelievably on the last pages, to have been a woman floating in a mermaid costume. But the illusion is not spoiled, for Caius has by this time come to know the woman herself, who lives a contemplative life on the remote Magdalen Islands, and has come through her to realize the power of a spiritual life.[24]

In each of these stories a higher reality is revealed through some melodramatic device. The coal gas was an illusion, as was the mermaid, but they point to a higher reality, a reality that in Dougall's theology has no need for expression through miracle or revelation, but will express itself through the natural world, through mountains, and through prayerful communion. In a later theological work, *Voluntas Dei* (1912), Dougall suggested, rather tentatively, that the Virgin Birth was a myth. She said that the old interpretation of Genesis mistook crisis for process, and argued: "Is it not possible that, in speaking of the process of the advent of Christ, the religious consciousness may again have mistaken crisis for process. But in admitting these mistakes, if they be admitted, we are bound always to admit that the truth they clothe was not a mistake."[25] The Christian miracles, she suggested, were, like the mermaid, an illusion, but they truth they represent was unchanged.

Dougall did not at this time identify the fictional experiences as mystical. She had, as a young girl, expressed an aversion to mysticism. She recalled:

> When quite young I once collected as many of the writings of the mystics as I could get, and read and read, but was put off by the "half metaphysical half imaginative" descriptions by mystics like Eckhart. I remember being worried by the effort to see my soul like an alp, its peak lost in heaven. The "Spark" at the apex of the soul, one with the uncreated God, vexed me by the picture it raised.

Her conclusion was to write the mystics off as unhealthy examples. "I remember feeling that the notable mystics were perhaps more different from the common devout man in the gift of a fantastical imagination and in love of expression than in having clearer perceptions of things unseen."[26] Yet the fact that she had read the mystics at a young age and used their imagery in her work suggests the power of mystical language and symbolism in her evangelical childhood. Mysticism had influenced evangelical culture in a number of ways; in particular prominent holiness writer Thomas Upham (1799-1872) borrowed heavily from Roman Catholic mysticism.[27] Upham popularized Quietist mysticism but also altered it in the translation, minimizing the asceticism and the annihilation of self, and making Quietism, as he said, "essentially Protestant."[28] The idea of divine union that lay at the core of Quietist mysticism was revised by Upham to a relationship with, rather than dissolution in, the Divine.

In an early autobiographical work Lily Dougall similarly altered a mystical experience. She described her father's conversion in terms drawn from Schleiermacher's mystical piety: "It is usually a new discovery to a man when he finds that religion is not anything he can do or believe, but the yielding to an inward power, other than himself, which transforms his deeds and beliefs . . . [he was] aware that there was a heavenly strength to be had in this life, which transforms conscious life into a conscious union with God." The editing of this passage, however, reveals Dougall's avoidance of the mystical concept of divine union for more evangelical Christological language. She substituted "which transforms conscious life into a conscious union with God" for "a power for holy work in the personal presence of Christ."[29] The second phrase replaces the suspect "union" with a more benign "presence," a presence, it is significant to

note, not of God but of Christ. In this simple shift of language the mystical experience became active, individualist and Christocentric.

Dougall lost her early suspicion of mysticism, however, and by 1910, when she published her third religious book, *Absente Reo,* a reviewer commented, "The writer is a mystic, a twentieth-century mystic."[30] The book is structured as a series of letters to a young Anglican cleric in which she calls for a renewal through inward spirituality. Her companion Sophie Earp wrote: "Perhaps the central idea of the book may be said to be the importance of personal illumination rather than the ceremonial forms which accompany that inward illumination and vary with age."[31] The book is playful, yet deeply serious; through it Dougall preaches, with some relish, to the men who usually preached to her:

> God is life and the fuller life comes only from Him. But this impulse of fuller religion implies independence of hackneyed thought, getting into the mountains of the soul at night time, and meeting there with God, going out a great while before it is day into the solitudes of the spiritual life. "And you – what are you doing? Is not the greater part of your time spent in forcing, as it were, the nose of the laity to the grindstone of hackneyed words, hackneyed ideas, hackneyed responsibilities."[32]

Dougall later told a friend that she felt she might have neglected the outer forms of religion in this book, in her attempt to stress the inner life, but, ". . . I am sure that mysticism produces the truest sanity."[33]

The shift in Dougall's views appears to have been influenced by the Bampton Lectures on *Christian Mysticism* delivered in Oxford by W.R. Inge (1860-1954) in 1899. She wrote *Absente Reo* in the midst of a flood of books on mysticism: the Roman Catholic Baron Friedrich von Hugel (1852-1925) wrote *The Mystical Element in Religion* in 1908; American Quaker Rufus Jones (1863-1948) followed with the first of many books on mysticism, *Studies in Mystical Religion*, in 1909; and Evelyn Underhill (1875-1941) wrote the book that has become the most popular text on the subject, *Mysticism*, in 1911.[34] Their books went into multiple editions and printings; Inge, Jones and Underhill each wrote a number of subsequent works that were variations on the theme.[35]

These writers laid the groundwork for the modern understanding of mysticism.[36] They were modernists; the people who preached the religion

of experience were the same people who would send religious authority tottering to its knees.[37] Inge was the president of the Anglican modernist organization, the Modern Churchman's Union, from 1924-1934; his predecessor from 1915-1922, Percy Gardner, also wrote on mysticism, and prompted the remark: "There is no one in Oxford who prays more and believes less than Percy Gardner."[38] Baron von Hugel was a Roman Catholic modernist who escaped censure in part because his audience was largely outside his own faith. Rufus Jones was a liberal Quaker.[39] Evelyn Underhill's liberal sympathies were so strong that she changed her mind about entering the Roman Catholic Church after the 1907 Papal condemnation of modernism, and subsequently returned to her childhood Anglican faith.

The confluence of modernism and mysticism had been predicted in 1844 by the Broad Churchman, Benjamin Jowett, who argued, "as faith loses in extent, it must gain in intensity, if we do not mean to shipwreck it altogether."[40] The religious history of the early-twentieth century suggests that if he was right about the potential for shipwreck, he was also right about an intensified liberal faith. Before World War One we find even such philosophers as Bertrand Russell toying with mysticism as an alternative to bleak agnosticism. As Russell argued,

> the decay of traditional beliefs has made every religion that rests on dogma precarious, and even impossible, to many whose nature is strongly religious . . . For right action they are thrown back upon bare morality; and bare morality is very inadequate as a motive for those who hunger and thirst after the infinite. Thus it has become a matter of first importance to preserve religion without any dependence upon dogmas to which an intellectually honest assent grows daily more difficult.[41]

Russell failed to find a *modus vivendi* between the imperatives of mysticism and logic, and after 1914 opted for the latter. The vehemence of his later anti-religionist outlook, however, reflected the promise that mystical thought had once held.

The modernist interest in mysticism was paralleled by the empiricism of an emerging psychology of religion. In a series of lectures delivered in Scotland two years after Inge's Bampton Lectures, William James also emphasized the experience rather than the authority of religion.

In *Varieties of Religious Experience*, he bypassed the "overbeliefs" of creed and church and defined religion as "*the feelings, acts and experiences of individual men in their solitude, so far as they apprehend themselves to stand in relation to whatever they may consider the divine*."[42] As he noted:

> The problem I have set myself is a hard one: *first*, to defend . . . "experience" against "philosophy" as being the real backbone of the world's religious life . . . and *second*, to make the hearer or reader believe, what I myself invincibly do believe, that, although all the special manifestations of religion may have been absurd (I mean its creeds and theories), yet the life of it as a whole is mankind's most important function.[43]

James stressed the abnormal, arguing that the essential elements are most obvious in "those religious experiences that are one-sided, exaggerated and intense."[44] He reduced religion to a subjective experience, an experience redeemed, it is important to note, by his confidence that the individual *is* in contact with some higher reality, and that this reality breaks in upon the world through "prayerful communion." This was not Christianity, but something better described, as it was by the Canadian psychiatrist cited by James, Richard Maurice Bucke, as a "cosmic consciousness."[45] James' understanding of mysticism has been influential, particularly in the philosophy of religion; his emphasis on the abnormal and his description of the hallmarks of the mystical experience, ineffability, noetic quality, transiency and passivity, have succeeded in defining, and according to Grace Jantzen, marginalising the mystical experience.[46]

Although she was fascinated by psychology, Lily Dougall had little patience with William James' interpretations of mystical experience. She met with James briefly to discuss her book on the psychology of religion, *The Mormon Prophet* (1899), but was unimpressed by his description of a reservoir of soul into which all believers dip. "I said how it was possible to make [the conception of a reservoir] affect my thought or that of others, because it was unimaginable." It was worse than useless, as she wrote to a friend: "The only imaginative image that I received from his conversation was that of frogs on the outskirts of a pond."[47] Instead she turned to the modernist mysticism described by W.R.Inge, who as Dean of St.Pauls spoke from within the Anglican establishment, and the Quaker Rufus

Jones, whose American outlook probably appealed to her lingering sympathies with liberal evangelicalism. *Absente Reo* is informed by Inge's *Christian Mysticism*, and Jones' *Studies in Mystical Religion*. Jones subsequently collaborated with Dougall on a joint volume, *Concerning Prayer* (1916).[48]

In contrast to James, Inge and Jones described mysticism as a normal and rational experience, a continuum whose lower reaches were accessible to any believer. Lily Dougall drew upon the language of personal idealism (and her girlhood evangelicalism) to compare mystical prayer to a relationship with a friend.

> The mystical element in prayer is perhaps constituted by the loss of sense of self in communion, and may perhaps be defined as participation in God's side of man's communion with Him. Consciously and with effort, or unconsciously and involuntarily, man's soul often seems to go over the line of its own urgency toward God and become absorbed in God's urgency manward. Of course, when we come to analyze it, this is a common experience of all affection, all friendship; an identification with the other self is involved.[49]

She quotes, approvingly, Rufus Jones' definition of mysticism as "the type of religion which puts the emphasis on immediate awareness of a relationship with God, a direct and intimate contact with the Divine Presence. It is religion in its most acute, intense and living stage."[50]

Mysticism was understood to be the experience of heard prayer, familiar to every believer. Inge wrote: "I have never myself had what are usually called mystical experiences. But in truth the typical mystical experience is just prayer. Anyone who has really prayed, and felt that his prayers are heard, knows what mysticism means . . . The higher stages are for the saints who have given up all to win the pearl of great price."[51] Similarly Dougall wrote, "The lamp of mysticism is more or less alight in every religious soul, and therefore in every true prayer, although often unrecognized."[52]

The emphasis was on sanity and normality. As Dougall told a friend, "One so often comes upon the notion, in early religious training of the young, that any experience of [the mystical] sort may lead to mental weakness."[53] She argued that mysticism was not dangerous; it could not fail or lead to "psychic miasma." Jones repeatedly used the word sanity in

his discussions of mysticism, arguing that a mystical element informs the "sanest and most matter-of-fact person among us" in the call of duty and in the moments when prayer is lifted into "vital communion with God." It was not necessarily a solitary pursuit: "These mystical experiences in a perfectly sane and normal fashion often come over whole groups of persons in times of worship." Nor did it necessarily involve extraordinary experiences: "the sanest mystics discount visions and ecstasies."[54] Inge similarly discounted visions. Mystics in his account were not spiritual athletes or religious extremists: Inge concluded the influential Bampton Lectures with a discussion of Wordsworth and Browning; by 1921, when he wrote *Studies of English Mystics*, he included scientists and intellectuals who have a momentary revelation, and even explorers like Gordon of Khartoum, in the pantheon of mystics.

As part of this emphasis on normality, these writers emphasized the practical, even business-like behaviour of many mystics. Dougall quoted Inge to show that St. Teresa's visions did not impair her powers as an organizer, "her extreme practical ability." She cited Jones' argument that Eckhart was a "highly practical man, who did his day's work with fidelity" and his observation on the "practical" side of Jean de Gerson's life.[55] "As a matter of fact," Inge stated, "all the great mystics have been energetic and influential, and their business capacity is specially noted in a curiously large number of cases."[56]

Inge and James wrote the "pathological aberrations" out of the tradition by insisting, in a typically modernist fashion, that these elements were incidental to mysticism. Dougall distinguished between mysticism and the "pathological" behaviour associated with the cloistered medieval mystics. She suggested that the popular image is skewed because only the more extreme mystics wrote about their experiences: "I am inclined to think that the greater mystics, and by far the greater multitude of mystics, have been, and always will be, greatly silent. The outcome of mysticism ought rather to be in action and in the progressive enlightenment of the reason."[57] When Rufus Jones contributed a chapter on mysticism to a book, *Concerning Prayer*, co-written by a select group of religious thinkers gathered at Dougall's home, he argued that they must discard the old negative mysticism that introduced such esoteric elements as the "mystic way" and the *via negativa* to create a new affirmative mysticism.[58]

> We can best help our age toward a real revival of Mysticism as an

> elemental aspect of religious life, not by formulating an esoteric "mystic way" not by clinging to the ancient metaphysic to which Mysticism has been allied, but by emphasising the reality of mystical experience, by insisting on its healthy and moral character, and by indicating ways in which such dynamic experiences can be fostered, and realized, and put into practical application.[59]

Similarly, Inge dismissed the *via negativa* as "the great accident of Christian mysticism," a result of "Asiatic" influence.[60]

These modernist mystics also wrote the erotic out of the mystical. Inge quotes Friedrich Schleiermacher's description of religious experience in *Studies of English Mystics*.[61] His quotation is, however, selectively edited, and Schleiermacher's comparison of the mystical experience to "holy wedlock" – "Did I venture to compare it, seeing I cannot describe it, I would say it is fleeting and transparent as a maiden's kiss, it is holy and fruitful like a bridal embrace. Nor is it merely like, it is all this" – has silently disappeared from the text.[62] This may be more than a matter of British prudery. Modernist mysticism, like the holiness mysticism of Thomas Upham, insisted upon the independent identity of the believer and resisted a final dissolution in the divine; they were concerned about the loss of personality in the divine union, and in the implication that mysticism was pantheistic.[63] As Dougall wrote,following the arguments of personal idealism, "The self, if it finds God, certainly finds Him within – in the sense that it is within that the self speaks to God and God speaks to the self. This belief is not pantheistic, there is no identity of self with God. It would put an end to all communication for, as we have seen, all true union depends on difference."[64] The model was one of a friendship rather than a marital relationship, as in Schleiermacher, or the more purely erotic relationships described in some early mystics. The loss of individual will and rational control in a passionate relationship with God has been replaced by a measured friendship with God. As Dougall wrote: "All spiritual activities seem to rise from man's consciousness that when he is most alone, in the sense of having retired from the things of sense, he is in company with another spirit . . ."[65]

This tamed and normalized mysticism was seen to be inherently rational. Dougall, who had rebelled against the suspension of reason in the evangelicalism of her childhood, was suspicious of any irrational faith. It was Inge who set Dougall's mind at rest on this point by arguing that

mysticism was compatible with reason, indeed was characterized by its "uncompromising rationalism." He had defined mysticism in idealist terms as "the attempt to realize, in thought and feeling, the immanence of the temporal in the eternal, and of the eternal in the temporal."[66] In *Christian Mysticism* he distinguishes between those mystics who pursue the *via negativa* and blind themselves to the world of the senses, and the objective or symbolical mystics, typified by the Cambridge Platonists, whose mysticism was not an alternative to, but an exercize of, purified reason.[67] After 1899 Inge focused on those mystics who were also philosophers, who were as he put it, "almost free from these aberrations"; his main scholarly work was a study of Plotinus. Coleridge, whose ideas were central to liberal Anglicanism, had laid the groundwork for Inge's argument. He had drawn upon the Cambridge Platonists, and developed their idea of reason as the "candle of the Lord," the vehicle or medium of spiritual experience. Understanding was the faculty that deals with objects of sense, whereas higher rationality, which Coleridge distinguished from lower purely logical operations of the reason, was the eye of the spirit. Inge explained in Coleridgean terms in 1907: "the organ by which we apprehend divine truth is no special faculty, but the higher reason, which we distinguish from the understanding because we mean it to include the will and feelings, disciplined under the guidance of the intellect."[68]

Dougall followed Inge in insisting that mysticism was consistent with rational thought, and her words also took on a Coleridgean tone: "The opening of the Soul's eye to the Love's being is only the beginning of an education which cannot proceed, as the progressive creed of the Pharisee did, from the known to the unknown, but always from the imperfectly known to the unknowable."[69] She said there would continually be discrepancies between the truth of revelation and orthodoxy, "the smug little system of thought,"[70] or the purely logical operation of reason. In *Absente Reo* she told her fictional clerical correspondent that a mystical faith provides a more secure base than the lower operations of reason. "My point in all this is, that this hearing element in prayer is necessary to make the individual soul appropriate and assimilate the inexpressible certainties of true religion as parts of its very life, deeper and higher and broader than any certainty that it can obtain by the instruction of man, or to put it another way, by any experience, racial or individual, that comes to it as knowledge."[71] The task is to reconcile the lower reason and faith, but if they were to contradict each other, she argued that faith provided the safer

path:

> It is quite possible that the utmost in knowledge in progressive science and the strongest reasoning upon scientific discovery form a slower and less satisfactory way of arriving at the secrets of the universe than the way of personal experiment in religion; it is also possible that while man's psychic powers are not in complete agreement and unity it is quite as honest for a man to adhere to what satisfies his emotional and volitional nature although his reason be dissatisfied, as to adhere to what merely satisfies reason while the rest of his nature cries against it.[72]

This revised mysticism had great promise for modernist thinkers. Mysticism provided new authority for a faith that had lost its old authorities in the Bible and creed. Inge wrote,

> We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that both the old seats of authority, the infallible Church and the infallible book, are fiercely assailed, and that our faith needs reinforcements. These can only come from the depths of the religious consciousness itself, and if summoned from thence, they will not be found wanting. *The "impregnable rock" is neither an institution nor a book, but a life or experience* (emphasis mine).[73]

Dougall paraphrased Inge in *Absente Reo*:

> Not long ago men took Christianity on the valuation of the clergy, or they left it altogether; now men are trying to fit Christianity into the facts of life as they are found in history or as they see them today, and life looks very different to this person and that. In the process of sifting all Christians must fall back upon some rock which is not being assailed, some common ground on which they can find footing, and on it stand to fight their battle. *The only rock on which they can rest is the personal experience of God's voice in their hearts.* It is this and this alone which brings the peace which science and research and social institutions can neither give nor take away (emphasis mine).[74]

Similarly Jones wrote, "We ought to challenge the elaborate logical constructions of bygone metaphysics, and base our interpretations upon the

sure ground of *vital religious experience* and on the inescapable implications of our minds as they co-operate with a universe which reveals rationality from outermost husk to innermost core."[75]

The reinforcement was an effective one: no less a liberal Protestant than Harry Emerson Fosdick has attested to the power of Jones' mysticism in shoring up his faltering faith as a young man.[76] Of course a higher spirituality had been claimed by evangelicals and holiness thinkers throughout the nineteenth century. What the study of mysticism offered, however, was more than simply a heightened spiritual experience, but the legacy of a mystical tradition. In his 1899 lectures Inge traced mysticism from the Fourth Gospel, through St. Paul, into the early Platonists. He described Meister Eckhart, and the other introspective mystics of the fourteenth century, the Spanish Quietists, and then turned to Renaissance nature mysticism, Jakob Boehme, William Law, and the Cambridge Platonists. Finally he described the romantic mysticism of Wordsworth and Tennyson.[77] Here was a tradition that the modernists could claim.

In creating a usable tradition, modernists rewrote mysticism in their own liberal Protestant image. Inge disparaged "the debased supernaturalism which usurps the name of mysticism in Roman Catholic countries."[78] He understood mysticism to be essentially Protestant, and identified with the Catholic mystics in their defiance of church authority. The mystics described by Inge are seen to be Protestants, even when in Roman Catholic garb; Eckhart and his school of introspective mystics anticipate Luther, and even the Counter Reformation Quietists eventually threaten the Roman Catholic church. "But the Jesuits say with their usual acumen that Mysticism, even in the most submissive guise, is an independent and turbulent spirit . . ."[79] His account of the characteristic features of western mysticism, drawn from an eleventh-century mystic, Amalric, is remarkably modern: "its strong belief in Divine immanence, not only in the Church, but in the individual, its uncompromising rationalism, contempt for ecclesiastical forms, and tendency to evolutionary optimism."[80] Amalric, despite a few "perversions" has in Inge's description anticipated liberal Protestantism, even to its evolutionary optimism.

The modernists could lay claim to a heritage that, whatever its "pathological aberrations," had an uncontested knowledge of God. Inge wrote: "I was convinced very early, and I have never wavered in my conviction, that this testimony of the saints and mystic has far greater evidential value than is usually supposed, and that it may properly take the

place of those traditional `evidences' which for one reason or another have lost their cogency.'"[81] These mystics also offered a route, a map for reaching God that substituted for the rejected creeds and dogmas of orthodoxy. Dougall, for example, cited St. Teresa's advice to her nuns about prayer, "to sum up all one's faculties in concentrated attention upon silence."[82]

The mystics also provided a language, a way of expressing spirituality, that, if it did not have the purity of the early gospels, was continually renewed by the experience of God, and appeared to be free of the institutional accretions of the intervening centuries. Mysticism offered an authority that was not an authority, a tradition that seemed to exist at the fringes and in resistance to the powers of the church.

Mysticism was also a potentially liberatory faith for women. Whereas the Church of England continued to deny women like Dougall any position of authority or responsibility, the voice of God in the heart made her an equal in the religion of experience. It was religious experience (as well as, admittedly, her many years of private study in Greek and theology) that gave Dougall the courage to lecture the young cleric in *Absente Reo* and challenge the church in her other modernist works. It was a religious framework with a strong female legacy, as feminists like Grace Jantzen are discovering today. Thomas Upham, for example, revived the work of Madame Guyon, von Hugel based his work on Catherine of Adorno, and Dougall referred to St. Teresa. It was, significantly, a woman, Evelyn Underhill, acting outside any theological or institutional authority, who became the leading twentieth-century writer on mysticism.

Dougall was in her fifties when she wrote *Absente Reo*, and she subsequently dropped references to mysticism. Several years after writing *Absente Reo* when she and Evelyn Underhill were invited to speak at a Church Congress, it was Underhill who spoke on mysticism, and Dougall, who was almost a generation older, returned to the evangelical language of her youth and spoke on the Spirit.[83] She also returned to an evangelical emphasis on Christian fellowship. After an initial flush of enthusiasm for the vitality of the various metaphysical movements, Dougall became concerned about the irrational directions taken by many of these groups:

> The quest of the inward light is not safe for the solitary wayfarer. The solitary soul that lies silent, open to spiritual impressions, is open to two kingdoms: from one the sanities and moralities of the religious

> life come as pedagogues, speaking in tones that are apt to seem harsh and prosaic, from the other the insanities and immoralities of the religious life come as guests, with exciting and interesting arguments.[84]

She advised the solitary soul to find fellowship in groups like the Society of Friends. An article published posthumously makes an even more forceful criticism of ecstatic irrational prayer, describing it as the prayer of the Oriental Mystery Religions now practised in Christian Science, Theosophy, New Thought and "any Christian teaching that depreciates the intellectual life." These new schools teach that "God's saving activities can only be fully drawn upon when the needy soul has learned by practice to make the mind vacant and receive what is desired in ecstatic realization."[85] Dougall writes that this form of prayer "is like a flood rising in hot river valleys, making the food fields fertile, but bearing on its tide malodorous things and germs of disease."[86] Rather than pursue this kind of mysticism, Dougall was drawn to the emerging school of personal idealism or personalism that, in its emphasis on the individual personality and a nexus of relationships, was closer to her childhood roots. She spent the last years of her life promoting a heightened spirituality within the safe fellowship of such groups as the Student Christian Movement, the Anglican Fellowship, the Guild of Health and the Cumnor School.

Endnotes

1. W.R. Inge, *Studies of English Mystics, St. Margaret's Lectures, 1905* (London: John Mire, 1921), 238.

2. W.R. Inge, *Vale* (London: Longmans, 1934), 34. Inge was not alone in his description of the shift. For other retrospective accounts see, C.C.J. Webb, *Religious Experience* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1945); William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, *Religious Experience and Other Essays and Addresses* (London: James Clarke, 1958); and in United States, H.E. Fosdick, *The Living of Our Days: An Autobiography* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956), 234-236.

3. A number of Canadian historians, following Owen Chadwick's *The Secularization of the European Mind in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1975), have adopted a sociological concept of "secularization" and described the various ways in which the transcendent authority

of the church has been replaced by Weber's bureaucratic iron cage, the social gospel by the welfare state, theology by schools of sociology and popular devotion by consumer culture. Recent discussions of secularization in Canada include: David Marshall, *Secularizing the Faith: Canadian Protestant Clergy and the Crisis of Belief, 1850-1940* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1992); Michael Gauvreau, *The Evangelical Century: College and Creed in English Canada from the Great Revival to the Great Depression* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1991); and Ramsay Cook, *The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1985). See also Phyllis Airhart, *Serving the Present Age: Revivalism, Progressivism and the Methodist Tradition in Canada* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1992).

4. For an earlier example of the dismissal of unorthodox beliefs see C.P. Stacey, *A Very Double Life: The Private World of Mackenzie King* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1976). The participation of figures like Mackenzie King might, however, give cause for a more serious reflection on the meaning of movements like spiritualism and theosophy. See Gaius Glen Atkins for an early sympathetic description of these movements which he said "represent the free movement of the creative religious consciousness of our time" (*Modern Religious Cults and Movements* [New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1923], 6). Like many liberals of the period he blamed the aridity of the churches for the success of the cults: "Unsatisfied needs of the inner life have unlocked the doors through which they have made their abundant entry" (58). For a more recent sympathetic analysis see Sandra Sizer Frankiel, *California's Spiritual Frontiers: Religious Alternatives in Anglo-Protestantism, 1850-1910* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1988).

5. In a fascinating exception to this tendency Marguerite Van Die has shown in her nuanced study of Nathanael Burwash that an experiential faith, the witness of the Spirit, informed his liberal outlook (*An Evangelical Mind: Nathanael Burwash and the Methodist Tradition in Canada, 1839-1918* [Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1989]).

6. [Lily Dougall], *Absente Reo* (London: Macmillan, 1910). Fearing that her reputation as a novelist would undermine her religious work, Dougall published most of her theological work anonymously; subsequent books were attributed to "The Author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*."

7. "The hard outline of [the preacher's] creed had grown luminous, fringed with the divine light from beyond, as the bars of prison windows grow dazzling and fade when the prisoner looks at the sun" (Lily Dougall, *The Zeit-Geist* [London: Hutchinson, 1895], 246). Other novels feature narrow-minded clerics, prophetic lay evangelists, and strong, intelligent, spiritual, single

women.

8. Bernard McGinn, *The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism*, vol. I, *The Foundations of Mysticism* (New York: Crossroad, 1991). McGinn's work, of which we only have the first volume, is the most comprehensive recent discussion of Christian mysticism. The "General Introduction" and the Appendix, "Theoretical Foundations: The Modern Study of Mysticism," to the first volume are particular useful surveys of the theological, philosophic, comparativist and psychological analyses of mysticism in the last century. In his emphasis on context McGinn draws upon the work by Steven Katz, especially "Language, Epistemology and Mysticism," in *Mysticism and Philosophical Analysis*, ed. Steven T. Katz (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1978), 22-74.

9. "Far from being a neutral objective account, the Jamesian account of mysticism accepted by modern philosophers of religion is an account inextricably intertwined with issues of power and gender in ways which feminists need to deconstruct. The privatized subjectivized ineffable mysticism of William James and his followers is open to women as well as to men; but it plays directly into the hands of modern bourgeois political and gender assumptions. It keeps God (and women) safely out of politics and the public realm, it allows mysticism to flourish as a secret inner life, while those who nurture such an inner life can generally be counted on to prop up the status quo . . . since their anxieties and angers will be allayed in the privacy of their own hearts' search for peace and tranquillity" (Grace Jantzen, *Power, Gender and Christian Mysticism* [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995], 348).

10. M.S. Earp, "Selected Letters of Lily Dougall with biographical notes," typescript, 23, box 5, file 9, Dougall Family Papers (hereafter DFP), National Archives of Canada (hereafter NAC).

11. Lily Dougall to J.A. [Janie] Couper, 16 December 1885; cited in Earp, "Selected Letters," 60.

12. Lily Dougall, "Lovreen," unpublished manuscript, Vol II, 106-117, Box 4, Lily Dougall Papers (hereafter LDP), Bodleian Library (hereafter BL).

13. [Lily Dougall], *Voluntas Dei* (London: Macmillan, 1912), x.

14. See A.B. McKillop, *A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Enquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1979) for a discussion of the transitional role of idealism in Canadian Protestantism, and its continuing cultural legacy in the idea of a moral imperative.

15. [Lily Dougall], *Pro Christo et Ecclesia* (London: Macmillan, 1900).

16. Hastings Rashdall, annual sermon to the modernist Churchman's Association, delivered at St. Peter's Bayswater, 6 October 1899; cited in Alan M.G. Stephenson, *The Rise and Decline of English Modernism* (London: SPCK, 1984), 61.

17. Lily Dougall, *The Madonna of a Day* (New York: Appleton, 1895), 55-56.

18. Dougall, *Madonna*, 99.

19. Dougall, *The Zeit-Geist*, 222.

20. Dougall, *The Zeit-Geist*, 142-143.

21. Lily Dougall, *The Mermaid* (New York: Appleton, 1895), 41.

22. Dougall, *Mermaid*, 58.

23. Dougall, *Mermaid*, 59.

24. See Scott Rothwell Swanson for an interesting discussion of the symbolism in *The Mermaid* ("Beyond Common Sense: Ideal Love in Three Novels of Lily Dougall," M.A. Thesis, Univ. of Victoria, 1993).

25. [Dougall], *Voluntas Dei*, 119-120.

26. [Dougall], *Absente Reo*, 266.

27. See Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, *Perfectionism* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1931), II: 339. Warfield notes, "In *Principles of the Interior or Hidden Life* (1843) [Upham] quotes not only from Tauler and Behman, A Kempis and Law, but from St Theresa, Francis de Sales, Molinos, La Combe, Madame Guyon, Fenelon, Antoinette Bourignon, and Pere Labaz" (*Perfectionism*, 371, n. 59). Thomas Upham's biography of Madame Guyon, *Life, Religious Opinions and Experience of Madame Guyon, including an account of the personal history and religious opinions of Fenelon, Archbishop of Cambray*, first published in 1847, had a long publishing history. W.R. Inge wrote an introduction to a later edition that was was edited and revised by an anonymous "English Clergyman" (Thomas Upham, *Life, Religious Opinions and Experience of Madame Guyon, including an account of the personal history and religious opinions of Fenelon, Archbishop of Cambray* [London: Allenson & Co., 1957]). For a recent assessment of Upham's influence, see Darius Salter, *Spirit and Intellect: Thomas Upham's Holiness Theology* (Metuchen: Scarecrow Press, 1986).

28. Upham, *Life of Madame Guyon*; cited in Warfield, *Perfectionism*, 376.

29. Dougall, "Lovreen," 21, 25.

30. *The Transvaal Leader*, 1 November 1910, clipping file, 11, box 6, LDP, BL.

31. Earp, "Selected Letters," 219.

[Dougall], *Absente Reo*, 209-210.

33. Lily Dougall to H.D.O. [Hilda D. Oakeley] Melbourne, Derbyshire, 7 September 1910; cited in Earp, "Selected Letters," 220. Dougall met Oakely in 1899 when Oakely was the head of the new Women's College attached to McGill University. She later became a reader in philosophy at King's College, London.

34. W.R. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, 7th ed. (London: Methuen and Co., 1899) 7th ed. (London: Methuen and Co.,[1932]) 1964); Baron von Hugel, *The Mystical Element in Religion as studied in St. Catherine of Genoa and her friends*, 2 vols. (London: Dent, 1908); Rufus Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion* (London: Macmillan, 1909); and Evelyn Underhill, *Mysticism, A Study in the Nature and Development of Man's Spiritual Consciousness* (London: Methuen and Co., 1911).

Inge's many subsequent works include *Studies of English Mystics*; *Faith* (London: Duckworth & Co, 1909); *The Platonic Tradition in English Religious Thought* (London: Longman's, 1926); and *Mysticism in Religion* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1948). In 1917-18 he delivered what he considered his magnum opus, the Gifford Lectures on "The Philosophy Of Plotinus" published, in two volumes, in 1918. During his life, however, he was probably better known for his popular weekly articles in the *Evening Standard* (1921-46). Jones was the author of more than fifty books, mostly on mysticism and Quaker history (see the bibliography in *Rufus Jones Speaks to Our Time*, ed. Harry Emerson Fosdick [New York: Macmillan and Co., 1951], 287). For Underhill's publishing history see Dana Greene, *Evelyn Underhill, Artist of the Infinite Life* (New York: Crossroads, 1990) and *Evelyn Underhill: Modern Guide to the Ancient Quest for the Holy*, ed. and intro. Dana Greene (Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 1988), which contains an extensive bibliography of works by and about Underhill. For a more distanced analysis see Christopher J.R. Armstrong, *Evelyn Underhill (1875-1941) An Introduction to her Life and Writings* (London and Oxford: Mowbrays, 1975).

36. Bernard McGinn describes the significance of this period for our understanding of mysticism: "Modern understanding of `mysticism,' especially as it affects the English-speaking world, began in earnest toward the end of the nineteenth century" (*Presence of God*, 267). Indeed, McGinn's definition of mysticism, as "the preparation for, the consciousness of, and the reaction to what can be described as the immediate or direct presence of God" (xvii), still owes a great deal to the world of modernists and personal idealists, and reflects a deliberate departure from the understanding of mysticism as "union" with the divine, particularly a union in which the personality is lost, and a substitution with the broader concept of the "presence" of God.

37. Of course not all modernists shared their faith in this avenue to faith; leading modernist Hastings Rashdall was outspoken in his criticism of mysticism (see P.E. Matheson, *The Life of Hastings Rashdall* [Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1928], 227, 241-244, 251).

Stephenson, *English Modernism*, 66.

39. It may be that this mysticism was less apparent in American modernism; Kenneth Cauthen did not consider Jones' mystical liberalism in *The Impact of American Religious Liberalism*, 2nd ed. (New York: Univ. Press of America, 1983) because, although religious experience was central to liberalism, the "distinctive mystical type of religion espoused by Jones is not so widespread as the other types" (36). Nor did W.R. Hutchinson consider modernist mysticism in *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1976). The influence of Roman Catholic modernism upon Anglican modernism may have led to a faith more conducive to mystical expression than American Protestant modernism.

40. Benjamin Jowett to B.C. Brodie, 23 December 1844, in *Life and Letters* by E.A. Abbott and Lewis Campbell (1897), I: 114-115; cited in Basil Willey, *More Nineteenth-Century Studies: A Group of Honest Doubters* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1963).

41. "The Essence of Religion," in *Collected Papers of Bertrand Russell*, eds. Richard A. Rempel, Andrew Brink and Margaret Moran (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1985), 12: 114-115. Between 1901 and 1914, Russell, in response to the Anglicanism of Ottoline Morrell, seriously considered mysticism in a series of works: "Prisons" (1911); "The Essence of Religion" (1912); *The Perplexities of John Forstice* (1912); and "Mysticism and Logic" (1914) (see *Collected Papers*, 12: part III).

42. William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature*, ed., and with an introduction by, Martin Marty (New York: Longmans, 1902; reprint, New York: Penguin, 1985), 31. Although it was published after Inge's *Christian Mysticism*, James had been working on the project since 1896. James is known as a pioneer in the secular field of the psychology of religion, but his work was highly influenced by both Pietism and romanticism. Grace Jantzen argues that William James derives his understanding of mysticism from Swedenborg and such romantics as Carlyle and Emerson (Grace Jantzen, "Mysticism and Experience," *Religious Studies* 25 [1989]: 295).

43. Cited by Martin Marty, "Introduction" in James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, xix.

44. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 45.

45. "The prime characteristic of cosmic consciousness is a consciousness of the cosmos, that is, of life and order of the universe. Along with the consciousness of the cosmos there occurs an intellectual enlightenment . . . To this is added a state of moral exaltation, an indescribable feeling of elevation, elation and joyousness, and a quickening of the moral sense . . . With these come what may be called a sense of immortality, a consciousness of eternal life, not a conviction that he shall have this, but a consciousness that he has it already" (R.M. Bucke, *Cosmic Consciousness: A Study in the Evolution of the Human Mind* [Philadelphia: 1901], 2; cited in James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, 398).

    Bucke has been too quickly dismissed by Canadian historians. Ramsay Cook wrote, "It is, however, evidence of Bucke's independence, not to say eccentricity, that at a time when liberal Protestants were turning away from `conversion experiences' and seeking rational, historical and sociological defence of religious belief, Dr. Bucke, the scientist, insisted that the mystical and emotional were the essence of religion" (*The Regenerators*, 100). Bucke, eccentric though he admittedly was, was not a throwback to an earlier time, but was in fact a harbinger of a modern mysticism that co-existed with, and indeed supported, the secular city described by Cook. He was associated with Walt Whitman and Madame Blavatsky, as well as William James – *Cosmic Consciousness* was in its 27th printing in 1973.

46. Jantzen argues that James selectively misinterpreted medieval mystics (*Power, Gender and Christian Mysticism*, 348).

47. L. Dougall to M.S. Earp, 14 November 1896; cited in Earp, "Selected Letters" 149-150. Rufus Jones had briefly entertained James' idea of a reservoir, arguing: "The vast realm of subconscious life, which for all we know, borders

upon infinite Life, *rises out of it* and may receive incursions from it" (Rufus Jones, *Social Law in the Spiritual World: Studies in Human and Divine Inter-Relationship* [Philadelphia: J.C. Winston Co., 1904]; cited in Leonard Hall Bridges, *American Mysticism: from William James to Zen* [New York: Harper and Rowe, 1907], 28).

48. Rufus Jones, "Prayer and the Mystic Vision," in *Concerning Prayer, Its Nature, Its Difficulties and Its Value*, 2nd ed., eds. [Lily Dougall], B.H. Streeter, et al (London: Macmillan, 1918), 110.

49. [Dougall], *Absente Reo*, 274.

50. Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion*, xv; cited in [Dougall], *Absente Reo*, 277.

51. Inge, *Vale*, 38.

52. [Dougall], *Absente Reo*, 273.

53. Lily Dougall to H.D.O. [Hilda Oakeley], Melbourne, Derbyshire, 7 September 1910; cited in Earp, "Selected Letters," 220.

54. Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion*, xviii, xix, xx, 144.

55. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, 222, and Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion*, 71, 314; cited in [Dougall], *Absente Reo*, 268-269.

56. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, xvii.

57. [Dougall], *Absente Reo*, 270.

58. "Mysticism will not be revived and become a powerful present day force until it is liberated from dependence on outworn and inadequate forms, and until it conquers for itself more congenial thought terms thought which in a vital way it can translate its human experience and its vision of God" (Rufus Jones, "Prayer and the Mystic Vision," 110).

59. Jones, "Prayer and the Mystic Vision," 117.

60. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, 115.

61. For Schleiermacher's description see, *On Religion: Speeches to its Cultured Despisers*, trans. John Oman, with an introduction by Rudolf Otto (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1958).

62. Inge, *Studies of English Mystics*, 27-28.

63. Inge, like von Hugel, argued that it was panentheistic, that God was both immanent and transcendent (Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, 179; McGinn, *Foundations*, 295; and Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion*, 9).

64. [Dougall], *Voluntas Dei*, 93.

65. [Dougall] *Voluntas Dei*, 51. The question of loss of personal identity was a difficult one which divided modernists, and was glossed over by Dougall (see Inge, *Personal Idealism and Mysticism*, chapter V; and C.C.J. Webb, "Rashdall as Philosopher and Theologian," in Matheson, *Life of Hastings Rashdall*, 240-249).

66. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, 5.

67. See Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, 290.

68. Inge, *Personal Idealism and Mysticism*, 5.

69. [Dougall], *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*, 167.

70. [Dougall], *Absente Reo*, 293.

71. [Dougall], *Absente Reo*, 20.

72. [Dougall], *Voluntas Dei*, 15.

73. Quoted in Stephenson, *English Modernism*, 73.

74. [Dougall], *Absente Reo*, 127.

75. *New Studies in Mystical Religion* (London: Macmillan, 1927), 23-24.

76. Fosdick, ed., *Rufus Jones Speaks to our Time*, v.

77. Jones' wide readership reveals that, in tracing a usable past for the Society of Friends, he was also establishing a mystical heritage for other liberal Protestants (see in particular, *The Flowering of Mysticism: the Friends of God in the Fourteenth Century* [London: Macmillan, 1939]; and *Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* [London: Macmillan, 1914]).

78. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, xiv.

79. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, 243.

80. Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, 139.

81. Inge, *Vale*, 39.

82. [Dougall], *Absente Reo*, 279.

83. Program of the Church Congress, Box 6, LDP, BL. Underhill also subsequently moved to a more corporatist understanding of spirituality.

84. [Lily Dougall], "Reading Summer School, Impressions by Members, By on Onlooker," *The Friend, a Religious, Literary, and Miscellaneous Journal* LIII, No. 38 (19 September 1913): 609-610.

85. Lily Dougall, *God's Way with Man, An Exploration of the Method of the Divine Working suggested by the Facts of History and Science*, with an introduction and biographical note by Canon B.H. Streeter (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1924), 55.

86. Dougall, *God's Way with Man*, 56.

Evangelicalism, Revivalism and the Female Contribution: Emily Spencer Kerby

ANNE M. WHITE

On 3 October 1938, Emily Kerby, a noted and respected Calgarian and "Pioneer Clubwoman," died at the age of 78. This was just eight days before she and her husband, George W. Kerby, were to celebrate their fiftieth wedding anniversary.[1] In a report of the funeral service held at Central United Church, the *Calgary Daily Herald* noted that over 1,000 people were seated in the flower-filled church to pay tribute to her. Emily Kerby was considered a woman who had exerted a profound influence on "the ministry and laity of the United Church of Alberta."[2]

So highly respected was Kerby that leading United Churchmen from across Canada attended the funeral. Two prominent United Church ministers and an Anglican Bishop officiated at her burial service. United Church Minister, Rev. Mr. Aitken, observed in his concluding funeral address: "For her monument, look around you. The many here today are few in comparison with the many throughout Canada who are paying tribute with us in spirit." Aitken continued by expressing gratitude for a life ". . . filled with beautiful devotion and loyalty to Jesus Christ. Mrs. Kerby lives, will continue to live, and her memory will live as a greater beacon on the horizon to challenge our young women to loftier and holier lives."[3]

Identifying the Elusive Mrs. Kerby

Surprisingly, apart from the glowing accolades and the obvious popularity of the old lady, the life story of Emily Kerby is not a familiar one.[4] This is somewhat bewildering as she was a co-worker alongside Nel-

lie McClung, Alice Jamieson, Emily Murphy, Irene Parlby, Lily Woodhall, Henritta Muir Edwards, Kate Underwood and Annie Davidson, to name a few, in the struggle for female equality.

Primary source material presents Kerby as an evangelical Christian strongly committed to female emancipation, education and far-reaching social reforms.[5] She was a strong and forceful person with a mind of her own.[6] Sometimes her approach was considered brusque for which she was openly criticized.[7]

When Kerby moved west to settle near the Canadian Rockies in a small city called Calgary she found a rugged frontier society wide open to innovation and experimentation. Calgary, or "Cowtown," afforded her ample opportunity to participate in the building of a city, a social infrastructure and a truly western identity.

That Emily Kerby was passionately involved in social issues is not surprising if one considers her background within Methodism. Methodism was the product of the eighteenth-century evangelical revival. At its very centre Methodism possessed a belief system centred around evangelism and social renewal. This zeal was transported to Canada and led to the successful establishment and rapid growth of the denomination within Canadian society.

Emily Kerby's life, personal development and lasting influence sprang out of her evangelical, revivalist roots. Her unique contribution can be identified through the ways she was able to utilize these dynamics during a truly fascinating period of Canadian history – the establishment of the west.

Background

Emily Spencer was born in Toronto on 26 March 1859.[8] Her family came from an established prosperous Methodist background with United Empire Loyalist roots.[9] Unfortunately, but not surprisingly, there are no details available about Emily's mother. There are, however, records available which show that Emily's father was a Methodist minister, one James Spencer, M.A., a professor at Victoria College, Toronto, who went on to become editor of the Methodist publication, *Christian Guardian*.[10]

Emily Spencer was an intelligent young woman. In keeping with the Methodist emphasis on education, she was well-educated, graduating from the Toronto Normal School in the mid-1880s. Later she became principal of a large public school in Paris, ON.

Miss Spencer first met the newly-ordained Methodist minister George William Kerby in Woodstock, ON. It was Kerby's first charge and significantly the couple met during a revival that was occurring in Woodstock under his preaching. During the early days of the Woodstock revival in 1888 attendance swelled from 100 to 400 persons. By the end of 1888 the revival had increased numbers to around 1,000 which caused chronic seating problems.

It was on October 11 of that same year that George Kerby and Emily Spencer were married.[11] The Methodist minister officiating at the marriage ceremony was the Rev. Dr. J.S. Williamson.[12]

The Revivalist Minister George Kerby

George Kerby was a charismatic man and a notably gifted preacher. He became one of a select band of evangelists set apart by the Methodist Conference to travel throughout Canada and the United States, preaching the Methodist conversion experience in a revival context.[13] Methodist evangelists went out in teams of two; there are many references in the *Christian Guardian* during the early 1900s to the work of these ordained men.[14] In keeping with this tradition George Kerby was "set apart" along with fellow minister George R. Turk, at a special service held on 25 August 1901, at Dundas Street Church, Woodstock, for this work.[15]

Kerby and Turk embarked upon an extensive preaching tour of Canada and the United States commencing in 1901. Kerby was a popular evangelical preacher who attracted large audiences. On one occasion in San Francisco he preached to 10,000 people. Kerby also preached to an equally large crowd under the cover of a Barnum and Bailey Circus Tent, in Chattanooga, Tennessee.[16] In the meantime, dutiful Emily was left on her own, with sole responsibility for the care of their two children, Helen and Spencer and the upkeep of the household. During this preaching tour George Kerby traversed Canada twice and consequently saw little of his wife and children.[17]

When Kerby concluded his preaching tour in 1902 he returned home to Ontario a famous, established Canadian preacher. Many invitations awaited him to take a pastoral charge at various churches in settled parts of Canada. One invitation made a distinct impression upon both Kerbys. It was from a Methodist church in the Northwest Territories, from a new city called Calgary. According to George Kerby the call hit them "Like a bolt out of the blue."[18] Emily Kerby is credited with having been the major

influence upon George to eventually take up the invitation. It is recorded that she ". . . plumped for the west, urging the frontier over the security of central Canada."[19]

On 2 January 1903 the Calgary press reported that a telegram had been received from the Rev. George W. Kerby. The famous preacher had accepted the call and would take up his ministry on the frontier, in the Northwest Territories, at Calgary Central Methodist Church.[20] The Kerbys, genteel easterners, from settled central Canada, would soon experience rugged western society in the city of Calgary which had developed from a primitive fort encampment into a rough but dynamic centre in approximately nineteen years.[21]

The Call of the West

The area known as the Northwest Territories was a wild place . (Alberta became a separate province in 1905.) To the credit of the North West Mounted Police (NWMP) law and order was kept efficiently. Intriguingly, the application of the law itself was sometimes open to surprising innovation. At times it was creatively interpreted on the spot, so flexible was the environment in which law enforcement found itself.[22]

Calgary was nicknamed "Cowtown." There was good reason for this because, apart from Catholic and Protestant missionary work and the whisky trade, ranching was primarily the first established white endeavour in the area. In the city's early years cows would walk or run through the streets along with stampeding sheep and sometimes a herd or two of rampaging pigs.[23]

When the Kerbys arrived they found a city which was home to many noted and wild eccentrics. For example, Mrs. Caroline Fulham (Mother Fulham) raised pigs which she sheltered in her basement during the frigid winter months. She collected pig swill from the downtown hotels by using her old horse and dilapidated buggy to haul her cargo. Mother Fulham was belligerent when drunk but was known also to do great acts of kindness for needy neighbours.[24]

The climate and terrain of the foothills of Alberta also presented health and safety problems. The banks of the Bow and Elbow rivers often displayed the bloated carcasses of dead cows, sheep and other animals that had either floated down the river or collapsed on the banks. Flies were in great abundance and in the dry heat of summer, combined with the strong prairie winds, the discomfort and stench could be intense. In winter, the

Chinook winds melted the snow, leaving muddy ground. This warm weather would then be followed by severe cold which would freeze the mud and snow. The resulting terrain and rotting, unsafe ice, proved treacherous for people and livestock alike.[25]

There was no zone planning and shanties proliferated the surrounding areas.[26] With the influx of settlers and migrants passing through, Calgary was initially a sprawling mass of chaos except for a few select sections such as Mount Royal and Elbow Park.

The Canadian Pacific Railway stopped in Calgary daily.[27] Trains brought not only freight but also hundreds of settlers of all nationalities. There were the Canadian-born, Scots, English, Irish, Welsh, Ukrainians and Austrians, Chinese and Polish; and they came in droves. According to the Census of the Northwest Provinces for the year 1901, the population of Calgary was 4,091. In 1906, the population had risen to 11,967. By 1911 it had reached 60,502.

The potential for expansion and evangelistic opportunity was not lost on the Methodists of central Canada or the western Canadian frontier. The correspondence of the time stressed the need for ministers, local preachers, missionaries and settlers to heed the call and venture out to the frontier to become nation builders.[28] Even the noted missionary the Rev. John McDougall of Morley Mission fame was interviewed by the Christian Guardian to emphasize the need for dedicated Methodists to settle in the west.[29]

It was into this melee of raw expansion and city-building that George Kerby decided to plunge at the prompting of his wife. In the typical heat of a dry foothills summer, during the month of July 1903, the Kerbys arrived in Calgary, via the CPR. From this time on Emily Kerby never looked back. She developed into a noted pioneer social reformer and a hard hitting, articulate representative of women's rights in Canada.

Revival Times in Calgary

George Kerby was pastor of Methodist Central Church in Calgary from 1903 to 1910.[30] Shortly after his arrival Kerby was preaching to packed audiences.[31] He also commenced open air services, often conducting them in the beautiful Canadian Pacific Railroad gardens.[32]

Under George Kerby's evangelical preaching there appears to have been a substantial religious ingathering in Calgary. Methodist records are unclear, however, as to whether they made the correlation between

numbers, conversions and a full-blown revival.[33] There was mention that the number of new members and families moving into the city was "very great. "[34]

In a letter to the *Christian Guardian* George Kerby wrote that "there were signs of a great awakening in the Sabbath school and a change of viewpoint," in dealing with people "in need of the Christian religion."[35] Kerby, the revivalist, was also quoted as saying that there was "great opportunity" and that "the people had been very responsive, "with conversions occurring on a regular basis.[36] On one occasion in the latter part of July 1904, Kerby preached to over 1,500 persons in the open air. In that same year it was also noted that the "Methodists had a most prosperous year," and that communicants had increased by 117 persons, making a total of 417 members.[37]

George Kerby's preaching not only emphasised conversion experience but also placed great importance on reaching the transient young male population of Calgary. Indeed, George embraced this cause whole- heartedly and took up the crusade for establishing an outreach for them via the Calgary Young Men' s Club in 1904. This cause became one of the George Kerby's greatest endeavours in evangelism during his pastorate at Central Methodist. In his writings he constantly emphasized that "the whole working force of the church needs an infusion of young, virile manhood."[38] Kerby was also an outspoken critic of many of the social ills affecting Calgary.[39] Unfortunately, the problems of female transients or immigrants did not seem to affect him as deeply as did the lot of the young men.[40]

Emily Kerby as a Church Worker

Emily Kerby was an educated, shrewd, capable woman who possessed considerable organizational skills. As the minister's wife she also participated in the experience of the revival movement in Calgary during this time. From the beginning, however, she was identified as being "different." There were specific church duties which she was expected to fulfil but the records indicate that she was not the typical pastor's wife. Tactful observations were made that "she was not active in offices as many women we could mention, but her name appears in the old minutes of the women's organizations; she gave Scriptural readings with comments, led in prayer, gave talks, offered many motions and ideas, and also, she sang in duets."[41]

Mrs. Kerby's use of exhortation in itself at that time was unusual in a western Canadian context. Women did not, in mixed company, give Scripture readings with comments or lead in prayer. This was a tradition from central Canada where female preachers and class leaders in Ontario and Manitoba exhorted and expounded.[42] However, in the district identified as Alberta during this era, women did not generally lead in mixed church gatherings, and that included the traditional Methodist class meeting. The only exceptions were deaconesses or minister's wives if they were competent. Emily Kerby was a marked exception. The first record of her appointment as a class leader was in 1910. This was the same year that George Kerby left his pastoral charge to become the first Principal of Mount Royal College.[43] Again, two years later in 1912, Emily Kerby is recorded teaching an especially esteemed group within the Methodist Church, this being the young men's Anti-Knockers Bible Class.[44]

Revival According to Emily Kerby

From articles appearing in the *Christian Guardian* around this era Methodists appear to have been seeking a full-scale Canadian revival.[45] In fact, in 1912 George Kerby was writing of the need for ". . . a revival of the mystic element in religion – the search after God, the better to fit us to cope with the bewildering issues of our age."[46] From the correspondence of the time, there appears to be a general consensus that revival meant "the renewing and increase of spiritual life."[47]

It is from the writings of Emily Kerby, however, that a new twist or emphasis on the qualities of revival emerges. Emily Kerby's definition of an indispensable element within revivalism was a prototype feminist interpretation of freedom. The sentiments she expressed in written rebuttal to a particularly offensive idea prove illuminating in this context. Some Methodist men, in their quest for revival and holiness, believed that liquor, tobacco and women were inextricably woven together and proved to be a demoralizing influence. Kerby wrote from around the time of the revival in Calgary early in her work as an activist: "Yes, we need a revival, a revival that will not make the name of womankind a byword or a jest." She continued further by stating

> Woman is a human being, endowed with capabilities as great as man, but she ha s never had a chance. Men have told women for centuries just what they are, what they must be and do. They must be ignorant

> to please the men. But God came to our rescue in the way of education, and the revival is upon us. Educated womanhood is asserting her right to a place in the sun. Can someone tell me why men think God made the world for the male half (or less than half) of his creation? It is the most utter case of egotism imaginable.[48]

The sentiments expressed in this passage embody the creed and dynamic by which Emily Kerby lived and worked. Kerby channelled her evangelical, revivalist beliefs into causes which would aid society and women in particular. She believed that freedom, self-respect and education were the fruits of revival and were rights that women should possess in the Kingdom of God.

Feminist Christian versus the Methodist and United Church

In furthering her goals for social reform Emily Kerby encountered many obstacles. Her writings bear witness to her alienation and frnstration with both the Methodist and then the United Church in its attitude towards women. In 1915, under her non deplume Constance Lynd she was one of a vocal number of women in the suffrage movement, censuring the organized Methodist church for its reluctance to allow women equal rights in the church courts.[49]

The ordination of women was also a volatile issue with many Christian female thinkers of the time. Kerby's intense estrangement from the hierarchy of the Methodist Church was expressed very articulately when, as Constance Lynd, she pondered the absence of women in the ministry:

> She is the one who first teaches the infant lips to lisp the name of Jesus; she is the one who first endeavours to set the tiny feet upon the right paths, yet when it comes to that day when these same children are of an age to be taken into the church, only men stand at the altar to receive them. No kindly face of motherly woman greets with outstretched hands to welcome them into the church, and to encourage them in the way she has sought to lead them.[50]

It was not until 1935 that the issue of ordination for women was resolved within the United Church with the ordination of Lydia Gruchy.

Emily Kerby effectively pursued most of her own personal innovative social activism through the various clubs to which she

belonged.[51] Remarkably at the same time, she still played an important role within her denomination despite the contradictions and disillusionment she experi- enced as women fought for equality within it.

Alongside her husband, Emily helped develop many church activities to address the needs of the rapidly expanding Calgarian population.[52] As a Methodist churchwoman she played an influential role in both the Ladies Aid Society and the powerful Women's Missionary Society (WMS).[53] The WMS was very active in evangelization not only overseas but within Canada. In Alberta alone there were numerous missions, including ones to the Ruthenians.[54]

The Pioneer Calgary Clubwoman

To do justice to Emily Kerby's achievements it is necessary to examine some of her endeavours. It becomes apparent that the commitment necessary to sustain and complete many of the objectives was enormous and her record of influence and social commitment within Calgary proves impressive.[55] Emily Kerby helped design, fashion and build a great part of the social infrastructure of Calgary, wider Alberta and, to a degree, even wider Canada.

The Young Women's Christian Association

By 1906 the population of Calgary had swelled to 11,967. The projections for 1907 anticipated another giant leap in the immigrant population. 1907 did prove to be a particularly heavy year for immigration to the western provinces and Calgary was, as always, a focal point along the way. When the immigrants started to arrive in March it was clear that there was going to be an accommodation crisis. Some of the leading clubwomen in Calgary were concerned about the plight of single girls and women who would be in need of shelter and aid.

On 2 July 1907 Emily Kerby convened a meeting at Central Methodist Church to discuss the problems that immigrant women were going to face. Mrs. John McDougall, Mrs. G.S. Jamieson and Mrs. Thomas Underwood, together with several other women, met to discuss the feasibility of organizing a Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) in Calgary. The meeting was opened with prayer led by Kerby. Fundraising was planned and Emily Kerby suggested that every woman be asked to raise $100 each. This was unanimously agreed.[56]

On 29 October 1907 the board minutes record that Kerby, seconded

by Mrs. Patterson, moved that a meeting of all young ladies in the city be called for Monday evening, November 4. By the time this meeting convened suitable accommodation for the YWCA had been found and enough money raised to pay one month's rent in advance. Mrs. Kerby moved that the accommodation be rented immediately. That same month the YWCA opened to meet the needs of some of the many immigrant females in Calgary.[57]

As part of the on-going aggressive fundraising campaign, the YWCA took charge of the publication of a major Calgary newspaper, the Calgary Daily Herald, for one day. The owners of paper were Methodists. All proceeds from the sale of the newspaper for that day – 31 July 1909 – were donated to the YWCA. The YWCA Minutes for 31May1909 record the various job descriptions; Emily Kerby was managing editor.[58]

By 1910 there was a Travellers Aid program in place and by 1912 not only did the YWCA have a facility of its own but it also offered social service programs.[59] In addition, there were physical education courses, summer camps, accommodation and employment services, and swimming and basketball tournaments for girls and women.[60] The board minutes for 3 August 1914 recorded that the number of trains met to that date for that year was 490. The total number of women assisted was 941.[61]

Emily Kerby was elected honorary president of the YWCA in 1907 and continued to serve as president and then board member until 1920.

Mount Royal College – Unpaid Teacher and Mentor

In 1910 George Kerby left his very successful ministry at Central United Methodist Church to become Principal of Mount Royal Junior College. By 1911 Emily Kerby was a teacher and mentor within the college. Using her teaching skills, she taught the junior grades for some years. Although holding a very influential position she donated all her expertise and never received financial payment of any kind.[62] At the college Emily Kerby enjoyed discussing cultural and political events and was ". . . in the habit of entertaining ladies who shared her interests in cultural causes at lunch at her table in the dining room. "[63]

It was from these interests that one of her greatest and most enduring contributions to Mount Royal College evolved. Emily Kerby organized the Mount Royal Educational Club for female students in about 1923.[64] (The Club continues to this day.) The Educational Club was designed "to draw women together from all walks of life" notwithstanding class or cultural background.[65] Membership was restricted to 65 members and each year the

club would present a scholarship to a girl in financial need who would otherwise not be able to complete her studies at the college.[66] The women would spend time studying issues of national and international interest. Each year a different country would be examined in depth. Members would break off into groups to collaborate on research pertaining to specific aspects of the designated country's religious, historical and cultural background. The women met on a monthly basis and the program ran from September to May each year.[67]

In the second year of the club's operation the leaders were listed as being Mrs. Emily Kerby and Mrs. Nellie McClung. It was their task to present the program and oversee it until the completion of studies.

The Calgary Local Council of Women

The Local Council of Women (LCW) acted as a forum and lobby for women's societies.[68] In 1912 the Calgary LCW was organized by Henrietta Muir Edwards. Alice Jamieson was elected interim president and Emily Kerby the first vice-president. In 1917-1918 Kerby served as president and she remained active in the LCW as a board member for many years.

Emily Kerby was personally involved in many issues of the day both locally, provincially and nationally. Her endeavours within the LCW included temperance issues, women's rights and suffrage. In addition, she was also actively involved in mundane things such as building and zone bylaws which included the enforcement of the prohibition of "so called" boxing bouts within the city limits.[69] Part of the LCW's civic platform also included weed control, the disposal of sewage and the discouragement of Sunday trading.[70]

In the LCW, Kerby was active in lobbying for equal enforcement of the law for both men and women and the appointment of a "woman policeman" or police matron.[71] Emily Kerby's commitment to women's rights also led to her involvement in the successful campaigns which saw the election of the first female Calgary Public School Board chairman and the first female school trustee.[72] She was also actively engaged in the successful campaign to elect the first female alderwoman in Calgary and, for that matter, within Canada.[73]

Emily Kerby was very aware of issues at the local level. As chairperson at the first Women's Forum in Calgary held in 1912, she recounted a statement which she had overheard on Eighth Avenue in central Calgary regarding the upcoming municipal elections. It reflected the antagonism

felt by some male voters towards the participation of women in the elections. She recounted, "We could run these elections all right if only these darned women could be kept out."[74] When, at the Forum, aldermanic candidate Alexander Ross, stated his appreciation that the women were there to be addressed as men, Mrs. Kerby quickly responded "No, not as men, sir! As Women." And then later, in response to yet another inappropriate statement made by Ross, she commented, "As women, sir, with our own rights."[75]

Emily Kerby was also extremely concerned about the child marriage custom for girls from Ruthenian (Austrian and Ukrainian) cultural backgrounds. In December 1913 she stressed that the girls from these communities were being denied a formal education and had no rights to the choice of a marriage partner. In these communities it was considered a disgrace if by the age of fifteen a girl was "not married and the mother of one or two children."[76] The LCW strove to bring this to the attention of many women's groups and lobbied both on a local and national level to have the marriage age raised from 18 to 21 to counter younger girls under 18 being passed off as of legal marriageable age.[77] The lobby was unsuccessful.

On the matter of equal franchise, at the January 1914 LCW Annual Meeting, Emily Kerby stated

> . . . Don't tell me the old story about woman being placed on a pedestal. Things are usually placed there on account of their value or for protection. Men are afraid the possession of the franchise will drag women down, but men do not hesitate to drag down the pedestal . . . We did not lose any of our womanliness in the recent civic election, why should we in provincial or Dominion?[78]

The struggle for the franchise was a long one. Kerby was the convenor of the Franchise Committee for the LCW. At the same time she was a personal friend of Albertan Premier Arthur Sifton, and spoke to him personally about the franchise issue.[79] In this connection she met with Sifton, together with her colleagues Mrs. Jamieson and Mrs. Langford. As a trio they "requested that the franchise be granted."[80] While McClung and Murphy applied political pressure, Alice Jamieson as president of the LCW and Emily Kerby as convenor, also worked strenuously for the cause within the group. When the date was fixed for the Suffrage Bill's final reading Sifton phoned Emily Kerby with the details of the time set for the debate and vote.[81] Emily Kerby, Alice Jamieson and the editor for the

Woman's Page of the *Calgary Daily Herald* organized a large delegation from Calgary to travel to the Legislature via the CPR. The second reading of the Bill was passed on Thursday, 2 March 1916, and the franchise was gained.[82]

Continuing on with the right to vote, commencing in the spring of 1916, Nellie McClung launched a federal franchise petition from her base in Alberta. In 1917 Emily Kerby, as president of the LCW, wholeheartedly supported the campaign, and the full lobbying support of the Calgary Council was behind McClung in yet another drawn out political wrangle.[83] Finally, on 24 May 1918, Canadian women, 21 years and over, were granted the federal franchise.[84]

In 1921 Emily Kerby was still actively lobbying, this time for the right of women to be legally considered "persons." Recognition must, of course, be rightly given primarily to the famous petitioners – the "Famous Five" – Murphy, McClung, Muir Edwards, Parlby and McKinney. It is fair to state, however, that Emily Kerby campaigned in her capacity as Vice President of the National Counsel of Women (1922-1924) and also later as an ordinary member.[85]

Overview of Other Clubs

Emily Kerby played an influential role in many other clubs locally and nationally. In 1911 she was a charter member of the Women's Canadian Club and was president of that organization in 1913. She was a member of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the Red Cross, the Women's Civic Organization and the Women's Research Club. In 1921, collaborating with Dr. G.W. Kerby, Emily Kerby organized the Canadian Authors Association.

Kerby was also a prolific writer contributing to various magazines and religious periodicals. Her work and letters were published in publications such as the *Women's Century*, *Chatelaine*, *The New Outlook*, *Christian Guardian*, *Maple Leaf*, *Calgary Daily Herald* and *The Albertan*.

Emily Kerby was a dynamic woman, with ordinary faults and extraordinary virtues. What made her special was the unique blend of socio-religious influences which forged her distinctive personality. Middle-class, sometimes autocratic, she was still a committed evangelical Christian who effected great change in her time. In death the testimony of her life was clear – by her community she was regarded as "A Mother in Israel."[86]

Endnotes

1. *The Albertan*, 5 October 1938.
2. *Calgary Daily Herald*, 7 October 1938.
3. *Calgary Daily Herald*, 7 October 1938.
4. See Michael Owen, "'Do women really count?' Emily Spencer Kerby – Early Twentieth-Century Alberta Feminist," *Historical Papers: Canadian Society of Church History* (1995): 101-126. In *A Leaven of Ladies: A History of the Calgary Local Council of Women* (Calgary: Detselig Enterprises, 1995), Marjorie Norris, discusses Kerby in relation to the Local Council of Women. Emily Kerby is mentioned in relation to her contribution to the work of Central Methodist Church and then upon Central United, Calgary (*They Gathered at the River* [Calgary: Central United Church, 1975]).
5. John Howse, "A History of Mount Royal College," unpublished manuscript, Mount Royal College Archives, chapter V, 3.
6. Dr. W.J. Collett, past-President of Mount Royal College, Interview by author, March 1996, Calgary, AB. Dr. Collett remembers Emily Kerby as a gifted organizer, possessing strong determination.
7. During the First World War she urged Calgary wives to persuade their husband to enlist. George Kerby at that time was Chief Recruiting Officer for the Province of Alberta. "Before Mrs. Kerby gives this advice, she should clean out the pool rooms and round up all the young single men who have no obligations. If all our married men are to go and leave young single men at home what is to become of Alberta? Who is to take care of the thousands of orphans who will be left? Who will help the war widows raise their families?" (see Howse, "History of Mount Royal College," chapter V, 4).
8. *The Calgary Herald*, 4 October 1938.
9. Howse, "History of Mount Royal College," chapter V, 4.
10. H. Baden Powell, untitled manuscript, n.d., Central United Church Papers, Glenbow Archives (hereafter GA).
11. Howse, "History of Mount Royal College," chapter V, 9.
12. Mrs. Doris Kennedy, Interview by author, April 1996, Calgary, AB. Mrs. Kennedy was awarded the Woman of Distinction medal in 1953 for community service. She was Executive Director of the Young Women's Christian Association from 1959-1964. In 1963 she started Operation Eyesight Universal in Calgary. Dr. Williamson was Mrs. Kennedy's maternal

grandfather. Mrs. Kennedy, nee Bingham, was ten years old when the family trekked westward from Ontario to Calgary in 1919. At the time of the move Dr. Williamson was concerned that he would never see them again as they were moving "so far away."

13. See evangelist George R. Turk's revival experience, "Two Years in the Evangelistic Work," *Christian Guardian* (9 September 1903), 8.

14. *Christian Guardian*, 21 August 1901; 4 March 1903; 9 September 1903. In a November 1904 edition evangelists McLachlan and Hughson are mentioned in the High River area. Later, in 28 April 1915, evangelists Gilbert and McPherson are mentioned regarding evangelism in the Pincher Creek area.

15. *Christian Guardian*, 21 August 1901, 1.

16. Undated manuscript, United Church Papers, GA.

17. Lewis G. Thomas, "The View from Sheep Creek, 1918-1939, Calgary," in *Citymakers: Calgarians After the Frontier*, eds. Max Foran and Shielagh S. Jamieson (Calgary: Historical Society of Alberta, 1987).

18. *Calgary Daily Herald*, 4 October 1938.

19. Howse, "History of Mount Royal College," chapter V, 8.

20. Grant MacEwan, *Calgary Cavalcade: From Fort to Fortune* (Edmonton: Institute of Applied Art, 1958), 150.

21. Fort Macleod was established by Inspector A.E. Brisbois for the Macleod garrison in August 1875 eight years after Confederation. Brisbois set up camp in the angle formed by the confluence of the Bow and Elbow Rivers. Fort Macleod became Calgary in 1876. Calgary was the name chosen by settlers predominantly from Scottish backgrounds, after Calgary, on the Mull of Kintyre (Leishman McNeill, *The Calgary Herald's Tales of the Old Town* [Calgary: Calgary Herald, 1967], 83-101).

22. MacEwan, *Calgary Cavalcade*, 3. The story of a Montana whisky trader around 1874-1875 is recounted. The whisky trader was apprehended by the NWMP and had his profits of 1,000 buffalo robes confiscated. Irate, he confronted Colonel James F. Macleod. "Hey, Colonel," he yelled, "is that the law?" Colonel Macleod is reported to have replied, "As matters stand at the present, we make the law as we go along."

23. Sheep and cattle were ranged extensively in the Foothills area of Alberta. The pigs would have been mostly courtesy of Mother Fulham, the Pig Lady (see Grant MacEwan's story of Caroline Fulham in . . . *and Mighty Women too: Stories of Notable Western Canadian Women* [Saskatoon: Western Producer

Prairie Books, 1975). 119-126).

24. MacEwan, . . . *and Mighty Women too*, 119-120.

25. Catherine Philips, "The Fair Frail Flower of Western Womanhood, " in *Frontier Calgary: Town, City and Region, 1875-1914*, eds. A.W. Rasporich and Henry Klassen (Calgary: Univ. of Calgary, McClelland and Stewart West, 1975), 114-123.

26. Mother Fulham's home was situated near to the shanties. After keeping her pigs all winter, she slaughtered them in the spring. The only problem with this was that the pigs had grown too large to get up the stairs of her basement. She adopted the practice of slaughtering the unfortunate animals in her basement and the squeals were heard at great distances. It was her unkempt ways that led to the introduction of municipal planning in Calgary and the surrounding district (see Howse, "History of Mount Royal College," chapter 1).

27. The Winnipeg to Calgary section of the CPR was officially completed on 28 August 1883 (see McNeil, *The Calgary Herald's Tales of the Old Town*, 85ff).

28. Rev. Walter Smith, "The Missionary's Enemy in the West," *Christian Guardian*, 1901. See also *Christian Guardian*, 14 August 1901; 14 May 1902; 28 May 1902; 16 September 1902; 31 December 1902; 14 January 1903; 2 December 1903; 24 April 1904; December 1904. George Turk's mentions George Kerby having "joined the ranks of nation builders in the great Canadian west" (*Christian Guardian*, 9 September 1903).

29. *Christian Guardian*, 11 February 1903.

30. The Methodist Book of Discipline limited duration of tenure to four years. Kerby was pastor at the same church for nearly eight years which indicates a special set of circumstances.

31. *The Albertan*, 4 October 1938.

32. *Christian Guardian*, 24 August 1904.

33. Fraser Perry, "Central Methodist Church Before WWI," in *Frontier Calgary*, 181ff. Fraser Perry observes that congregations of whatever complexion never kept records indicating the views of members.

34. "Calgary District," *Christian Guardian*, 9 March 1904, 28.

35. "The Calgary Young Men's Club," *Christian Guardian*, 16 March 1904.

36. *Christian Guardian*, 13 July 1904.

37. Undated clipping, United Church Papers, GA. The Methodist church immediately began a period of enormous growth under Kerby's pastorate. From 1900 to 1910 member ship grew from 14 to about 1,250 (see *They Gathered at the River*, 46).

38. G.W. Kerby, "Calgary Young Men's Club," *Christian Guardian*, 16 March 1904.

39. MacEwan, Cavalcade, 152. Calgarians heard fearless sermons about Calgary's "moral mudholes" and strong messages about the need for better welfare programs.

40. "In his first sermon [at Central Methodist Church] he said that he would appeal to the young men during his ministry here, for through them he hoped to reach all their connection" (*They Gathered at the River*, 190).

41. Mrs. F.E. Graham, Central Women-Centennial Program, 1967, 4, United Church Papers, GA.

42. Elizabeth Muir traces the evolution of female preacher s within British Methodism and the development of the same office within an Upper Canadian context (*Petticoats in the Pulpit: The Story of Early Nineteenth-Century Methodist Women Preachers in Upper Canada* [Toronto: United Church Publishing House, 1991]). Marilyn Färdig Whiteley identifies the tradition of female evangelists in the late nineteenth and early into the twentieth century ("Modest, Unaffected, and Fully Consecrated: Lady Evangelists in Canadian Methodism," in *Changing Roles of Women Within the Christian Church in Canada*, eds. Elizabeth Muir and Marilyn Färdig Whiteley [Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1995]).

43. *They Gathered at the River*, 303.

44. *They Gathered at the River*, 176.

45. See *Christian Guardian*, 4 February 1903, 3 April 1903, 3 June 1903, 20 January 1904, and 28 July 1915.

46. Rev. G.W. Kerby, "Milestones in Methodism: Calgary and Canada, 1912," in *They Gathered at the River*, 33.

47. "Wanted – a General Revival," *Christian Guardian*, February 1903.

48. E.S. Kerby, "A Defence of the Capability and Dignity of Women by a Human Being and a Woman," *Calgary Daily Herald*, n.d., 6.

49. Constance Lynd, "No Votes for Married Women," *Christian Guardian*, 14 April 1915, 27. This editorial expressed shock that the municipal franchise for women in Ontario had been rejected by the Provincial Government. Lynd brought them to task for their hypocrisy, drawing attention to the fact that women had no vote or equality with men in the Church courts either. In 1918 the Canadian Methodist Assembly unanimously passed the resolution that women should have equal rights with men in church membership (see Mary Hallet and Marilyn Davis, *Firing the Heather: The Life and Times of Nellie McClung* [Saskatoon: Fifth House, 1993], 191-192).

50. Constance Lynd, "Grist," clipping, n.d., Provincial Archives of Alberta 75.387/6028, United Church of Canada, Box 181.

51. Graham, Central Women,4. Graham states that Emily Kerby did not participate as frequently in church offices as many other women of her day did but that "Mrs. Kerby was busy in cultural progress and women's reform movements."

52. H. Baden-Powell, untitled manuscript, n.d., Central United Church Papers, GA, 4 3/4.

53. Norris, A Leaven of Ladies, 53.

54. Michael Owen, "Lighting the Pathways for New Canadians: Methodist and United Church WMS Missions in Eastern Alberta, 1904-1940," in *Standing on New Ground: Women in Alberta*, eds. Catherine Cavanaugh and Randi Warne (Edmonton: Univ. of Alberta Press, 1993), 1-18.

55. Baden-Powell, untitled manuscript, 4 3/4.

56. 2 July 1907, YWCA Board Minutes 1907-1910, GA.

57. 31 May1909, YWCA Board Minutes 1907-1910, GA.

58. 31 May1909, YWCA Board Minutes 1907-1910, GA.

59. 27 May 1912, YWCA Board Minutes, GA.

60. YWCA, Annual Report, 1911.

61. 3 August 1914, YWCA Board Minutes, GA.

62. Howse, "History of Mount Royal College," chapter V, 3.

63. Thomas, "The View from Sheep Creek," 42.

64. Introduction card dated 1936, File M8463, Mount Royal Educational Club Papers, GA. This item gives the date oforigin as 1912 but this appears to be inaccurate. The other dates given are 1923 and 1927. As Nellie McClung only

moved to Calgary in 1923 and was a joint presenter two years later it wou ld reasonable to conclude that Kerby established the Mount Royal in 1923. In 1924 the Club had a whole program and calendar of research presentations recorded.

65. Thomas, "The View from Sheep Creek," 287.

66. Howse, "History of Mount Royal College," chapter V, 4.

67. File M8463, Mount Royal Educational Club Papers, GA.

68. Norris, *A Leaven of Ladies*, v.

69. Norris, *A Leaven of Ladies*, 57.

70. Norris, *A Leaven of Ladies*, 57.

71. Norris, *A Leaven of Ladies*, 57.

72. Norris, *A Leaven of Ladies*, 26, 27. Calgary's first female Public School Board Chairman was Mrs. Anne Langford. Calgary's first female School Trustee (1914-1917) was Annie Graham Foote.

73. Norris, *A Leaven of Ladies*, 27. Mrs. Annie Gale was Canada's first Alderwoman.

74. Norris, *A Leaven of Ladies*, 57.

75. Norris, *A Leaven of Ladies*, 57.

76. Norris, *A Leaven of Ladies*, 89.

77. Undated letter from the Local Council of Women, c. 1913, from Lillie McKinney, Correspondence Secretary, File M8463, Mount Royal Educational Club Papers, GA.

78. "Council of Women Out for Franchise: Past Year Saw Important Work Done," *Morning Albertan*, 24 January 1914, 9.

79. Sifton was also a Methodist and had helped George Kerby with the establishment of Mount Royal College. He was Premier of Alberta from 1910 to 1917.

80. Introduction card dated 1936, File M8463, Mount Royal Educational Club Papers, Miscellaneous clippings, GA.

81. Introduction card dated 1936, File M8463, Mount Royal Educational Club Papers, GA.

82. "Alberta Women Hear Reading of The Woman's Suffrage Bill," *Calgary News-Telegram*, 2 March 1916, 13.

83. Kerby was president of the LCW for the period 1916-1917.

84. Norris, *A Leaven of Ladies*, 96.

85. Norris, *A Leaven of Ladies*, 114. Kerby had input through petitions and lobbying through the NCU. Women's groups proved too weak to lobby at a federal level and Murphy went on to challenge this through the Supreme Court of Canada. Women were recognized as persons on 18 October 1929.

86. "Hundreds Pay Last Respects to Mrs. Kerby," *Calgary Daily Herald*, 7 October 1938.

"Bred in the Bone:" Egerton Ryerson, Methodist Polity and Educational Administration, 1844-1850[1]

DAVID YATES

No one disputes the fact that the appointment of Egerton Ryerson as Superintendent of Education in 1844 was a significant one. Indeed, J.S. Moir has argued that it was "the most important event in the educational history of the province."[2] Even though Ryerson did not single-handedly create the Upper Canadian school system out of whole cloth, his appointment nonetheless stands as a watershed event. It was Ryerson who, more than any other single individual, provided the initiative and the ideas to construct an effective system of common schools throughout the province.[3]

But where did Ryerson get his ideas for this system? What were the sources which influenced him in shaping the fledgling bureaucracy – a state bureaucracy, it must be said, that was virtually the first of its kind in nineteenth-century Ontario?[4] The received version of the development of public education under Ryerson's administration begins with his fifteen-month tour to study the educational systems of the eastern United States, Britain and Europe. Upon his return in 1846, Ryerson wrote his observations and recommendations in a *Report on a System of Public Instruction for Upper Canada*, which became the basis for the School Act of 1846 and its subsequent refinements. This is the gist of the argument in C.B. Sissons' magisterial two-volume biography entitled *Egerton Ryerson: His Life and Letters*. Sissons attributes almost all of Ryerson's subsequent educational reforms to his overseas experiences. This is also the view taken in J.D. Wilson's chapter in *Canadian Education: A History*. Wilson argues that Ryerson's international tour "sets the framework for the public school system that was evolved over the next three decades."[5] But unlike

Sissons, Wilson notes that Ryerson's system was "much more highly centralized than that of either New York or Massachussetts, the two American states most often referred to by nineteenth-century educational reformers."[6] More recently Bruce Curtis has written that the report, which was the blueprint for an efficient system of education, "borrowed its curriculum, teacher training system, and system of inspection from Ireland, its administrative details from New York state and its 'humanistic' philosophy of education from Prussia via Horace Mann."[7]

There are, however, problems with such interpretations. One is that Ryerson's system was far more centralized than even the American examples to which Wilson and Curtis refer. Another is the assumption that Ryerson had to go abroad to find examples. As the intermittent editor of the highly influential weekly newspaper *Christian Guardian* between 1829 and 1842, Ryerson was a keen follower of educational practices in Europe and America. Thus when Ryerson left on his overseas tour his mind was not a *tabula rasa*. Many of his observations could have been made with the knowledge and experience he had acquired before he left.[8] Equally, Ryerson might well have drawn on indigenous sources for his ideas, building on the earlier failed experiments in system-building attempted by John Strachan, and the debate over school reform during the 1830s and early 1840s. Susan Houston and Alison Prentice point out that foreign examples "figure prominently in the pages of Ryerson's report," but do not maintain that these sources were the inspiration for Ryerson's ideas for administrative reform.[9] Rather, they suggest that the subsequent school law of 1846, supposedly based upon Ryerson's report, "drew less on foreign example than on its own Upper Canadian predecessors."[10] And in an early article on the subject, R.D. Gidney attributes the development of Ontario's "monolith" to "Upper Canadian conservatism" which sought to develop an efficient and effective educational system to "protect and preserve a fragile political structure within which an indigenous tradition could grow."[11]

There are elements of truth in all of these interpretive stances, and all, it must be said, are more sophisticated than this brief historiographical review can suggest. But equally, all overlook one critical hypothesis that deserves exploration. Egerton Ryerson was not only the chief architect of the educational system but a Methodist minister, steeped in Methodist beliefs and doctrines. And the origins of his administrative reforms may well lie in his lived experience of Methodism rather than in his foreign tours, his admittedly wide and eclectic reading before 1846, or his political

aspirations for the future of Upper Canadian society.

On the one hand, an older generation of historians, in most cases scholars not primarily concerned with educational history, have at least recognized the centrality of religion even if they assume its influence on institution-building rather than explain that influence. C.B. Sissons wrote that "the primary and dominanxt motive of his [Ryerson's] life was religious."[12] According to Robin Harris, "Ryerson was a Christian, first, last, and all the time . . . [Ryerson] was a particular kind of Christian, a Methodist, and he subscribed fully to the doctrines of that Church."[13] Aside from an overlooked article by Goldwin French and an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation by Alberto Fiorino, little effort has been made to examine precisely how Ryerson's Methodism shaped his concept of education.[14] More important, none of these authors attempt to compare Methodist polity with Ryerson's organizational schemes.

The revisionist educational historians who began writing in the late 1960s and 1970s, on the other hand, have generally been reluctant even to acknowledge the power of religious conviction in shaping secular institutions, or to attribute nascent forms of social organization to pre-existing models, and this applies not only to the administrative structure itself but to the promotion of schooling generally. For example, in neither of his early articles on these subjects does R.D. Gidney give religion any sustained attention.[15] And though a decade later he would begin a short biography of Ryerson by pointing to the centrality of religion in Ryerson's life, he does not pursue the idea with respect to the school system itself.[16] Both Susan Houston and Alison Prentice explain the development of the province's school system in terms of the efforts of the state and various interest groups to produce an industrious, loyal, sober and "respectable" citizenry.[17] In *Building the Educational State* Bruce Curtis maintains that a coercive and centralized bureaucracy was designed to promote bourgeois and capitalist forms of state formation and to create a populace loyal and subservient to those forms. Whatever the particular interpretive emphasis, in any case, religion, and more particularly the role of Methodism, gets short shrift.

Ontario's educational historians, nonetheless, have been in good company on this point: the academic study of religion has been *terra incognita* for most social historians over the last thirty years, and not just in Ontario but elsewhere as well. Too often the role of religious sentiment as a means of effecting social, economic and political change has been dismissed, underestimated or maligned outright. Perhaps the most specta-

cular example of the latter case, but one that has been enormously influential, is E.P. Thompson's landmark work, *The Making of the English Working Class*. Thompson credits Methodism with almost single-handedly defusing early nineteenth-century working-class discontent in England through "religious terrorism" in Methodist-run Sunday Schools.[18]

Only in recent years has the importance of religion as a social force has been given a more positive and judicious reading. J.C.D. Clark challenges Thompson's cynicism regarding the socio-political function of religious institutions. According to Clark, one cannot begin to understand eighteenth and early nineteenth-century British society unless one understands the paramount influence of religious feeling amongst all classes. Clark contends that British society's "motives and values essentially . . . depended first and foremost on religion."[19] Similarly, the respectability of evangelical Christianity as an intellectual movement has been partially restored by Boyd Hilton, a British political economist. Hilton, like Clark, argues that "before 1850, especially, religious feeling and biblical terminology so permeated all aspects of thought (including atheism) that it is hard to dismiss as epiphenomenal."[20] This permeation of religious sentiment in British society, particularly amongst the middle classes, Hilton argues, had a profound impact upon the social, political and economic institutions which developed throughout the nineteenth century.[21]

Similar conclusions have been reached by influential American historians. Nathan O. Hatch has re-examined the importance of evangelical Protestantism in post-revolutionary America. Religion, far from acting as an agent of social control as Thompson would argue, was a popular and dynamic element in the promotion of egalitarian republicanism. Evangelical sects such as the Baptists and Methodists demanded fundamental social reform. Radical measures such as the abolition of slavery, universal manhood suffrage, temperance and publicly funded schooling were major causes which these religious groups advocated.[22] To ignore or deprecate the impact of evangelical denominational sentiment on a barely literate society in either Britain or North America is to ignore a critical force for change in those societies. "Only land," Hatch argues, "could compete with Christianity as the pulse of a new democratic society."[23]

Parallel arguments have been advanced for developments in British North America. Michael Gauvreau, for example, has pointed to the link between evangelical religion and secular state-building. Far from perceiving Protestant evangelicalism as a "dead-hand" which inhibited social change, Gauvreau concludes that "evangelicalism must be viewed as a

movement of liberation."[24] According to Gauvreau, "evangelicalism supplied the essential mind-set by which English-Canada entered the modern age."[25] He sees in evangelicalism an attempt to reconstruct society. Upper Canadian "concepts of order, respectability, and the patterns of personal and social behaviour which were to prove most influential in forging the values and institutions of the maturing English Canadian society were provided by evangelicalism."[26] In the early nineteenth-century, when institutional apparatus was almost non-existent, the evangelical movement proved to be the most dynamic influence upon Upper Canadian culture.[27]

Two other recent works have also developed this theme of the relationship between religious sentiment and secular decision-making. One of William Westfall's main contentions in *Two Worlds* is that religious beliefs and values permeated every aspect of Upper Canadian life in the early decades of the nineteenth-century and thus, until at least mid-century, the clergy was still very active in civic affairs. Westfall underscores the impact of Protestant culture upon Upper Canadian statecraft: the inter-denominational Protestant culture that emerged in Upper Canada sought to join together, "the secular and sacred worlds."[28] John Webster Grant reached similar conclusions regarding the intimate relationship between Protestant evangelicalism and state institutional growth in Upper Canada. Grant draws attention to the devoutly religious character of many of the interest groups, such as temperance unions, literary societies and benevolent organizations, which shaped government policy.[29] In early Upper Canadian society it did not occur to the inhabitants that "official neutrality" in matters concerning religion meant the exclusion of clerical leadership in matters concerning the state. Boundaries that would separate church and state affairs had yet to be established.[30]

Following the example of historians like Clark, Hatch, Gauvreau, Westfall and Grant, I believe a reassessment of the role of religion in the creation of the Ontario school system is long overdue. In shaping this system and in making it work, I will argue, Ryerson was profoundly influenced by his experience with Methodist organization. Converted in 1815 at age twelve to his Methodist faith, Ryerson virtually came of age with Upper Canadian Methodism itself. Both its message and its "machinery," its doctrines and discipline, were "bred in the bone." Moreover, as his society began to change, Ryerson responded with a critique of his denomination that called for greater education among the ministry and more financial and personal commitment among the laity. Cumulatively, it was these influences which would form the intellectual backdrop as he

turned his hand to building the Upper Canadian school system. One cannot study Ryerson as chief superintendent of education apart from Ryerson the Methodist minister. Prior to becoming superintendent of schools for Upper Canada, Ryerson's only experience with an organizational structure was within the Methodist polity. Many of the organizational reforms that he attempted to introduce had already been articulated in the *Christian Guardian* or derived from John Wesley's *Doctrines and Discipline of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada*, which Ryerson believed was a description of "a system . . . which God has signally blessed."[31] Indeed his central goal was expressed in the phraseology he had once used to describe the virtues of Methodism itself, that is, to impose "uniformity, simplicity and efficiency" upon the Province's schools.[32]

How, then, did Ryerson's Methodism infuse his reform of educational administration, and what parallels can be drawn between his experience as a leading Methodist minister and his role in creating a state system of schools? As I have suggested elsewhere, there are in fact many parallels,[33] but given the limits of this short article I propose to illustrate my argument by focusing on three of them: the similarities between the duties and responsibilities of the office of superintendent in the Methodist polity and the school system; Ryerson's imposition of Methodist statistical collection procedures upon educational administration; and the spiritual dimension with which Ryerson sought to infuse the educational system.

The office of superintendent was a post created by John Wesley to "properly take care of the internal state" of the church.[34] Superintendents, who held responsibility for several circuits, acted as inspectors and liaisons between the circuits and the district chairman.[35] Within *Doctrines and Discipline* more space is devoted to the duties of the superintendent than any other office.[36] The circuit superintendents were to make quarterly reports to the district chairman on a wide variety of matters. Among other duties they were "to see that other preachers behave well and want nothing; to enquire . . . what each Member can give for the salary; to appoint all the Leaders and change them when he sees it necessary; but not contrary to the wish of the Class, or without consulting the Leader's Meeting." Other responsibilities requiring a great deal of paperwork, included maintaining accurate records of the status of membership of each circuit. Printed forms were available to keep records of everything from "Backsliding" members to those admitted on trial.[37] Superintendents were: to examine the finances of the Stewards (treasurers) of each circuit to oversee the creation of new bands and classes; to adjudicate complaints

and problems between members; to recruit potential candidates for ordination and class leaders and to license such people with consultation with local class leaders; and, in general, "to enforce, vigorously, but calmly, all the rules of the Society."[38]

Yet the most important task delegated to the superintendents was the inspection of preachers, class leaders, and exhorters. Each of these was subject to licensing and quarterly inspections. The unpaid and untrained volunteers who made up the corps of class leaders and exhorters were, in principle, subject to "strict enquiry" in regard to their moral character, punctuality and "everything that relates to their office."[39] Their examination and inspection was of the utmost importance to the movement to ensure orthodoxy and the movement's growth.

The substantial duties and responsibilities demanded from the superintendents required considerable powers to enforce them – powers entrusted to the district chairman, who was "to see that every part of the Discipline is duly enforced."[40] The district chairman could change, replace and suspend any preacher found wanting. He could overturn any decision made by the superintendent. The district chairman could be called upon by any superintendent, preacher, or lay leader when difficulties arose. Wesley wrote that the district chairman was given "considerable powers . . . that no Chairman may have cause to complain of the want of power."[41]

Local superintendents were also to play a vital role in Ryerson's educational machinery. Though not new to the education department, the office of superintendent under Ryerson took on greater significance.[42] As "the mainspring of the system," Ryerson recommended an impressive array of clearly defined powers for superintendents in the 1846 report.[43] As in Methodist organization, this office carried tremendous responsibilities with broad powers of enforcement. Indeed, the 1846 report averred that "there is no class of officers in the whole machinery of elementary instruction on whom so much depends for its efficient and successful working, as upon the local Superintendents."[44] Wesley's dictum that superintendents should "enforce, vigorously, but calmly, all the rules of Society" was put into practice by Ryerson in education as well.[45] Local school superintendents were "to see that the general principles of the Law . . . are in no instance contravened."[46]

Other parallel duties which the superintendents of both organizations were to oversee were the condition of church/school buildings and accompanying furnishings.[47] In the same way that Methodist superintendents were to supply and recommend books to their circuits from lists

provided by the Methodist Book Committee, so educational superintendents were "to provide or recommend books . . . suitable . . . for the use of their Schools" from lists provided by the General Board of Education.[48] Local superintendents, as proxies of the central authority, were allotted substantial powers to enforce compliance with school regulations. In 1846 Ryerson recommended that district superintendents be empowered with "the examining and licensing of teachers," a recommendation subsequently adopted in the 1846 and 1850 school acts.[49] Conversely, teaching certificates could be revoked, and the use of unapproved text books could mean an end to the legislative grant.[50] Although Methodist superintendents could not cancel something as significant as the legislative grant, they were empowered to examine clerical candidates and grant temporary preaching licences, or, if candidates were found deficient at the quarterly meetings, preaching licences could be suspended.[51]

Yet the local superintendents' "most vitally important duty," Ryerson insisted, was "the inspection of Schools."[52] This rapid change in the role of educational inspectors is explained by Ryerson's experience with an already functioning and efficient Methodist superintendency. Drawing upon this first-hand knowledge, Ryerson was able to create an effective inspectoral system accountable to the centre in a relatively short period of time. This was an advantage that railroad, canal and prison reformers at the time could not match. As Peter Baskerville noted, the first effective corps of government inspectors was "most obvious in the educational sphere."[53]

Furthermore, just as Methodist superintendents, according to *Doctrines and Discipline*, were "to make strict enquiry . . . into the moral character of all the leaders," so school superintendents were to examine the "character of candidates for teaching."[54] Ryerson expected superintendents to look beyond the classroom to investigate the "character of the Teachers" as well.[55] Much as a Methodist superintendent was to see that clergy "behave well and want nothing" by ascertaining from the district chairmen whether "all the Preacher's characters were examined," teachers were to undergo a similar ritual with the district superintendents.[56] Just as the Methodist superintendents were the animating spirit behind the local circuit organization, Ryerson wanted the school superintendents to "impart vigour" to "Teachers, Trustees and parents . . . by every available means."[57]

Ryerson envisioned that educational superintendents would become evangelists preaching the benefits of common schooling. Previously, at the

1837 Conference, Ryerson successfully introduced a motion that circuit superintendents "deliver at least one sermon at each appointment on his Circuit during the year, on the importance and advantages of Sabbath Schools."[58] Under the provisions of the 1850 School Act, the local school superintendent, like his Methodist counterpart, was "to do all in his power to persuade and animate parents, guardians, Trustees and Teachers, to improve the character and efficiency of the Common Schools."[59]

Using the language of an evangelical preacher, Ryerson exhorted his school superintendents "to awaken the spirit, and arouse to action the populace" of the country.[60] "If the right spirit glows in the bosom of every Superintendent," he believed, "it will appear in any Public Lecture, in every School Visit."[61] As editor of the *Christian Guardian*, Ryerson admonished the Sabbath school superintendent to "daily bear the interests of the school under his care" by frequent visitation.[62] The local common school superintendent was, when possible, to preside over the proceedings and was encouraged to arouse "the spirit and action of the people."[63]

Ryerson anticipated that the local superintendents would, like their Methodist counterparts, be an active, visible and familiar presence in the school sections. He intended that, "what the Government is to the system, and what the Teacher is to the School, the local Inspector, or Superintendent of Schools, should be within the limits of his District."[64] Although the local superintendents were to be a visible presence amongst the communities in which they served, however, they were not to be heavy-handed. Ryerson cautioned local superintendents to be sparing in the use of their powers. The cancelling of a teacher's certificate was considered by Ryerson "an extreme use of power" and except in the case of "proven immorality" a local superintendent should be reluctant to use it.[65] As Methodist preachers were aware of the necessity of local support, so too was Ryerson as chief superintendent of schools.

The 1850 School Act required the superintendent "to visit each Common School within his jurisdiction at least twice a year (once in Summer and once in Winter) and oftener, if practicable *once in each quarter*."[66] Even quarterly visits were not enough for Ryerson. In the 1850 circular to the local superintendents, he made four visits each year the minimum. He demanded that each superintendent "visit each School within his jurisdiction at least once in each quarter."[67] Although not specified, Ryerson intended that these visits should coincide whenever possible with the quarterly public examinations over which local superintendents were encouraged to preside.[68] Likewise, *Doctrines and Discipline* required cir-

cuit superintendents "to visit each class at least quarterly" to offer encouragement, read the rules of the connexion and ensure that Conference directives were being enforced.[69]

A second critically important organizational mechanism that Ryerson carried over from Methodist practice was the collection and gathering of statistical data. Although Robert Murray, Ryerson's predecessor, had attempted as early as 1843 to create standardized forms for inspectoral reports on the quality and character of the common schools there were no specific guidelines provided on how to complete the forms, nor on what criteria were to be used to evaluate schools.[70] Before 1847 superintendents, by necessity, relied upon little more than highly subjective personal impressions.[71] As Chief Superintendent, one of Ryerson's first endeavours was the preparation of "suitable forms and Regulations for making all Reports and conducting all necessary proceedings."[72] So important was standardized statistical reporting to Ryerson that he argued the success of common schooling was "doubtless" due to "the Forms and Regulations furnished for . . . [the] execution" of the 1846 school law.[73]

Ryerson required that teachers and trustees submit quarterly reports to district superintendents, who in turn would collate the data and pass them on to the central authority.[74] These teacher reports were also to be completed on standardized forms drafted by Ryerson "in the plainest language" possible to ensure simplicity.[75] The resulting superintendents' reports were compiled by Ryerson into the *Annual Report*(s), first published in 1847. "Almost entirely new," Ryerson boasted, the *Annual Report*(s) were by far the most comprehensive and detailed collection of statistics that any government department had yet assembled.[76] They gave detailed district-by-district breakdowns of statistics on the numbers, kind, quality, size and finances of the schools. Running to several hundred pages, the reports gave the Chief Superintendent, and the public, a comprehensive quantitative analysis of the state of the common schools. Although superintendents could disagree on what made a good teacher, or schoolhouse design, standardized forms and questionnaires ensured a degree of efficiency and uniformity hitherto unheard of in education or any other government department.[77]

This easy familiarity with the preparation of standardized forms was not new to Ryerson. As Chief Superintendent, he was able to draw upon an efficient and well-developed system of data collection and reporting already in operation within the Methodist organization. The annual Conferences invariably opened with a recorded statement listing the

numbers of ordained preachers, preachers on trial, retired, or died, in addition to the number of members in the connexion reported by district and circuit. Data regarding church finances, the money collected and apportioned by the circuits, and circuits "deficient" in the payment of dues were also included in the annual statement issued on the first day of the Conference.[78] As with the common schools, Methodist district chairmen were required by *Doctrines and Discipline* to collate data reported by the circuit superintendents who, in turn, gathered information from the circuit preachers who were required to maintain up-to-date circuit registries with the assistance of the local class leaders. These district reports were then presented to the Conference. The annual Conference reports were then printed in the minutes of the meeting for analysis and discussion about future directions.[79]

Ryerson was not just an observer of the reporting process in the Methodist church but was an active participant in its development. One of the duties of the circuit superintendent was "to prepare and present to Conference an Annual Report on the state of Sabbath Schools on his Circuit."[80] In 1831 Ryerson recommended to the Conference that the circuit superintendents' annual Sunday school reports should include statistics on attendance, enrolment trends, and hours of operation, as well as detailed lesson plans with aims and objectives.[81] As secretary of the Methodist Conference in 1834, Ryerson was authorized to draft "printed forms" for the use of Superintendents, stewards, circuit preachers and class leaders to record attendance, the payment of dues, and the condition of church buildings.[82] In addition to enrolment figures, Ryerson's forms required preachers to keep accurate attendance registers recording the amount of money each member had contributed.[83] All of these criteria also appeared in the *Annual Report*(s). In developing school statistical report forms, Ryerson adapted and elaborated upon existing Methodist statistical gathering procedures to gauge the strengths, deficiencies and progress of the schools.

Effective "machinery" promoting unity and efficiency was important to Ryerson. But more than this, Ryerson sought to imbue the educational system with a "spiritual" character in order to mobilize its participants to a high level of enthusiasm and commitment to the cause. While this intention is evident, as already suggested, in the language he used and the kinds of expectations he held with respect to the role of superintendents, it showed itself in yet another way, and one more generally neglected by historians – perhaps because they have paid so little attention to Ryer-

son's Methodist roots. This was his conviction that meetings, conferences and conventions were of critical importance to the maintenance of collective morale. Ryerson spoke of school conferences as the most effectual means "to erect unanimity of views and feelings and to excite a general interest in the cause of Popular Education."[84]

Methodism in nineteenth-century Ontario was able to achieve unity and harmony through the use of various conferences, quarterly and camp meetings, so that the organization could feel connected as a larger body. In remote and scattered settlements, these meetings were events eagerly anticipated by Methodist adherents. Regular meetings helped weld the organization together. Camp, circuit and district meetings were powerful tools to promote unity amongst the faithful. These gatherings ensured continuity in church standards, re-kindled enthusiasm for the faith and instilled a sense of belonging to a society larger than one's own remote community.[85] Whether it be in education or Methodism, Ryerson believed that conferences were an important agency in the efficient operation of the system.

John Bowmer termed the Methodist concept of meetings and conferences as "Classical Wesleyanism."[86] The various levels of meetings within the Methodist connexion were effective instruments that kept the spirit alive. The principle, moreover, extended from top to bottom. From the beginning, Ryerson wanted to be more than an anonymous state administrator. In the manner of the Conference President, who was empowered "to travel through the Connexion at large and oversee the spiritual and temporal business of the Church," Ryerson embarked in 1847 on a province-wide educational tour.[87] He met with as many local school officials as possible to answer questions of the school law and finances, recommend plans for libraries, and hear suggestions for the improvement of the schools.[88] Ryerson was convinced that his annual visits as Chief Superintendent of Schools "would intensively promote the great object of public instruction."[89] Similarly, the Conference President was expected to attend as many of the annual district meetings as possible to deliver sermons explain and enforce Conference directives, arbitrate disputes and discuss "what can be done to improve" the financial and spiritual well-being of the movements.[90]

Other sorts of meetings were no less important. As a former circuit preacher, Ryerson recognized the need to build professional morale amongst the local representatives of the organization who worked in isolation. Teacher institutes, established in 1849, were to be occasions for

common school teachers to gather with other members of their profession. Teacher conferences were, Ryerson believed, "the most important measure that can be adopted to perfect our own admirable school system."[91] Likewise, within the Methodist organization, the clergy gathered at annual district meetings to discuss issues of common interest.[92] In both the Methodist and common school organizations, the *esprit de corps* of the local representatives was vital to the organization's continued success.

The other level of school conference was the quarterly public examination in each school section. Although Ryerson claimed that he was "not aware of such a provision existing in any other Common School law," there was a precedent in Methodism.[93] The Methodist quarterly meetings brought together all of the local officers of the circuit, both lay and clerical, to hear sermons, discuss business and meet with brother Methodists.[94] The quarterly examinations, like the Methodist circuit meetings, were intended to rejuvenate and maintain local interest in the organization in order to prevent local officials from backsliding into indifference.[95]

In his inimitable fashion, nonetheless, Ryerson conceived of these meetings as far more than occasions to do "business." They were to become "regular school *celebrations*" (italics added).[96] Ryerson entertained hopes that the quarterly examinations would become part of the Upper Canadian culture as they were to be "accompanied with addresses, music, refreshments, etc."[97] He anticipated that the public quarterly examinations would be "attended by the clergy, and other leading persons of various persuasions, as well as by the parents and friends of the pupils."[98] Perhaps – indeed probably – this is one case of Ryerson's enthusiasm and imagination running wildly beyond local commitment or inclination. Yet that is not the point here. Ryerson's view that "regular conventions by parents, teachers, inspectors and clerical, and other official visitors were essential to the vitality of the whole" organization.[99] And they were "essential" because, like the Methodist quarterly meetings, they were opportunities for all local participants to congregate, observe first-hand, celebrate achievements, diagnose problems, and above all, re-affirm their faith in the educational enterprise.

Commenting in 1846 on his plans for education in Upper Canada, Ryerson remarked that "we are not left to rude conjectures, or untried theories, in this work."[100] There was, in other words, a fund of precedents and exemplars that Ryerson was aware of and could draw upon in constructing a suitable administrative structure for the school system. And there is no reason to think that he did not borrow his ideas from many

sources. Indeed as Bruce Curtis has pointed out, "the educational office did not begin in a vacuum: bureaucratic practice was established in other jurisdictions and was accessible to educational activists as a model."[101] Like other innovators of his generation, Ryerson was not only well-read in the contemporary literature on educational reform but made a deliberate effort to visit other jurisdictions in preparation for his work as Chief Superintendent. Throughout his 1846 report, moreover, he attributed each recommendation to a particular European country or American state. On the face of it, then, it appears eminently plausible to look for the origins of his ideas in an international arena, and in comparable secular examples of system-building.

Yet all of this, I would argue, was filtered through Ryerson's central life experience as a Methodist. For Ryerson, "system," and system of a particular kind, was "bred in the bone." Methodist polity as set forth in Wesley's *Doctrines and Discipline* was proclaimed by Ryerson to be perfect in theory and referred to as "Our Excellent *Discipline*."[102] Not surprisingly, then, there were powerful and indicative parallels between Methodism and the organizational structure he created for the schools.

Many historians and sociologists in recent years have invested a substantial amount of time in identifying the process, and tracing the origins, of "state formation" during the middle decades of the nineteenth-century.[103] The tendency, however, has been to stress essentially secular models ranging from Benthamite utilitarianism to an emergent bourgeois hegemony. What is missing in nearly all these accounts is the potent influence of religious conviction and the extant ecclesiastical organizational models already in place. In framing the administrative system for education in Upper Canada, I have argued, Ryerson drew primarily from his lived experience of Methodist polity. And whatever other influences were at work, and there were undoubtedly many, I suggest that it is time that other scholars look more closely, and critically, at explanations of state formation that rest entirely upon secular foundations.

Endnotes

1. I gratefully acknowledge the helpful advice and criticism of Professor R.D. Gidney in preparing this article and supervising the thesis on which it is based.

2. *Church and State in Canada West: Three Studies in the Relation of Denominationalism and Nationalism, 1841-1867* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1959), 135.

3. There are now several important studies of the growth of the Upper Canadian educational administrative system. Among them are R.D. Gidney and Douglas A. Lawr, "The Development of an Administrative System for the Public Schools: The First Stage, 1841-1850," in *Egerton Ryerson and His Times: Essays on the History of Education*, eds. Alf Chaiton and Neil McDonald, 160-184 (Toronto: MacMillan, 1978); R.D. Gidney and D.A. Lawr, "Bureaucracy vs. Community? The Origins of Bureaucratic Procedure in the Upper Canadian School System," in *Historical Essays on Upper Canada*, ed. J.K. Johnson, 369-399 (Ottawa: Carleton Univ. Press, 1989); R.D. Gidney, "Centralization and Education: The Origins of an Ontario Tradition," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 7, 4 (November 1972): 33-48; and Susan Houston and Alison Prentice, *Schooling and Scholars* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1988). Two recent books by Bruce Curtis are also sure to set the terms for future debate: *Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836-1871* (London: Falmer and Althouse Press, 1988); and *True Government by Choice Men? Inspection, Education and State Formation in Canada West* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1992).

4. Peter Baskerville, "Transportation, Social Change, and State Formation, Upper Canada, 1841-1864," in *Colonial Leviathan: State Formation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Canada*, eds. Ian Radforth and Allan Greer (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto, 1992), 231-232.

5. J. Donald Wilson, Robert M. Stamp, and Louis-Philippe Audet, *Canadian Education: A History* (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall of Canada, 1970), 217.

6. *Canadian Education*, 212.

7. *True Government*, 62.

8. David Onn, "Egerton Ryerson's Philosophy of Education: Something Borrowed or Something New?" *Ontario History* 61, No. 2 (1969): 77.

9. *Schooling and Scholars*, 114.

10. *Schooling and Scholars*, 116.

11. "Centralization and Education," 33.

12. *Egerton Ryerson: His Life and Letters* (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin Ltd., 1937-1947), I: 3.

13. "Egerton Ryerson," in *Our Living Tradition*, ed. Robert MacDougall (Toronto: Irwin, Clarke Ltd., 1972), 244-246.

14. Goldwin French, "Egerton Ryerson and the Methodist Model for Upper Canada," in *Egerton Ryerson and His Times*, 59-80; and Alberto Fiorino, "The Moral Education of Egerton Ryerson's Idea of Education," Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Toronto, 1977.

15. "Centralization and Education," 33-48; see also "Upper Canadian Public Opinion and Common School Improvement in the 1830s," *Histoire sociale/Social History* 5, 9 (April 1972): 48-60.

16. "Egerton Ryerson," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1982), XI: 783-794.

17. Susan E. Houston, "Politics, Schools and Social Change in Upper Canada," *Canadian Historical Review* 53 (1972): 250-252; and Alison Prentice, *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1977), 82-84.

18. *The Making of the English Working Class* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1963), 412-413.

19. *English Society, 1688-1832: Ideology, Social Structures and Political Practice during the Ancien Regime* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985), 87.

20. *The Age of Atonement: The Influence of Evangelicalism on Social and Economic Thought, 1795-1865* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), ix.

21. *The Age of Atonement*, 7-9.

22. *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1989), 9-12.

23. *The Democratization of American Christianity*, 6.

24. "Beyond the Half-Way House: Evangelicalism and the Shaping of English Canadian Culture," *Acadiensis* 20, 2 (Spring 1991): 165-166. Despite the emphasis here on recent work, it is important to note that several decades ago the Canadian sociologist S.D. Clark observed that "in few countries in the western world has religion exerted as great an influence upon the development of the community as it has in Canada" (quoted in Goldwin French, "The Evangelical Creed in Canada," in *The Shield of Achilles: Aspects of Canada in the Victorian Age*, ed. W.L. Morton [Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1968], 15).

25. Gauvreau, "Beyond the Half-Way House," 168.

26. Michael Gauvreau, "Protestantism Transformed: Personal Piety and the Evangelical Social Vision, 1815-1867," in *The Canadian Protestant Experience, 1760-1990*, ed. George A. Rawlyk (Burlington: Welch Publishing Company, 1990), 50.

27. Gauvreau, "Protestantism Transformed," 50, 57.

28. *Two Worlds: The Protestant Culture of Nineteenth-Century Ontario* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1989), 6, 27-88.

29. *A Profusion of Spires: Religion in Nineteenth-Century Ontario* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1988), 198-200.

30. *A Profusion of Spires*, 97.

31. *Christian Guardian*, 26 November 1834.

32. J.G. Hodgins, ed., *The Documentary History of Education In Upper Canada (Ontario)* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1895-1899), III: 109-110 (hereafter *DHE*).

33. See David Yates, "'Bred in the Bone:' Egerton Ryerson, Methodist Polity and Educational Administration, 1844-1850," M.Ed. thesis, Univ. of Western Ontario, 1995.

34. John Wesley, *The Works of the Reverend John Wesley, A.M.*, 4th ed. (London: John Mason, 1842), II: 287 (hereafter *Works*).

35. *Doctrines and Discipline of the Wesleyian Methodist Church in Canada* (Toronto: Anson Green, 1850), 27.

36. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 29-35.

37. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 22.

38. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 29-34.
39. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 34.
40. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 27.
41. Clark, *English Society, 1688-1832*, 52-53.
42. Curtis, *True Government*, 68-69.
43. *Journal of Education for Upper Canada* (Toronto: J.H. Lawrence, January 1848), 29 (hereafter *JEDUC*).
44. *DHE*, VI: 206.
45. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 31.
46. *DHE*, VI: 206.
47. *DHE*, VI: 206; and *Doctrines and Discipline*, 105-107.
48. *DHE*, VI: 206.
49. *DHE*, VI: 206.
50. *DHE*, IX: 44; and *DHE*, VI: 267.
51. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 29-30.
52. *DHE*, IX: 209.
53. Baskerville, "Transportation, Social Change, and State Formation in Upper Canada," 231-32.
54. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 34; and *DHE*, VI: 207.
55. *DHE*, VI: 206; and Gidney, "Centralization and Education," 40.
56. *The Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Upper Canada, From 1824 to 1845* (Toronto: Anson Green at the Methodist Conference Office, 1828), 18 (hereafter *Minutes*); and *Doctrines and Discipline*, 25.
57. *DHE*, VI: 206.
58. *Minutes*, 1837, 159-160.
59. *DHE*, IX: 43.
60. *DHE*, IX: 212.

61. *DHE*, IX: 212.

62. *Christian Guardian*, 8 August 1832. See also *Christian Guardian*, 7 December 1831; and 1 April 1835.

63. *JEDUC*, July 1856, quoted in Houston and Prentice, *Schooling and Scholars*, 139.

64. *DHE*, V: 206.

65. *DHE*, VI: 303.

66. *DHE*, IX: 43.

67. *DHE*, IX: 210.

68. *Annual Report of the Common Schools of the Province of Ontario for the Year 1847* (Toronto, 1848), 17; and *DHE*, IX: 210.

69. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 31-32.

70. Curtis, *True Government*, 61.

71. Curtis, "Class, Culture and Administrative Educational Inspection in Canada West," 122; and Curtis, *True Government*, 64.

72. *DHE*, VI: 59.

73. *DHE*, VIII: 288.

74. *DHE*, VI: 63, 67.

75. *DHE*, IX: 176.

76. *DHE*, VIII: 287.

77. Gidney and Lawr, "The Development of an Administrative System for the Public Schools," 177; and Curtis, *True Government*, 188.

78. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 17.

79. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 27.

80. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 35.

81. *Christian Guardian*, 11 June 1831.

82. *Minutes*, 1834, 76; see also *Minutes*, 1844, 357-68 for a comprehensive District and Circuit report.

83. *Minutes*, 1834, 76.

84. *DHE*, VI: 272.

85. Grant, *A Profusion of Spires*, 58-59.

86. *Pastor and People: A Study of Church and Ministry in Wesleyan Methodism from the Death of John Wesley to the Death of Jabez Bunting* (London: Epworth Press, 1975), 163.

87. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 26.

88. Sissons, *Egerton Ryerson: His Life and Letters*, II: 145-46.

89. Letter to the Secretary of the Province, D. Daly, 13 January 1848, *Annual Report* (Toronto, 1848), 77.

90. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 20-24.

91. *JEDUC*, July 1848, 202-205.

92. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 19.

93. *Annual Report* (Toronto, 1848), 17.

94. *Doctrines and Discipline*, 24.

95. Neil Semple, *The Lord's Dominion: The History of Canadian Methodism* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1996), 129-131.

96. *Annual Report* (Toronto, 1848), 17.

97. *Annual Report* (Toronto, 1848), 17.

98. *Annual Report* (Toronto, 1848), 17.

99. Sissons, *Egerton Ryerson: His Life and Letters*, II: 97.

100. *DHE*, VI: 211.

101. Curtis, "Class, Culture and Administrative Educational Inspection in Canada West," 111.

102. *Christian Guardian*, 9 April 1834.

103. For the best Canadian introduction to this literature see Ian Radforth and Allan Greer, eds., *Colonial Leviathan: State Formation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Canada* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1992).

"Inevitable From the Beginning": Queen's University and Separation from the Presbyterian Church, 1900-12

ELSIE WATTS

In 1912 Queen's University at Kingston, Ontario, separated from the Presbyterian Church of Canada to become a public institution. Queen's separation from the church would seem to support the contention by a number of Canadian historians of religion that in the Western world, during the nineteenth century, Protestant institutions accommodated their Christian doctrine to realities of modern thought and life and, in doing so, made Christian religion irrelevant in national institutions.[1] Queen's has been signalled as a specific Canadian institution which accommodated doctrine to the late-nineteenth century cultural context.[2] In examining the process leading to separation in the years 1900 to 1912, therefore, one may expect to find that Queen's lost much of its religious character and, therefore, its ability to influence society religiously.

Did Queen's University at Kingston "lose its soul" when it separated from the Presbyterian Church in 1912? Queen's historians D.D. Calvin, Wilhelmina Gordon, Hilda Neatby, George Rawlyk and Kevin Quinn interpret separation as inevitable for financial rather than religious reasons. Calvin's statement that "[a]s certainly as the child becomes an adult, so the records of the University prove . . . that separation from the Church had been inevitable from the beginning," suggests that the connection with the church was not necessary for the university to achieve its aims.[3] That Gordon, daughter of Principal Gordon could, almost thirty years after separation, still describe scornfully as "exaggerated statements" the argument that separation would sweep away Queen's religious atmosphere

and influence indicates that the possibility of religious secularization was not an issue for her.[4] Neatby does not consider theology an issue, though she uses "secularization" as a synonym for "separation."[5] Rawlyk and Quinn emphasize practical considerations in the separation process but observe that while "the University was now a secular institution . . . it was hardly a godless one." The 1912 separation was not an admission of the basic incompatibility of secular and sacred worldviews.[6]

This essay agrees with Rawlyk and Quinn that the severing of the connection between the Presbyterian Church and Queen's University in 1912 did not signal a loss of belief in God. In fact, the separation process itself reflected the religious heritage of the university. The overriding theme in the process leading to separation was the Scottish Presbyterian belief in the church's association with national life, that is, that Queen's should indirectly exercise in Canada the kind of influence in national affairs that the Presbyterian Church exercised directly in Scotland. The doctrinal changes that occurred at Queen's were consistent with and even considered necessary within this context. Although Queen's stood for a free search for truth, at no time did it consider itself secular. Doctrinal orthodoxy was not a factor in the respective discourses of the administration, faculty, students or graduates or Queen's from 1900 to 1912. Separation did not require the cessation of religious belief because it was consistent with the religious character of the university.

Queen's was founded by the Church of Scotland in Canada in 1841. Its founders and their successors patterned their worldview and institutions after those of Scotland.[7] The Scottish Presbyterian Church had two characteristics that are important for this study. First, the church believed that ministerial training should be based on a liberal arts education. The Church of Scotland was renowned for having appropriated the experimental spirit of the Enlightenment without giving up reverence for revelation. Although it contained a tenaciously evangelical constituency, its moderate leadership stood for doctrinal flexibility, in tandem with free enquiry. This freed the Scottish universities to participate in educational reform. While belief in providence continued as the unifying curricular principle, subjects like history, philosophy, and natural science became fields of inquiry separate from theology, with their own specializing professors and faculties.

Second, the Church of Scotland needed a learned ministry partly because it believed in a national church guiding national life. Though the

church had moved from episcopacy to presbyterianism, it remained associated in the Scottish mind with the state. By implication, the university was an essential institution in Scottish national life. The clergy professors were part of the educated ruling elite of Scotland, and they exercised intellectual leadership in culture as well as in their lecture halls. Their close identification with culture demonstrated that the church believed it had responsibility not only for the well-being of individual Scots but also for the Scottish nation. The clergy professors applied their knowledge in the service of the nation not only in training its leaders but also by cooperating with Scottish industrial interests.

When Scottish Presbyterians in Canada felt compelled to establish a university to counter the planned exclusivity of John Strachan's Anglican institution, they made it clear from the beginning that they were identifying Queen's with the broader Canadian culture. While Queen's was officially named Queen's College, it was conceptualized and referred to as a university. Queen's taught arts as a prerequisite for theology and was open to adding other faculties as part of the development of the university concept.[8] Queen's did not require a denominational test for entrance.[9] The national orientation of Queen's became not only its founding rationale but also its guiding principle.

The importance of the national principle to Queen's can be seen in the controversy from 1900 to 1912 concerning the separation of Queen's University from the Presbyterian Church. Actions and arguments on both sides of the debate demonstrated that each believed the university must continue to develop to fulfil its religious mission of leadership in Canadian culture. Those who sought separation did not desire secularization. Separation was the unhappy consequence of inability of the church to pay for the national principle. Those who opposed separation used the possibility of secularization as an argument, but it did not emerge as their key point. Their most consistent concern was whether the church would continue to participate with Queen's in its influence on civil religion. Both sides embraced the university's national mission and neither supported secularization. This was true at all levels of the close-knit Queen's community – the chancellor, principal, board of trustees, council and senate, graduates and students.

The separation of the university and church was initially suggested by George Monro Grant. By the time he became principal of Queen's in 1877, Grant's national vision was well-known. As a leading Presbyterian

clergyman, he had campaigned for Confederation and later for the unification of Canadian Presbyterianism into a national church to strengthen the new nation.[10] In his inaugural address in 1877, Grant showed that he understood the university to be a national institution.[11] In 1886, he wrote Queen's chancellor Sir Sandford Fleming that, ". . . I found that there was a great work for Queen's both as regards the Church and Canada."[12]

Under Grant's leadership, Queen's resisted Ontario's plan to consolidate all of Ontario's universities under the University of Toronto. Queen's strengthened its medical school and established a School of Mining. Its theological and arts professors appropriated contemporary applications of scientific method to biblical scholarship in the same spirit the moderate Presbyterians of Scotland had shown during the Enlightenment.[13]

The willingness of Queen's to accommodate new thinking kept it in a position to exercise cultural leadership, but the monetary demands of development were onerous. Realization of the national vision required an aggressive growth policy. In the late-nineteenth century, Canadian colleges aspiring to become universities faced major costs. Specialization and professionalization brought more students and the need for more faculty, more sophisticated equipment, and more buildings. To maintain its status as a national university, with the same credibility as the University of Toronto and McGill University, Queen's could not go into a maintenance or a cut-back position. Hence the university was under constant financial pressure.

The funding arrangements Grant that devised were complicated and difficult. In 1875, the united Presbyterian Church permitted Queen's to raise an endowment for the arts faculty. Individual churches within Queen's fundraising district were asked to pay the expenses of the theological faculty. Medicine and the School of Mining were supported by the Ontario government. The use of government funds accorded with the national ideal. Since the Scottish university was the necessary partner of the state in cultural and economic development, it could expect state assistance. By setting up its science faculties as required for access to public funds, Queen's applied this philosophy in the context of Canada.

To gain access to government funds for arts and end the convoluted arrangements between the various faculties, Grant, reasoning that the university would remain Christian and maintain its Christian national role,

proposed that the university be chartered as a public institution and the theological faculty as a denominational college. The 1901 Presbyterian General Assembly approved resolutions passed by the university trustees, senate, council, graduates, alumni,[14] and benefactors, that:

> (1). . . Queen's University should be undenominational, and should be in a larger degree than at present, directly representative of the graduates and friends of the University; (2) that the Faculty of Theology should be under the management of a Board distinct from the Governing Body of the University.[15]

The Assembly appointed a committee to work out the details with the Queen's trustees.[16] All parties expected that the 1902 Assembly would finalize Grant's proposal.[17]

One month before the Assembly of 1902, Grant died. At the Assembly, opposition to the separation that Grant had kept in check by force of personality and achievements appeared. Queen's solicitor and trustee, George M. Macdonnell, whose service to the church and to Queen's had spanned that of Grant, presented the board report. Macdonnell would have been familiar with the national principle, having been so long a part of shaping the university. He "drew special attention to the course of legislation proposed, and traced the history of the institution . . . showing that the proposed changes [were] in line with the past history of the University."[18] However, the Assembly favoured a motion to study the matter further.[19]

The *Queen's Quarterly* jubilantly promised that the "future development of the University will naturally bring increasing honour to the Church under whose maternal care it has grown from helpless infancy to self-responsible manhood." It also speculated that the search for a principal might surmount narrow professional and denominational restrictions.[20] Several trustees and faculty, however, especially wanted a man sympathetic to the claims of the denomination. The board decided that Daniel Miner Gordon, whose career as a leading Presbyterian clergyman and member of the Queen's board paralleled Grant's, would not break the traditions of the university.[21]

Gordon believed that his appointment as principal had been made on the understanding that he would carry through Grant's national vision and the separation from the church that its financial requirements necessitated.[22] To the university council he declared: ". . . (T)he aims and ideals

of a university must be national . . . I think we may claim that this has always been the ideal of Queen's . . ."[23]

Gordon presented to the 1903 Assembly a separation recommendation, endorsed by the trustees, university council, faculty, and a committee of the Assembly.[24] To Queen's surprise, a wealthy lay member persuaded the Assembly that the church could raise the funds necessary to maintain the traditional connection.[25] The Assembly decided to support a new endowment campaign for the arts faculty.[26] The lay member promised to endow a chair.[27] Gordon, however, remained unsure the church would provide the necessary funds.[28]

The opponents to separation who submitted articles to the Queen's press did not raise secularization as an argument. In the *Queen's Quarterly*, Samuel Dyde voiced his opinion that the Assembly vote showed the church wanted to participate in Queen's national vision:

> In framing the bill the aim of the trustees had avowedly been to make the college as national in its forms of government as it had long been in spirit. So far as can be gathered from the tone of the Assembly, if to nationalize the college meant to enlarge its work and extend its influence, the question was simply whether this movement shall go on under or outside the church. And the Assembly desired that the church as a whole ought to have some of the honour and accept some of the responsibility.[29]

Dyde's opinion was significant. He was professor of moral philosophy, the curriculum designed to integrate Christian faith and knowledge.[30]

Another important opponent of separation, The Rev. Dr. James Campbell, argued in the *Queen's University Journal* that separation might mean provincialization rather than nationalization, an unacceptable restriction of Queen's mission.[31] Campbell was more concerned about Queen's fulfilling its national mission than with the possible secularizing effect of separation.

During 1904, the general lines of the separation controversy became clear. No one within Queen's appeared willing to compromise its cultural mission, despite its financial burden. Some, believing that the church would not provide sufficient funds, continued to see separation as a necessity. Some, like Principal Gordon and probably the majority of the Queen's community, would retain the connection if the church could raise

the funds. Others, like Dyde, Campbell, and now G.M. Macdonnell, hoped to retain the university's identification with the church. They did what they could to encourage the church to establish the connection financially.

By February 1904, a commission of the Presbyterian General Assembly reported that the presbyteries favoured retaining the connection of the church to the university but held that a national university should not be supported by the church alone. Gordon already had begun trying to raise large sums of money from private benefactors.[32] Money for higher education from the Carnegie Foundation was an important lure because universities which met its terms, like Toronto and McGill, had an advantage in development over universities which did not. However, Gordon was advised by Dr. James Douglas, a Queen's graduate, trustee, and wealthy New York businessman, that Andrew Carnegie "has a very bitter aversion to all ecclesiastical establishments and . . . will not endow a college that is allied in any way to one of the Churches."[33]

Driven by the need to keep Queen's competitive with McGill and the University of Toronto, Gordon could not resist the possibilities offered by the Carnegie money. Toronto and McGill were well aware of Queen's national ambition. Queen's constant promotion of its national vision and entitlement to government grants irritated Toronto's pride and purse. In early 1904, President James Loudon and Chancellor Nathanael Burwash of Toronto published an expose of Queen's creative financing.[34] Loudon and Burwash sat on a special committee of the Ontario Board of Education which determined that Ontario teachers must be certified through the University of Toronto.[35] Understanding this as a strategy to discredit the popular Queen's teacher-training program, Gordon began a campaign for a faculty of education at Queen's.

Since the main argument that Loudon, Burwash and others could use against Queen's access to government funding was its denominational tie to the Presbyterian Church, its administrators emphasized the nonsectarian nature of the institution. That Queen's equated its nonsectarianism with the culture of English Canada is apparent in the literature of Queen's from the first paragraph statement of the 1841 Charter, that " the establishment of a college . . . would greatly conduce to the welfare of our said province."[36] On the basis of its nonsectarian policy, Queen's argued that the institution was reflective of the people of Canada and therefore its service to the nation should be legitimized by public recognition.

At the General Assembly in June, the Queen's board reported that

"(t)he very growth and expansion of the University have caused additional outlay, while the revenue has not grown in proportion . . . Hence, the finances of the year show a considerable deficit."[37] The Assembly persisted with the endowment campaign. It set the target figure at $500,000, to be fully paid by 31 December 1907,[38] and freed Gordon from his teaching duties to go out and stump for it. Gordon emphasized Queen's national mission clearly in selling the endowment campaign. He told the presbyteries that "[t]o assist Queen's would be to aid the higher interests alike of the Church and of the country."[39]

In 1904, the link between separation and secularization appeared for the first time. Professor John Macnaughton expressed relief that separation had not occurred, for "(t)he separation of Theology from the general body of culture and science is unwholesome on both sides, tending to emasculate Theology and to maim culture."[40] Yet Gordon did not receive evidence from the church that Macnaughton's argument was compelling. To the lay member who had stalled the separation process in 1902 Gordon wrote: "The general interest in her welfare that might be looked for in view of Queen's agreeing to continue her Church connection has been much less than we anticipated."[41] The *Queen's University Journal*, meanwhile, advertised that students could subscribe to the endowment campaign on the instalment plan.[42]

The 1905 Assembly granted Queen's a full-time fundraiser for the endowment campaign.[43] After the Assembly, however, given the overriding importance of the national vision, Gordon still seemed ambivalent about whether the connection between Queen's and the church would endure:

> The development of Queen's has been along national lines, with the ideal of national service, and with the breadth of outlook and purpose befitting a national university. Those who advocated her separation from the Church argued that this development would be more secure if all Church connection were severed. It is gratifying, however, to see that the Presbyterian Church, which is itself so truly national in its aims and efforts . . . has no desire to check this national development of Queen's . . . What should be the connection between the Churches and the University system of our country is by no means clear . . . The Churches and the universities should be at one in their aim to lift the people above the more material and commercial spirit . . .[44]

Freed from his fundraising responsibilities, Gordon turned his attention back to the developmental needs of the university.[45] Despite its untenable financial situation, Queen's did not slacken its competitive stance. The university continued to pursue a faculty of education and approved a new building for the biological sciences.[46]

By January 1906 it was clear that, even with the services of a fundraiser, the endowment campaign was not going well. Gordon thought that "[i]n view of the large service rendered to the country Queen's might well claim the generous aid of many outside the Presbyterian Church." As matters stood, ". . . we receive comparatively few subscriptions from any except Presbyterian sources, save only from Queen's graduates, all of whom irrespective of Church connection, are singularly loyal to their Alma Mater."[47] The *Queen's University Journal* also noted that: "(w)here ever (our own graduates and Alumni) live and work, Queen's is honoured and the movement for Endowment gathers strength much more quickly."[48] The university began to focus more attention on alumni. The board already had drafted legislation adding five trustees elected by the graduates.[49] Now the council appointed a committee to prepare a proposal for strengthening the relations of the council with the various alumni associations.[50]

Gordon continued to explore the possibility of access to Carnegie Foundation funds. He asked James Maclennan, supreme court judge and chairman of the Queen's board, for a legal interpretation of whether the denominational requirement of a Presbyterian majority on the board disqualified Queen's for consideration.[51] Maclennan's opinion was that Queen's was not eligible.[52] Chancellor Fleming suggested that Queen's offer Carnegie an honorary degree.[53] The degree was bestowed, though Carnegie did not appear to receive it.[54] Gordon then sent the Foundation a formal application for $200,000 to be applied to the arts endowment.[55]

The application was refused. The administration renewed the application.[56] In December 1906 Gordon announced that Carnegie had offered to give $100,000 for the endowment campaign after it had reached its $500,000 goal. In the meantime, Carnegie would provide pensions for three retiring professors.[57] Gordon responded to a tactful inquiry from the president of the Baptist Acadia University as to why Queen's as a denominational institution qualified for Carnegie funds[58] with the clarification that Queen's did not qualify. Carnegie had made a private gift, as a favour to his friend, Chancellor Fleming.[59] To queries from an already retired Queen's professor as to whether he might receive a pension,

Gordon replied that there would be no pensions for other Queen's professors, working or retired.[60] This reply inflicted a hurt which united the faculty, which routinely coped with heavy teaching loads, poor working conditions, inadequate equipment, and non-competitive remuneration, in favour of separation.

While Fleming and Gordon courted Carnegie and his Foundation, the board and council were deeply involved in the ongoing struggle for public funds. The council struck a committee to convince Ontario legislators that Queen's was as entitled to funding as the University of Toronto. Macdonnell and Dyde agreed to serve on the committee.[61] Gordon wrote Premier Whitney, arguing that Queen's was not a denominational college because the church did not elect the Queen's trustees (the board was self-perpetuating) and the graduates had representatives on the board.[62] Early in 1907 Whitney promised more aid for technical education,[63] but his government "wished it to be clearly understood that any grant would be only `by way of aid' for (Queen's) was not a government school."[64]

Again, Queen's turned to giving its graduates more power to affect the direction of the university. A board committee recommended that the university council be developed to allow graduates to vote on the affairs of the university.[65] The board deferred the recommendation but directed the administration to distribute the university's annual report to the Assembly to all graduates.[66] Clearly, in its interest in expansion, Queen's was moving away from its connection with the church.

Queen's administrators, however, did not want disunity over separation to jeopardize the possibility of the completion of the endowment campaign. While they told the 1907 Assembly that the endowment receipts still were disappointing, they did not reopen the issue of constitutional changes in either the trustee or joint commission report.[67]

As the slow work of canvassing the church went on,[68] the task of strengthening broad support of the university continued. The university finance and estate committee recommended that Gordon use the university's annual alumni conference to organize the graduates in support of government assistance for Queen's.[69] The trustees voted to give local alumni associations the right to elect representatives to the council though this would weigh the trustee/faculty and alumni ratio in favour of the latter.[70] The council resolved that "a more organized effort should be made to carry on the campaign of education, not only among our own graduates,

but among the people of the province of Ontario generally and the members of the Legislature, with the object of creating public sentiment in favour of Queen's."[71]

In January 1908 Queen's circulated to all graduates a broadsheet on behalf of the endowment fund. The broadsheet implicitly demonstrated Queen's national ambition. Since 1902 Queen's had added, on average, one building a year, hired new professors, opened a faculty of education, and doubled its student body. The broadsheet described the nonsectarian composition of the student body as ". . . a good example of the practical Christian union, covering the ground `From Ocean to Ocean' . . ."[72]

In 1908 Queen's continued to stress an active religious life as central to good citizenship. Religious influence was woven through the fabric of the university, through the presence of the theological faculty, the principal arranging Sunday afternoon services and teaching general Bible classes,[73] faculty participating in religious activities,[74] and the *Queen's University Journal* routinely reporting the meetings of such campus groups as the YMCA, YWCA and Queen's University Missionary Association.

Gordon made it clear that Queen's did not stand for an either/or choice between philosophy and theology, and that its search for knowledge of God through science was consistent with its church tradition:

> With increasing knowledge we may be required to restate some doctrines today just as was the case with our fathers . . . but the firm grasp of the essentials of faith, such as the Person and Work of Christ, and the present guidance of the Holy Spirit, may enable us to move with freedom and without fear.[75]

It was not theological disagreement or lack of affection for Presbyterianism which was moving Queen's toward separation from the church.[76] It was that the church was not providing the funding necessary to maintain a national university.

In the same year, the festering issue of inadequate remuneration pushed the faculty to explore the possibility of seeking Carnegie funding for themselves. In February, James Cappon, dean of the arts faculty, paid an investigative visit to the New York headquarters of the Foundation. Cappon learned that McGill University was already on the Carnegie list of beneficiaries and the University of Toronto was about to be added. On his return, Cappon asked the Queen's senate to prepare a memorial to the

trustees, "praying them to take into favourable consideration the question of the admission of the University to the benefits of the Carnegie Fund."[77] The next day, Gordon reported these developments to Chancellor Fleming in Ottawa:

> Yesterday afternoon we had a somewhat animated meeting of Senate, discussing the whole question of memorializing the Trustees to consider the whole question of the possible relation of Queen's to the Carnegie Pension Foundation. The serious feature is that it opens up the whole question of severing the connection of the University and the Church . . . The latest report . . . decided beyond all question that the University must be formally and legally separate from the Church if it is to enjoy any of the benefits of the Pension Fund.[78]

On March 16, after defeating an amendment by Professors Dyde and J.L. Morison objecting to the role the possibility of Carnegie funds was playing in the separation controversy,[79] the senate adopted a memorial to the board of trustees that:

> . . . (i)n their opinion it is quite practicable to make such alteration in Queen's Constitution as will bring the University under the benefits of the Carnegie Foundation, and that this may be done without essential disturbance of either the relation the Theological Hall has to the University or anything that is natural and vital in the relation which now exists between the University and the Presbyterian Church.[80]

The chief administrators of the university expressed concerned that the memorial would endanger the endowment campaign, which was within $90,000 of the amount needed for Carnegie's contribution. To Trustee Rev. D.R. Drummond, who wished to postpone the pension issue,[81] Gordon replied that the Carnegie list of beneficiaries might soon be closed.[82] Macdonnell gave Fleming a letter from Rev. Watts of Halton County, warning that if the issue of constitutional changes was revived, his parish no longer would subscribe to the endowment fund. Fleming sent it to Gordon and Maclennan, insisting that the professors' cause should be given "the fullest consideration. It is due to the University itself that we should take means to retain and attract the best of professors."[83] Maclennan, wary that Queen's might not only lose potential donations but also

Presbyterian political advantage, asked Gordon if he thought the university should be made a government institution with an affiliated theological college, noting that Fleming had made a similar suggestion to Macdonnell.[84] Even the *Queen's University Journal* came out in support of this solution.[85] Macdonnell and others, however, determined to back the eventual success of the endowment campaign. Unable to come to a harmonious solution, the Queen's board asked the 1908 Assembly for advice.[86]

Both sides arrived at the Assembly in June ready for a showdown. The Assembly diffused the controversy by appointing a committee of Gordon and Cappon for and Macdonnell and Dyde against, and directing them to come back to the Assembly with a recommendation. The result appeared to endorse separation. The committee recommended that the Queen's board be empowered to act in the best interests of the university, making provision for the theological faculty in a manner acceptable to the church.[87]

The discussion of the committee's recommendation was heated. Macdonnell argued that:

> All that 90% of Queen's men wanted was that the church should continue to stay with Queen's . . . [T]hey had in Queen's the Scottish type of national university, not a denominational university, but a Scottish national university with the Scottish Canadian notion behind it.[88]

Secularization entered the discussion as one argument among many. A speaker expressed concern that Queen's might cease to be a moral force in the nation. Speakers for separation argued that the Presbyterian character of the university would not change because "(h)istory and sentiment forbade it."[89] One speaker reminded the Assembly, the church could not pay for the national vision of its university:

> [The issue was being discussed] [a]s if the Assembly had a holiday in sight and was tripping along, led by a brass band . . . The financial needs of Queen's were getting greater. The church said they could not shoulder them . . . [Queen's] simply asked the assembly to give her a larger scope in the greater work of national education. (Applause).[90]

The discussion ended with the Assembly rejecting the committee's recommendation. By a vote of 67 to 53, the Assembly stood behind the endow-

ment campaign. It asked Queen's to consider offering pensions itself.[91]

Cappon concluded bitterly that the Assembly, dominated by non-Queen's men, did not care about the university's interests.[92] Gordon continued to promote Queen's as a national university.[93] In October, the faculty again chose to ask the trustees to "renew the application to the General Assembly for certain changes in the Constitution to Queen's University."[94] Only three professors dissented. The board decided, by a vote of sixteen to three, to send the second senate memorial to the 1909 Assembly, with the opinion that "the altered conditions with which the University has had to deal in these latter times call for the removal of the denominational disabilities in the charter of the University."[95]

Gordon turned once more to the university's broad constituency. He prepared a circular to the endowment subscribers, graduates, and ministers of the Presbyterian Church, "making it possible for them to change the destination of their contribution if they think they were led to subscribe under any false pretences . . ."[96] With the circular, the graduates received a statement requesting that they indicate whether they agreed with the board resolution asking for removal of the denominational disabilities.[97] At the same time, Gordon explored with Fleming and Maclennan how Queen's might free itself from the denominational disabilities while re-emphasizing the importance of the theological faculty.[98] The least complicated solution seemed to be the affiliation of a private theological college to a public Queen's.[99] After receiving resolutions from the university council, the School of Mining and the medical faculty, the Queen's board petitioned the 1909 Assembly for removal of the denominational restrictions through constitutional change.[100]

Gordon told the 1909 Assembly that "either the church must assume responsibility for the maintenance in a way she has never done before, or accede to the request of the Trustees . . ."[101] Gordon promised that the proposed change was not separation but a "readjustment of the relations between the church and the university in such a way that the vital and spiritual connection would still be fully maintained." Macdonnell and Dyde, along with James Campbell, put forward a miscellany of opposing arguments, one of which was that the strength of Queen's national mission was her association with the church.[102] In 1909, however, more speakers argued on behalf of separation. Their arguments included the contention that Presbyterians had always been opposed to denominationalism in education. "[D]enominational universities mean a divided Canada."[103]

Separatists also argued that the legal bond was not the real bond that held the university and church together.[104] The Assembly passed the Queen's motion and appointed a commission to cooperate with the Queen's board in regard to the constitution.[105]

Some delegates voted for the motion because it referred the consideration of the question to an Assembly commission.[106] The trustees' first task after the Assembly, then, was to delineate its proposed constitutional changes for the Assembly representatives. The trustees agreed that the corporators of the university, previously the members of the Presbyterian General Assembly, now should be the benefactors and graduates. Macdonnell and the Rev. Dr. Wardrope lost their motions to have trustees selected by the Assembly. Significantly, no trustees known for opposition to separation were appointed to the trustee committee to confer with the commission.[107]

The January 1910 *Queen's Quarterly* gave Macdonnell and Dyde the opportunity to put their case before the Queen's community.[108] Macdonnell and Dyde identified the Carnegie fund as the motivation for separation. They argued that salary "comparisons are an offence," and not grounds for a change in constitution. Constitutional change should be in keeping with Queen's history and traditions. "The Church has . . . given her her distinctive character, built her up on the Scottish traditions and ideals, on the model of the Scottish universities, made her thus national in spirit from the beginning and left her free to grow along those broad lines."[109] The crux of the whole matter was how to preserve this vital relationship.

In the same issue, Cappon replied to Macdonnell and Dyde's arguments.[110] He argued that professors and their widows needed to be properly remunerated. Cappon reminded Macdonnell that, in 1902, he had presented Grant's scheme for separation to the Assembly with the reassurance that it was in keeping with the past history of the university and unlikely to change the character of Queen's. Theological students would participate in university life as before. Cappon repeatedly expressed frustration that a minority was lengthening the constitutional debate, though its negative effects on the future of the university were apparent. "Adjournments, re-adjournments, pleas for further consideration, for `a resolution that can be made unanimous,' (as if you could get any unanimity between the majority and G.M. Macdonnell that was not a mere pretence)."[111]

When the Assembly commission accepted Queen's recommenda-

tions concerning the constitutional changes and made its report to the Queen's board, Macdonnell continued to advance his position. He made a series of counter motions designed to keep the church within the governing structure of the university.[112] In the end, however, a majority of the board approved every clause in the commission's report.

Despite the commission's recommendations and their endorsement by the trustees, Gordon wrote Fleming that he expected a "serious engagement" at the annual Assembly in Halifax.[113] Gordon may have been heartened somewhat by a letter from Professor J.L. Morison, received just before the Assembly:

> You know that I formed one of the original very small minority on the Senate who opposed separation . . . Informal reorganization of our university, the bringing of peace and unity once more . . . the fitting of our college to take a perfectly national position in the education of Canada, and the placing of Queen's in a position from which she may claim government support as a right, such government support as in Britain, the state deems it right to give to every truly national university – all these things force me to abandon any desire for opposition that might remain, and to fall in line with the majority.[114]

However, the Assembly proved as stormy as anticipated. The Assembly tabled the matter for a year and directed the Queen's board and those opposing separation to reach unanimity on the matter.[115]

In keeping with the direction of the Assembly, Gordon asked Macdonnell and Douglas, the current board chair, to reach agreement regarding Presbyterian representation in Queen's administrative structure.[116] At this point, Macdonnell's support began melting away. For example, Dyde accepted a position in Alberta.[117] But the board did not expect that full unanimity would be achieved.[118]

The board distributed a new opinion survey, asking trustees and faculty not to try to influence the answers of the graduates.[119] Seven graduates managed to precede the survey with a circular, asking for a decisive vote.

> An University which is doing national work must be nationalized . . . To say that to put the University under a Board of Trustees who would be mainly elected by the graduates would be to destroy the spirit of mingled enthusiasm for truth and religious reverence which

> has hitherto characterized her graduates, is at once a contradiction in terms and a causeless insult . . . That outlook will not be destroyed by the abolition of a legal fiction.[120]

The deans of all the faculties except theology also issued a circular urging a decisive vote.[121] N.F. Dupuis, dean of the School of Mining, replied to Gordon's rebuke with a copy of the circular and the offer of his resignation if his views were to be repressed.[122]

The graduates voted overwhelmingly in favour of separation. Gordon thought he could approach the 1911 Assembly with the asked-for unanimity, since Macdonnell had promised to abide by the results of the vote.[123] He observed, however, that Macdonnell seemed anxious to escape the results of the vote.[124] Gordon no longer felt disposed to try to conciliate. When Macdonnell attempted to delay resolution by withholding his unanimity, the board ignored him and went ahead.[125] The 1911 Assembly passed the proposed constitutional changes and appointed a new commission to work with the trustees in preparing the necessary constitutional legislation for presentation to parliament.[126] The board accepted Macdonnell's resignation as a trustee and as solicitor of the university.[127] The bills submitted to parliament in February 1912 were based on the legislation prepared in 1903. The bill making Queen's University a public institution came into law on 11 March 1912. The bill creating Queen's Theological College passed the House on 1 April 1912.[128] Macdonnell went on to chair the board of the theological college. Queen's University integrated its faculties and continued its development with the reliable base of government funding. Queen's canvassed the endowment subscribers and found them to be satisfied with the use of their donations.[129] Gordon made numerous applications and visits to the Carnegie Foundation on behalf of undenominational Queen's in the succeeding years, but Queen's was not placed on its list before it closed.[130]

Now that separation had occurred, Queen's would have to deliver on its contention that its inherent religious nature had not changed during a process that was, on the surface at least, an obvious secularization. Gordon had assured the Canadian Club in Ottawa, on October 1911, that the Queen's of 1911 was essentially the same Queen's it had been in 1900.

> The university does not stand for the training of men to make money . . . The university stands for the highest ideals for the individual man

> and the nation . . . What shall it profit a man or a nation if he gain the whole commercial world and lose his own higher and truer life? That is what the university stands for.[131]

In Canada, a national cultural mission could be achieved only through separation of church and state; that is, through separation of church and education:

> The old idea of the Church that religion and education should go together was and is perfectly correct, and while we deny the right of Church control in this or any other function of the State, yet if our citizens are to be of the proper stamp, more adequate provision must be made for their moral and religious life. Not by the Church's control of the State, but by the Church's co-operation with the State, can the Church today best fulfil its function in regard to education.[132]

The theological college was housed on the university campus and its students and staff participated fully in the university activities.[133] The principal and faculty still led Bible classes and participated in Christian organizations on campus.[134] As late as 1942, principals of Queen's made the arrangements for university mission events.[135]

The history of the decade-long controversy surrounding Queen's which ended in the separation of the university from the Presbyterian Church does not strongly support the idea that separation was the culmination of a religious accommodation of Queen's that made Protestantism irrelevant to Canadian life. The consistency of the university with its Church of Scotland founding tradition was striking. Even its separation in 1912 was consistent with its understanding that its mission was religious. Queen's interpreted its mission culturally, aiming to develop Christians whose lives would influence the nation. While the content it gave Christian terms often was not traditional, Queen's saw itself as attempting to achieve out a vital Christianity for its time. In 1912 Queen's did not regard religion as something to be compartmentalized or as increasingly irrelevant, but was willing to make the practical adjustment necessary to enable it to prevent those perceptions.

The animating principle of all parties in the separation controversy was the cultural mission of Queen's. All agreed that the church's involvement with Queen's was important to its mission. To the majority, the

legal bond between the university and the Presbyterian Church had come to hinder the mission's fulfilment. They believed that the church tradition was inherent in the nature of Queen's and would endure. To the minority, the national vision was Presbyterian and should be associated with the Presbyterian Church. They were being asked to give up something they revered, the direct alliance of education and Presbyterianism in culture.

What occurred at Queen's in 1912 was not secularization but the re-ordering of the manner in which the religious educational mission would be expressed. In the context of the early-twentieth century, the soul of Queen's could not depend on theology as the centre of the curriculum. With specialization and professionalization, maintaining a nationally recognized institution lay beyond the ability of a church constituency which contained competing loyalties. Queen's chose to work within a modern cultural context, severing its ties with the church in order to secure the public funding necessary to maintain its vision. Queen's retained its reverence for theology in its formal and informal relations with the theological college, and consciously endeavoured to keep the Christian spirit at the forefront through academic and co-curricular programs. Separation of Queen's University from the Presbyterian Church did not result in the secularization of Queen's, according to its religious tradition, in 1912 and for some time to come.

Endnotes

1. Canadian histories which argue this thesis include Ramsay Cook, *The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1985); and David B. Marshall, *Secularizing the Faith: Canadian Protestant Clergy and the Crisis of Belief, 1850-1940* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1992).

2. A.B. McKillop, *A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1979); Cook, *Regenerators*, 1985; and Michael Gauvreau, *The Evangelical Century: College and Creed in English-Canada From the Great Revival to the Great Depression* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1991).

3. D.D. Calvin, *Queen's University at Kingston* (Kingston: The Trustees of the University, 1941), 149-50.

4. Wilhelmina Gordon, *Daniel Gordon: His Life* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1941), 225.

5. Hilda Neatby, *Queen's University, 1841-1917* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1978), 245-68.

6. George Rawlyk and Kevin Quinn, *"The Redeemed of the Lord Say So": A History of Queen's Theological College 1912-1972* (Kingston: Queen's Theological College, 1980), 14, 1.

7. My understanding of the Scottish universities is mainly drawn from Douglas Sloan, *The Scottish Enlightenment and the American College Ideal* (New York: Teacher's College Press, Columbia Univ., 1971); and McKillop, *A Disciplined Intelligence*.

8. ". . . [W]e do further will . . . that the said college shall be deemed and taken to be a University; and that the Students in the said College shall have liberty and faculty in taking the degrees of Bachelor, Master and Doctor in the several Arts and faculties . . ." ("Royal Charter of Queen's College," 16 October 1841, Queen's University Archives [hereafter QUA] 3706-2/6-Vol. I).

9. ". . . [N]o religious test or qualification shall be required . . . save only for all persons admitted . . . to any degree in Divinity . . ." ("Royal Charter of Queen's College," 1841, QUA.)

10. Other Canadian mainline denominations came to share the national vision. Canadian historians link the idea of Canada as "His Dominion" to Protestant social activism in the beginning decades of the twentieth century (see Phyllis D. Airhart, "Ordering a New Nation and Reordering Protestantism 1867-1914," *The Canadian Protestant Experience 1760-1990* [Burlington: Welch Publishing Company, 1990]; and Nancy Christie and Michael Gauvreau, *A Full-Orbed Christianity: The Protestant Churches and Social Welfare in Canada* [Montreal: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 1996]).

11. Calvin, *Queen's University*, 92-93.

12. Grant to Fleming, 17 March 1886 (Fleming Papers), quoted in Neatby, *Queen's University*, 225. Just before his death, Grant reminisced, ". . . I had always contended that it was a waste for Nova Scotia to spend on half a dozen small colleges the little it gave for higher education, instead of concentrating its efforts, so as to have an institution fit to compete with McGill, Toronto or Harvard. I also believed that the highest University ideal was not government by a denomination but self-government, and that on Boards only public and educational interests should be represented. But clearly Ontario needed more than one university . . . and Queen's, from its location, traditions, and freedom from denominational control seemed particularly suited to be the second, and of all the more value to the province because of its distinctiveness of type"

(G.M. Grant, "Thanksgiving and Retrospect," *Queen's Quarterly* 9, No. 3 [January 1902]: 229).

13. In Scottish Calvinism the national ideal is religious in character. There is no division between the sacred and secular because this world is taken to be God's world. Everything that is and everything one does is related to God. Natural and moral truth can be pursued scientifically in the confidence that anything learned is being learned about God. From this point of view, national life is religious life.

14. It is unlikely that the alumnae were consulted as they did not enjoy voting privileges in student affairs at this time.

15. "Report of the Committee on Conference with the Trustees of Queen's University," 25 May 1901, in *Minutes of General Assembly 1900-1907*, QUA 1023-3-24.

16. "Minutes of General Assembly," 1901, in *Minutes of General Assembly 1900-1907*, QUA.

17. The minutes of the University Council in 1901 indicate that the members expected that Queen's would become a public university and receive government funding. They appointed a committee "to approach other universities with a view to considering a uniform matriculation for the universities of Ontario and Quebec at least." When told that the planned gymnasium would cost approximately $7000, they resolved to "aim at a . . . building costing not less than '10,000.'" Meanwhile, the trustees continued their creative financing by transferring a professor of physics to the School of Mining for salary purposes, keeping his faculty status within the university unchanged. Further assistance appeared imminent as the Ontario government agreed to establish a School of Mining.

18. "Minutes of General Assembly," 1902, in *Minutes of General Assembly 1900-1907*, QUA.

19. "Minutes of General Assembly," 1902, in *Minutes of General Assembly 1900-1907*, QUA.

20. "Current Events," *Queen's Quarterly* 10, No. 1 (July 1902): 122-23.

21. John Macnaughton, "Principal Gordon," *Queen's Quarterly* 10, No. 3 (January 1903): 249, 250-51.

22. Calvin, *Queen's University*, 140.

23. "The Functions of a Modern University," *Queen's Quarterly* 10, No. 4 (April 1903): 494.

24. "Draft Bill to Enact Constitutional Changes in Queen's University," 23 March 1903, QUA 1023-3-22.

25. John Charlton was a well-to-do Ontario lumberman and member of parliament. His appeal appeared to be sentimental rather than theological.

26. "Minutes of General Assembly," 1903, in *Minutes of General Assembly 1900-1907*, QUA.

27. Daniel M. Gordon to Lord Mountstephen, 9 January 1904, QUA 1023-1-4.

28. Daniel M. Gordon to A.T. Drummond, 6 October 1903, QUA 1023-1-4; and D.M. Gordon, "Queen's and the Assembly's Commission," *Queen's Quarterly* 11, No. 2 (October 1903): 189-90.

29. "The Future of Queen's," *Queen's Quarterly* 11, No. 2 (October 1903): 191-92.

30. In fact, the previous year, Dyde had argued in the *Queen's Journal* that: "Many colleges . . . founded by religious bodies have, to their credit, become independent. Nor can it be argued that a college must be secular and irreligious, when it becomes unsectarian; it is possible to preserve, even to deepen, religious life by dropping denominational peculiarities" ("The University Question," reprinted in *Queen's University Journal* 31, No. 3 [23 November 1903]: 41).

31. "The Future of Queen's," *Queen's University Journal* 31, No. 1 (16 October 1903): 21.

32. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 11 February 1904, QUA; and "Statement of Proceedings Affecting the Relation of Queen's University to the Church," undated, QUA 1023-3-24.

33. James Douglas to Daniel Gordon, 4 January 1904, QUA 1023-1-5.

34. "Queen's University and the University Question," pamphlet, QUA 1023-3-17.

35. "Current Events: The Proposed Provincial Board for Teacher's Certificates," *Queen's Quarterly* 11, No. 3 (January 1904): 330-31.

36. Royal Charter of Queen's College," 1841, QUA.

37. "Report of the Board of Trustees to the General Assembly," 1904, in *Minutes of General Assembly 1900-1907*, QUA.

38. "Meeting of the General Assembly's Committee in Co-operation with the Trustees of Queen's University," 1 September 1904, QUA 1023-3-24.

39. "Outline of Address on Behalf of Queen's Endowment Fund," c. 1904, QUA 1023-5-82.

40. "Professor Macnaughton' Inaugural Speech," *Queen's University Journal* 32, No. 3 (16 November 1904): 83.

41. Daniel M. Gordon to John Charlton, 23 February 1905, QUA 1023-1-14.

42. "Editorial Notes," *Queen's University Journal* 32, No. 10 (16 March 1905): 382.

43. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 27 April 1905, QUA; and "Minutes of General Assembly," 1905, in *Minutes of General Assembly 1900-1907*, QUA.

44. D.M. Gordon, "The General Assembly and Queen's University," *Queen's Quarterly* 13, No. 1 (July 1905): 70.

45. "Editorial Notes," *Queen's University Journal* 33, No. 2 (3 November 1905): 64.

46. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 18 September 1905, QUA.

47. Daniel M. Gordon to J.S. Willison, 4 January 1906, QUA 1023-1-8.

48. "The Endowment Fund," *Queen's University Journal* 33, No. 6 (15 January 1906): 204.

49. The trustees were informed in September that parliament had passed the bill ("Minutes of Board of Trustees," 11 September 1906, QUA).

50. "Minutes of University Council," 24 April 1906, QUA.

51. Daniel M. Gordon to James Maclennan, 28 March 1906, QUA 1023-1-8.

52. James Maclennan to Daniel M. Gordon, 5 April 1906, QUA 1023-1-8.

53. "Minutes of Senate," 21 April 1906, QUA.

54. "Honouring Mr. Carnegie," *Queen's University Journal* 33, No. 12 (4 May 1906): 402-04.

55. Daniel Gordon to Andrew Carnegie, 21 May 1906, QUA 1023-1-8.

56. Daniel M. Gordon to Andrew Carnegie, 28 November 1906, QUA 1023-1-12.

57. Daniel M. Gordon to Lord Strathcona, 6 December 1906, QUA 1023-1-13.

58. J.F. Tufts to Daniel M. Gordon, 1 December 1906, QUA 1023-1-13.

59. Daniel M. Gordon to J.F. Tufts, 14 December 1906, QUA 1023-1-13.

60. R.M.W. Kennedy to Daniel M. Gordon, 5 January 1907, QUA 1023-1-14; N.B. Hamm to Daniel M. Gordon, January 1907, QUA 1023-1-14; and Daniel M. Gordon to R.M.W. Kennedy, 7 January 1907, QUA 1023-1-14.

61. "Minutes of University Council," 24 April 1906, QUA.

62. Memo for Letter to Hon. Mr. Whitney, undated, QUA 1023-3-23.

63. "Science: The Growing Queen's," *Queen's University Journal* 34, No. 8 (15 February 1907): 306-307.

64. "The Visit of the Legislative Assembly," *Queen's University Journal* 34, No. 8 (15 February 1907): 306-07.

65. "Minutes of University Council," 23 April 1907, QUA.

66. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 25 April 1907, QUA.

67. "Report of the Board of Trustees," 1907; and "Report of the Committee Appointed by the General Assembly to Co-operate with the Trustees's of Queen's University in Securing Additional Endowment for the University," 1907, in *Minutes of General Assembly 1900-1907*, QUA.

68. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 16 October 1907, QUA; and "The Endowment Number," *Queen's University Journal* 35, No. 2 (5 November 1907): 64-65.

69. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 16 October 1907, QUA.

70. "Minutes of the Board of Trustees," 17 October 1907, QUA.

71. "Minutes of University Council," 11 November 1907, QUA.

72. "Some News Items," 17 January 1908, QUA 1023-3-24.

73. Daniel M. Gordon to Annie B. Rankin, 9 February 1906, QUA 1023-1-8; "Minutes of Senate," 7 April 1908, QUA; and Daniel M. Gordon to Chancellor McKay, 15 January 1906, QUA 1023-1-8.

74. "Divinity," *Queen's University Journal* 35, No. 7 (3 February 1908): 338-340; and "Editorials," *Queen's University Journal* 36, No. 10 (15 March 1909): 377.

75. Daniel M. Gordon to Alexander Henderson, 13 January 1908, QUA 1023-1-17.

76. While Gordon's correspondence shows that Queen's broad theological stance alienated some traditionalist ministers and congregations, the majority in the church held a similar stance. By 1908, the movement for the union of the Presbyterian Church with the Methodist and Congregationalist churches, which required doctrinal moderation to succeed, was well underway. (For an example of a negative congregational response, see R.G. McBeth to Daniel M. Gordon, 27 December 1905, QUA 1023-1-5.)

77. "Minutes of Senate," 10 March 1908, QUA.

78. Daniel M. Gordon to Sandford Fleming, 11 March 1908, QUA 1023-1-17.

79. The amendment observed that "the seriousness of the situation is increased by the working, actual and probable, of the Carnegie Foundation" ("Minutes of Senate," 12 March 1908, QUA).

80. "Minutes of Senate," 12 March 1908, QUA.

81. D.R. Drummond to Daniel M. Gordon, 23 March 1908, QUA 1023-1-17.

82. Daniel M. Gordon to D.R. Drummond, 25 March 1908, QUA 1023-1-17.

83. Sandford Fleming to Daniel M. Gordon, 31 March 1908, QUA 1023-1-17.

84. James Maclennan to Daniel M. Gordon, 2 April 1908, QUA 1023-1-18.

85. "Queen's and the Church," *Queen's University Journal* 35, No. 12 (18 May 1908): 535-536.

86. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 30 April 1908, QUA.

87. My main source for the Assembly is the detailed report made by James Cappon to the Queen's community ("The Case of Queen's Before the Assembly," *Queen's Quarterly* 16, No. 1 [July-August-September 1908]: 98-115).

88. Cappon, "The Case of Queen's," 105.

89. Cappon, "The Case of Queen's," 111.

90. Cappon, "The Case of Queen's," 111.

91. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 14 October 1908, QUA.

92. Cappon, "Case of Queen's," 114.

93. James Douglas to Daniel M. Gordon, 16 June 1908; and Daniel M. Gordon to James Douglas, 29 August 1908, QUA 1023- .

94. "Minutes of Senate," 8 October 1908, QUA.

95. Daniel M. Gordon to J. Roberts Allen, 17 October 1908, QUA 1023-1-23.

96. Daniel M. Gordon to Sandford Fleming, 27 October 1908, QUA 1023-1-23; Circular, "To the Subscribers of the Endowment Fund," 27 October 1908, QUA 1023-1-23.

97. Daniel M. Gordon to Sandford Fleming, 19 November 1908, QUA 1023-1-24.

98. James Maclennan and Sandford Fleming to Staff at Queen's, 1 December 1908, QUA 1023-1-24.

99. James Douglas to Daniel R. Gordon, 26 April 1909, QUA 1023-1-25.

100. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 28 April 1909, QUA.

101. W.G. Jordon, "Queen's and the General Assembly," *Queen's Quarterly* 17, No. 1 (July-August-September 1909): 89.

102. Jordon, "Queen's and the General Assembly," 92.

103. Jordon, "Queen's and the General Assembly," 93.

104. Jordon, "Queen's and the General Assembly," 96.

105. "Minutes of General Assembly," 3 June 1909, QUA 1023-2-13.

106. John Watson, N.F. Dupuis, and James Cappon, "Some Considerations on Queen's Position," *Queen's Quarterly* 17, No. 2 (October-November-December 1909): 90, 91.

107. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 5 October 1909, QUA.

108. G.M. Macdonnell and S.W. Dyde, "Queen's and Her Future," *Queen's Quarterly* 17, No. 3 (January-February-March 1908): 218-19.

109. Macdonnell and Dyde, "Queen's and Her Future," 223.

110. James Cappon, "The Constitutional Relation of Queen's University to the Church," *Queen's Quarterly* 17, No. 3 (January-February-March 1910): 192.

111. Cappon, "The Constitutional Relation of Queen's University to the Church," 211.

112. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 26 April 1910, QUA.

113. Daniel M. Gordon to Sandford Fleming, 10 May 1910, QUA 1023-1-26.

114. J.L. Morison to Daniel M. Gordon, 29 May 1910, QUA 1023-1-26.

115. Daniel M. Gordon to Sandford Fleming, 7 June 1910, QUA 1023-1-26.

116. Daniel M. Gordon to G.M. Macdonnell, 23 September 1910, QUA 1023-1-26.

117. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 19 October 1910, QUA.

118. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 16 November 1910, QUA.

119. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 16 November 1910, QUA.

120. J.R. Shannon, D. Strachan, C.F. Hamilton, Andrew Haydon, E.R. Peacock, J. McDonald Mowat, and R.W. Brock, "To Our Fellow Graduates," 20 December 1910, QUA 1023-3-24.

121. N.F. Dupuis, W.L. Goodwin, James Cappon, J.C. Connell, and W. Ellis, "Circular to Graduates," 25 December 1910, QUA 1023-1-26.

122. N.F. Dupuis to Daniel M. Gordon, 3 January 1910, QUA 1023-1-26.

123. Daniel M. Gordon to J.K. Macdonald, 20 March 1911, QUA 1023-1-27.

124. Gordon to Macdonald, 31 March 1911, QUA 1023-1-27.

125. "Minutes of University Council," 25 April 1911, QUA.

126. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 13 June 1911, QUA.

127. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 18 October 1911, QUA.

128. "An Act to Incorporate Queen's Theological College," 1 April 1912, QUA 1023-3-22.

129. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 21 May 1912, QUA.

130. "Minutes of Board of Trustees," 21 May 1912, QUA; Daniel M. Gordon to Henry S. Pritchett, 3 December 1912, QUA 1023-1-26; and 28 May 1913, QUA 1023-1-26; 13 February 1915, QUA 1023-1-26. Gordon was awarded a pension by the Carnegie Pension Fund in 1916 (Daniel M. Gordon to Henry S. Pritchett, 19 June 1916, QUA 1023-1-26).

131. "Canadian Club Luncheon No. 1," 7 October 1911, QUA, 1023-5-110.

132. Daniel M. Gordon, "Some Principles of Education," c. 1912, QUA 1023-5-17.

133. Rawlyk and Quinn, *Redeemed of the Lord*, 15.

134. "Queen's Missionary Conference," *Queen's University Journal* 38, No. 13 (25 January 1911): 271.

135. Principal Wallace to S.M. Gilmour, 6 November 1942, QUA-Principal's Files-Box 16.

"How to Win Friends and Influence People": Missions to Bawating, 1830-1840[1]

KARL HELE

From 1830 to 1840 the Anglican and Methodist missionaries to Sault Ste. Marie sought to convert the Indians to their specific interpretation of the faith. They desired to "make friends quickly and easily," "increase [their] popularity," "win people to [their] way of thinking," "increase [their] influence . . . prestige . . . ability to get things done," and "keep [their] human contacts smooth and pleasant," while arousing enthusiasm and stir the people to whom they preached out of the 'mental rut of uneducated superstition.'[2] In essence the missionaries sought to become fathers, brothers and friends to the people of the Sault.

Throughout the decade fifteen Protestant missionaries were present on the Canadian side of the rapids at one time or another, with an additional two or three on the American side.[3] Proselytization efforts appear to have peaked in 1833 when eight itinerant Methodist catechists and an Anglican were seeking adherents (see Appendix I). All the missionaries obtained "pledges [from the Indians] that they would embrace the Christian Religion."[4] The question is why, despite the promises of the Indians to adhere to either the Anglican or Methodist faith, did the Anglicans experience the greatest success?

The key, partly, to understanding lies in the expectations of the Ojibwa. They promised to adhere to Christianity as long as "a missionary [be] sent amongst them."[5] None of the Methodists remained beyond the dispersal of the people after their summer gathering, while the Anglicans stationed a missionary there throughout the decade despite the dispersals.

Nevertheless, this explanation fails to account for the conversion of people to the Methodist faith.

Elizabeth Graham presents an explanation for the apparent success of the Anglicans. She recognizes that "[t]he various roles played by the missionaries in the Indian communities are important in regarding the missionaries not only as a source of change, but also as an integral part of the social structure of changing Indian society."[6] Moreover, these roles included, "spheres of influence" and access to various "sources of power, combined for the "[s]uccessful performance of the 'missionary role.'"[7] Despite her assertions Graham does not provide a comprehensive method with which to analyze such roles and influences.

A recent article by Bruce White about the fur trade can be utilized to provide a method through which we can develop an understanding of what, in part, made a missionary successful. He reveals that the understanding of the terms 'father' and 'brother' when applied to a trader by the Indians and/or used by the trader himself, implied a specific type of relationship.[8] Each term denotes a specific social responsibility: a father was suppose to be more generous, while a brother was an equal.[9] In addition, White maintains that these fictive connotations can be turned into an actual relationship through marriage: "marrying into an Indian family did not lesson his [the fur trader's] obligation . . . it simply provided him with a previously defined kinship network."[10] In other words, the trader, to be successful, became part of the community, establishing various social relationships through kin, services, goods, and gifts. The creation and solidifying of such a relationship was similarly necessary for a missionary to win adherents. Whether fictive or actual kin, a missionary had to establish a firm relationship to the people with whom he was working otherwise success would continue to elude him.

The Methodists were the first seek to establish a field of labour along the shores of the Canadian Sault. Furthermore, Shingwauk, chief at the Sault and later Garden River, met and promised the Rev. Peter Jones in 1830, at Penetanguishene, that he was "willing to give himself up to the white man's worship, but would have to consult with his people . . . and he would recommend them to become Christians."[11] Responding quickly, the Methodists did send a few men to preach to the Indians, such as John Sunday, and by 1833 had a fair following with "between one and two hundred . . . [giving] pledges that they would embrace the Christian Religion."[12] The *Christian Guardian* contains numerous accounts of men

and women seeking solace in God despite the obvious displeasure and conflict caused by conversion or merely listening to the missionary. For example, David Sawyer reports that Indian women from both sides of the river met after a prayer meeting and decided to build a house where they might hear the words of God.[13] Another woman, after finding that her husband had taken the canoe, swam across the St. Mary's River with her two children seated upon either shoulder to reach John Sunday's sermon.[14] Persistence in seeking out the missionaries and conversion resulted in one woman being rejected by her husband: he eventually attempted to take her life.[15] Despite apparent rifts developing between converts and non-converts the missionaries predicted that the field was going to be a great success but it was far from their field alone.

In 1830 the Anglicans made their appearance at the rapids under the auspices of James Cameron. However, within a season Cameron was a convert to the Baptist faith and dismissed from his post, all despite the conviction by his employer that he was "zealous even to enthusiasm, on the object of civilizing and converting his countrymen."[16] From all appearances, Cameron was conducting the mission well; he had the support of the Head Chief Shingwauk, was holding adult prayer meetings and had a day school with the eighteen to twenty people in attendance.

With the dismissal of Cameron in 1832, William McMurray was appointed in his stead.[17] It was under the direction of McMurray that the Anglican mission to the Sault would be placed upon a firm and lasting footing. From 1832 to 1838 McMurray laboured at the Sault to bring the people over to the Anglican faith and despite problems typical to mission stations such as the seasonal withdrawal students, the presence of detractors and whisky traders, by the end of his tenure he was able to claim one hundred and sixty baptisms with forty people having been admitted to Holy Communion.[18] With the health of his wife failing, McMurray requested relocation to a more southerly climate, which was granted.[19]

Rev. McMurray's replacement was Rev. Frederick O'Meara who, upon arrival in the Sault, was pleased with the evidence of the progress of the Indians toward civilization, their abstention from alcohol, and continued gathering every Sunday to pray despite the absence of a minister.[20] After re-establishing the Sunday school and being confronted with a large attendance, and seeing that people continued to desire baptism, O'Meara predicted that, "the most blessed result may be anticipated."[21] Yet within two years of his arrival, the congregation had dispersed and the

church left to decay.[22] He subsequently withdrew to a new station on Manitoulin Island in 1840/1. This left the field essentially empty until the late 1840s.

Methodists and Anglicans both interacted with and sought converts among the Ojibwa at the rapids, yet only Rev. McMurray's mission was deemed a success and was unequalled until the 1850s. The Ojibwa at the rapids sought out the missionaries as friends, allies and teachers, yet apparently the majority of the converts sought out and followed McMurray. From this conclusion, I will attempt to explain why the various missionaries to the Sault were able to create a following and from this following draw converts.[23]

A large part of the early success of the Methodists was due to the propagation of the faith by native (mixed blood) preachers, such as Peter Jones, Peter Jacobs, Peter Marksman, John Sunday and David Sawyer who spoke Ojibwa. James Evans is an exception but apparently he was fluent in Ojibwa.[24] The ability to appeal to the Indians in their own language gave the Methodists an advantage over those who did not. The Anglicans recognized such influence and ensured that their first missionary, Cameron, was of mixed ancestry and spoke fluent Ojibwa. Later both McMurray and O'Meara learned the local language to enable them to readily talk with the people with whom they were working. All believed that to be successful it was necessary to acquire a thorough knowledge of Ojibwa, for without this one was handicapped by the quality of interpreter and the inability to converse with the people in their homes.[25]

A following was also acquired by the native preachers sent by the Methodists through their talk of native homelands. They presented these lands as being open to Indians only where they could seek spiritual and physical solace, Christian Brotherhood, aid in the development of a settled community and escape from frontier society.[26] Additionally the itinerant preachers/exhorters provided seasonal schooling, returned year after year, and administered medicine to the sick. With high attendance numbers at sermons and classes, combined with the interest of the Chief, great success was being predicted. Peter Jones felt that the Spirit of God had instilled an interest in Jesus in the hearts of the Indians which would make the Sault and Garden River an excellent mission station.[27]

In his prediction Jones also noted that the construction of a church, schoolhouse and residence, as well as the establishment of a model farm would secure their initial successes. Chief Shingwauk, in 1830 and again

in 1832, requested the governor and missionaries, specifically James Evans, to send a teacher to his people. Obviously the Chief felt that a permanent teacher was needed among his followers. If the Methodists were unable to provide one then he would turn elsewhere. The arrival of the Anglicans under the auspices of McMurray and their desire to become a permanent presence was what, in part, the Chief and others sought.

Upon his arrival McMurray called a council at which he presented his credentials of office to all present and stated that he had been sent to instruct the Great Father's red children. Before accepting his word, the council and Chief Shingwauk sought to obtain proof of his appointment by the governor. In establishing his credibility McMurray presented papers which bore a seal; this image, after being compared to a medal worn by the chief, gained McMurray his initial acceptance.[28] With this done "the council decided to accept the offer of the Church and Government, and promised to open their ears to the instruction of their agent."[29] To affirm his word, McMurray moved quickly to establish the permanence of the mission by hiring an interpreter of his sermons, and by renting a house and farm to serve as his mission station and school. McMurray was soon able to gather a large following around him, and within two years of his arrival predicted the success of his mission due to the reciprocal attachment that was developing between himself and the people.[30] His success in winning souls can be attributed to several factors, such as his relationships with community members, choice of wife, as well as government support.

Locally, there were two main sources of influence which furnished McMurray with access to the community, besides the desire of the people to have their own minister. One such source he touched, albeit unknowingly, was that of the fur trade. Governor Simpson had the Hudson's Bay Company (hereafter HBC) post host McMurray until suitable accommodations could be found.[31] After a dispute with the factor at the post, McMurray moved across the river and into the John Johnston's home. John Johnston was both a prominent community member and considered a "gentleman of rank" in the Sault and area, partly due to his ties to the fur trade and partly because of his wife.[32]

Mrs. Johnston, or O-shah-gus-ko-da-wa-quay (Woman of the Green Meadow), was the daughter of the war chief Waub-o-jeeg and a fullblood Ojibwa.[33] She was a powerful woman in local affairs: American Indian Agent Henry Rowe Schoolcraft credits her with preventing war between the United States and the Ojibwa in 1821 over the extension of American

sovereignty into the area.[34] She also conducted the affairs of her husband while he was away on business.

After a brief stay with this locally notable family McMurray was able to relocate to the Canadian side once more, but often returned to the hospitality of the Johnston home. The residence he rented was owned by a former fur trader, Charles Oakes Ermatinger.[35] From these connections McMurray was able to draw upon the goods and established relationships which both had created. Furthermore, Johnston and the HBC's factor encouraged their kin and fictive-kin (trade customers) to attend to the new minister.

While residing at the Johnston home, McMurray was able to make to more very important connections. First, he established a friendly relationship with Schoolcraft, a son-in-law to the Johnstons through his marriage to their daughter Jane. Schoolcraft believed himself and others to be under a moral obligation to introduce and educate the heathen Indians about the advantages of Christianity and civilization, which would elevate them to a status on par with Euro-Americans.[36] As such, Schoolcraft was more than willing to help the new minister.

McMurray's introduction to Charlotte (Jane's sister) is the second connection and perhaps the most important one he made while residing at the Johnston home. She was an accomplished translator, having been employed by the Rev. Able Bingham, and as such McMurray hired her to both instruct him in, and translate his sermons into, Ojibwa. He subsequently married Charlotte Johnston in 1833, making him a son-in-law of an important trading family and brother-in-law to Schoolcraft. Charlotte (Johnston) McMurray is credited by contemporaries as being of great assistance to her husband. For instance, Anna Jameson a traveller to the Sault, noted that, "He [McMurray] is satisfied with his success, and seems to have gained the good-will and attachment of the Indians around; he owes much, he says, to his sweet wife, whose perfect knowledge of the language and habits of her people has aided him in his task."[37] Mrs. McMurray established a school where she taught girls and women how to sing and initiated "them into the ways of civilized life."[38] She was able to teach her husband the language while assisting him in translating the bible, his sermons as well as prayers. Eventually, the McMurrays were able to translate the Church catechism, part of the prayer book and the Ten Commandments into Ojibwa.[39] Nevertheless, according to Jameson, Mrs. McMurray was never limited to the realm of translation. Native women

were "always lounging in and out, coming to Mrs. McMurray about every little trifle, and very frequently about nothing at all."[40] She was able through her own connections to function as a counsellor among the women while Rev. McMurray played the role among the men. Additionally, her education in the Sault area provided her with the ability to function in both the white and Indian worlds. This ability allowed her to interpret Ojibwa culture and worldviews to her husband, as well as explain the missionary to the Ojibwa. Simply put, she had the ability to translate cultural suppositions to both her husband and the Ojibwa. Finally, Mrs. McMurray also managed the household. Such a task freed her husband from performing tasks such as cooking, cleaning, and cutting wood for which he would have experienced derision.[41] McMurray was thus able to avoid the problems entailed in attempting to gain the people's respect while carrying out duties not befitting the Ojibwa image of a man.

The roles Mrs. McMurray assumed – translator, teacher, wife, and mother – as well as her ties to the community, gave her husband and the Church of England the ability to establish itself at the rapids. These connections would serve him well, for "the influence and success that a trader [and missionary] had with the Indians corresponded to the strength and renown of his father-in-law," to which can be added in this case the renown of both the mother and brother-in-law as well.[42] Kin ties established by McMurray added weight to his authority and position within the Ojibwa Sault community. As expressed by Augustine Shingwauk (son of Shingwauk and subsequent chief), thirty-three years later, he "took Ogenebugokwa [Charlotte], one of our nation, for his wife; and we loved him still more, for we felt that he was now indeed become one of us."[43] The Methodist itinerant preachers – like Jones being Mississauga and fluent – simply could not compete with the ties created by marriage.

Aside from the personal ties McMurray created, he attracted potential adherents upon the basis of the powers he represented, that of a new God and the Crown. Indians, according to Janet Chute, sought missionaries out both as potential allies and for their power in an effort to sustain their traditions and independence while interacting with the incoming Euro-Canadians.[44] The desire expressed by Shingwauk, in the name of the people of the Sault, for a teacher can be seen as such an effort. McMurray was, therefore, entering a role predetermined by the Indians at the Sault; all that was left was to see if he would be able and/or willing to fill it.[45]

McMurray was the representative of the Governor General's Church. One year after McMurray's arrival, and after considering the different faiths, Shingwauk stated that he would "shut [his] ears against them, and attend only to the Preacher you [Gov. Colborne] have sent us."[46] Hence, McMurray was seen as the representative of the Great Father in Toronto.[47] Shingwauk and others at the rapids were not wrong in this assumption, for McMurray was appointed by the Society for Converting and Civilizing the Indians and Propagating the Gospel Among Destitute Settlers (hereafter Society) whose key patrons were the leaders of Upper Canadian Society, such as Lieutenant-Governor Sir John Colborne and Bishop John Strachan. In 1835, in response to rumours that McMurray was an imposter, Thomas G. Anderson, Superintendent of Indian Affairs at Manitowaning, stated "that if their father had anything to communicate to them he would do it thr' their Minister and should they have anything to say to him, he would write it for them if it was proper."[48] Furthermore, until Anderson's appointment as Superintendent, McMurray was the Indian Agent for Sault Ste. Marie. As such the Ojibwa were more than justified in believing that they had a direct line to the heart of British civilization and authority.

Apart from representing the Crown, McMurray also represented a source of potential material goods. McMurray's original instructions, given to him by Sir John Colborne and members of the Society, called for the construction of twenty houses, a supply of farm implements and animals, and an instructor.[49] This promise was renewed by Sir J. Colborne in 1831 when McMurray brought Shingwauk and his son Augustine to ask their Great Father which religion they should assume; naturally the governor recommended the Queen's religion.[50] The promise of housing went quite far in encouraging at least adherence if not outright conversion. In the Society's *Annual Report* for 1833, McMurray recognized the advantage which the promise of houses had given him over the other faiths in the field.[51] Other material inducements to conversion in addition to the housing, such as oxen, cows, chickens, harrows, and ploughs, attracted potential Indian converts from the growing Methodist flock on the American side.[52] Such advantages left the Methodists complaining that their converts were being induced by material rewards to assume the Queen's religion.[53] Shingwauk, in attempting to take advantage of the government's promise of housing as well as the perceived material advantages of Anglicanism, claimed that "[m]any Heathen Indians would if they saw me and my band in good houses be induced to give up their wandering habits

[and] come [and] reside with us [and] pray with us, should the like be done for them."[54]

The promise of housing was only one of many inducements to join with the Queen's Church. McMurray's followers were entitled to receive their annual gifts at the Sault, whereas the pagan, Roman Catholic, and Methodist Indians had to travel to Manitoulin Island to obtain theirs.[55] Shingwauk and his followers perceived the promise held out to them by ascribing to the Anglican faith in the terms of material and spiritual advantages. Years later, Captain Anderson advised his son, the Rev. Gustavus Anderson, that he should not promise the Indians any material aid despite the fact that McMurray had been relatively successful due to the liberal support of the government.[56] Clearly, material benefits and the Anglican brand of Christianity had been successfully linked in the minds of many people, or, as succinctly expressed to Rev. Anderson by one of his followers, "the English appear to be most favoured in everything, the Great spirit must look with favourable eye upon him."[57]

Material benefits and ties to the government were not the only inducements to join McMurray's church. After all, McMurray's position as a man of God also endowed him with spiritual power. Shingwauk and others who desired to learn about the God of the Bible so as to better understand and deal with the world beyond the Sault called upon their minister for both advice and medicines.[58] McMurray's power was felt to be superior to that of the local shamans; he was able to destroy 'meta-wa-aun' bags and bring their owners over to his faith.[59] Shingwauk was a powerful member of the mede society and had given over his beliefs and practices under the tutelage of McMurray.[60] When the McMurrays left the Sault in 1838, Shingwauk apparently resumed them, and it is debatable as to whether or not Shingwauk actually gave over his meta-wa-auns.[61] As with all conversions, that of Shingwauk was multifaceted, but a significant contribution to it was the result of the apparent cure of another son, Buhjwujjenene, by the supplications of McMurray to his God. Out of respect for his friend, William McMurray, Shingwauk took his name upon being baptised a member of the Church of England on 19 January 1834.[62]

A further indication of acceptance by the Indians was the bestowing of an Indian name by which the person was to be known for the rest of his life. McMurray was honoured with the name Nashikawah-wahsung or The Lone Lightning. The name, according to Augustine Shingwauk, was conferred upon their beloved teacher of Christianity and the good Book,

because he was "the first messenger of Christ to bring them the light of the Gospel."[63] McMurray, in effect, was now seen as an important member of the community, an ally, a representative of Euro-Canadian society, and a access channel to the power of the new nation.

Nevertheless, the ties to the administration of the colony would prove to be McMurray's undoing. With the appointment of Sir Francis Bond Head to the post of Lieutenant-Governor, a change in Indian Affairs occurred. Bond Head sought to relocate all Indians, including those at the Sault, to the Manitoulin Island chain where they could vanish peacefully, while opening land up for settlement.[64] The schoolmaster was soon removed by Bond Head, causing McMurray to fear the collapse of his efforts to educate, civilize and Christianize the Indians. Baptisms began to drop off, as houses promised by Lt.-Gov. Colborne were now cancelled by Bond Head. However, the Society failed to acknowledge the source of the problems and instead stated that the reason for the decline was the fact that all Indians in the Sault were now baptized by one faith or another.[65] McMurray was subsequently informed that the houses would only be delivered if he and his converts located to Manitoulin Island. Despite official denials of the impending collapse of mission efforts, McMurray incontrovertibly realized the reciprocal relationships he had created were disintegrating. He felt the betrayal by Bond Head,

> reflected sorely upon me as their missionary. I made the promises to the Indians on the strength of those to them by Sir John Colborne; but as they were not carried out by his successor my position was seriously altered, for the Indians began to think that I had not the authority for making the promises referred to, thus casting a doubt upon my veracity.
>
> This induced me to resign my mission, not because I did not love the work, but I could not allow myself to be looked upon as a deceiver by the changed action of the Government under Sir Francis Head. It was a severe trial, for I loved the work, which had prospered until the shock came to which reference has been made . . .[66]

The illusion, as well as the reality, of power emanating from the Great Father had been destroyed. Without the ability to live up to his promises, McMurray's word soon came to mean nothing – after all, many people converted because of the promise of temporal gain.[67]

The people of Garden River were sad to see their missionary leave,

"for we loved him very much; we loved his wife . . . his children who were born on our land, and had grown up together with our children."[68] Such sorrow is only confirmation of the respect in which McMurray was held. Rev. F.A. O'Meara soon replaced McMurray. However, O'Meara's relationship with the community was not nearly as cordial as the McMurrays. First the temporal advantages that McMurray was able to offer were denied O'Meara under the change of Lt.-Governors. For example, Shingwauk continually pressed for the promised housing, which he soon realized that O'Meara was in no position to deliver due to the government's bad faith.

Further disputes arose between the new minister, Shingwauk and his band over Bond Head's relocation scheme. To bring his policy into effect Bond Head solicited the aid of the Anglican Clergy, and specifically that of O'Meara.[69] After receiving a letter from the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, Captain T.G. Anderson, in November 1840, as to the desirability of removal, O'Meara sought to enlist the chief's aid. However, when presented with the idea both the Chief and band rejected it. Instead of accepting the council's decision, O'Meara believing that the people would soon see their error and change their minds. Again in 1841 he officially presented the idea to the Chief, expressing his opinion in favour of removal.[70] Shingwauk merely promised that he would consult his principle men on the subject and abide by their decision. Despite this second setback O'Meara did try to encourage the people to move. Basically, the relocation scheme placed mission and the band in direct conflict of opinion as to what was in their best interest.[71]

The alienation of his charges by O'Meara continued through his lack of compassion and 'cultural' sensitivity. For instance, instead of consoling Shingwauk as his oldest son lay dying, O'Meara reprimanded those present for not calling him to administer to the man before the delirium had set in. Then, once Nahwahquashkum died, O'Meara refused to provide burial goods. He thought it necessary to correct the Indians in their false impression of his ability to procure goods and provide for them; he felt that by removing the false impression, the Indians would be better able to appreciate salvation.[72] Regardless of O'Meara's intentions, people felt that he was being selfish and extremely rude in a time of mourning. At the funeral O'Meara proceeded to take advantage of the opportunity presented, and preach to those assembled on the benefits of being prepared for death. This speech was given after his refusal to help the dying man meet this

very need. In addition to his unfeeling nature at the funeral, O'Meara failed to grasp the depth of Shingwauk's pain. When finding the Chief and his sons-in-law drunk shortly thereafter, he reprimanded the Chief, further alienating him.[73]

O'Meara's understanding of his role was incompatible with Ojibwa expectations. Shingwauk and his followers sought to cast O'Meara into the same role as McMurray had played, that of a go-between. The lack of understanding and sympathy O'Meara showed for the aspirations of the Indians is demonstrated by his seeking the removal of the Garden River people to Manitoulin Island instead of defending their desire to remain at Garden River. A second example of his misunderstanding of the role comes in October of 1839. Before O'Meara left from Manitoulin Island to go to Toronto Chief Shingwauk placed a pipe in his hands to present to the Lieutenant Governor with a message. Shingwauk's aim was to have O'Meara remind Bond Head of the promises of his predecessor to construct houses for the Indians.[74] Yet upon meeting the Lieutenant-Governor, O'Meara only discussed the planned removals and how best to go about encouraging the people at Garden River to remove to Manitoulin Island. For all his efforts at converting the people, O'Meara's lack of understanding or unwillingness to play the role cast for him caused further erosion of his support. The loss continued until O'Meara, under direction of the Government, willingly moved himself to Manitoulin Island. Refusing to recognize the true reasons to why he was losing support, O'Meara blamed the whisky.[75]

Loss of support for O'Meara is evident in many forms. People stopped attending services regularly and refused to settle and farm. They refused to travel to the Mission house in the Sault, which eventually forced O'Meara to travel once a week to Garden River to deliver his sermons. Suggestive of further disenchantment with O'Meara was the collapse of temperance: in 1841, when O'Meara arrived at Garden River to preach, he found charges drunk and unable to attend service.[76] The Indians also showed their displeasure by refusing to transport the priest to Manitoulin Island, forcing him to ride in the HBC's boat.[77] In spite of waning support and trust for O'Meara, the people were not willing to give up their chosen Church.

When O'Meara left in 1841 in an effort to force the Indians to relocate to Manitoulin Island, Shingwauk called upon his friend and brother to live once more amongst them or "help . . . me, that we may

again have a Minister at Bahwetang (Sault Ste. Marie)."[78] McMurray, taken with his people's plight, requested Bishop Strachan to post him once again to his former station, but the request was denied on the grounds that Shingwauk had merely "taken liberty with the truth."[79] Despite their disappointment with the Anglican Church, people at Garden River and the Sault did attempt to maintain their faith in opposition to the growing numbers of Catholic and Methodist converts, although they felt "like sheep standing in the midst of wolves, who are striving to scatter us."[80] Despite the 'wolves,' McMurray had succeeded in planting the seed of the Church of England in the Sault and area. The following McMurray had in the Sault was based upon respect, power, authority and love felt for and commanded by him as well as love of the new God and material gain.

In their efforts to "make friends quickly and easily," "increase [their] popularity," "win people to [their] way of thinking," "increase [their] influence . . . prestige . . . ability to get things done," and "keep [their] human contacts smooth and pleasant," while arousing enthusiasm and attempting to get the people to whom they preached out of the 'mental rut of uneducated superstition,' both the Anglican and Methodist missionaries were able to report successes.[81] Yet, it was the Anglican faith that attracted the most adherents – Why? The various ties McMurray created and had to the community, especially through marriage, and the outside world enabled him to harvest the sowings of others. Conscious efforts on the part of McMurray and the Anglican church to attract adherents included the promise of housing, farm implements, as well religious and secular. McMurray's marriage to Charlotte Johnston furthered his mission well beyond the promise of temporal gain. Perhaps if the Methodists, as Peter Jones suggested, had taken advantage of the situation and established a permanent mission the story would have been different. While the ability to speak Ojibwa and understand the culture were definite advantages, the lack of permanence, official ties to government and its funds were definite hindrances during these years. When asking why Indians chose to follow a specific faith we must consider also who the missionary was. For like the fur traders who preceded the missionaries, they were representatives of the European culture, sources of aid, useful as allies, and valued as kin. By entering into pre-established kin networks, missionaries became integrated into the societies they sought to recreate in the civilized Christian image. To be a successful missionary meant to come to an understanding and act as a member of the community one sought to change. Rev. McMurray's

mission to the Sault is a useful example of how a missionary could win adherents to his faith by becoming "one with a people." A missionary, hence, was more than a blind propagator of the faith, and more than a simple tool of the government.

Endnotes

1. I would like to thank those friends who read and commented upon earlier versions of this paper. This paper was written with the support of the McGill Institute for the Study of Canada Graduate Fellowship, Roger Warren Research Fellowship, and Garden River First Nation Educational Support. Preliminary research was conducted with the support of a University of Toronto Open Fellowship.

2. Dale Carnegie, *How to Win Friends and Influence People* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981), 3.

3. While preaching at the Sault and Drummond Island on their way to the Red River Colony the Catholics did not seek to establish a permanent presence in the area until 1842.

4. *Sixth Annual Report of the Canada Conference Mission Society of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, 1829-1831*, 8.

5. *Sixth Annual Report of the Canada Conference Mission Society of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, 1829-1831*, 8.

6. Elizabeth Graham, *Medicine Man to Missionary: Missionaries as Agents of Change among the Indians of Southern Ontario, 1784-1867* (Toronto: Peter Martin Associates Ltd., 1975), 5.

7. Graham, *Medicine Man to Missionary*, 5, 62, 89-90.

8. "'Give Us a Little Milk': The Social and Cultural Significance of Gift Giving in the Lake Superior Fur Trade," in *Rendezvous: Selected Papers of the Fourth North American Fur Trade Conference, 1981*, ed. Thomas C. Buckley (St. Paul: the Conference, 1984), 188-197.

9. White, "'Give Us a Little Milk,'" 194-195.

10. White, "'Give Us a Little Milk,'" 195.

11. Peter Jones, "Journal of Penetanguishene Indian Meeting," *New York Christian Advocate*, 13 August 1830, 198.

12. *Sixth Annual Report of the Canada Conference Missionary Society of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, 1829-1831*, 8.

13. "Continuance of extracts from D. Sawyer's Journal," *Christian Guardian*, 20 February 1833, 58.

14. Peter Jones (Kahkewaquonaby), *History of the Ojebway Indians: with especial reference to their conversion to Christianity* (London: A.W. Bennett, 1861), 227.

15. "John Sunday's Journal extracts, continued." *Christian Guardian*, 2 October 1833, 186.

16. *Toronto Societies Report for 1832*; cited in *The Stewart Missions: a series of letters and Journals, calculate to exhibit to British Christians, the spiritual destitution of the emigrants settled in the remote parts of Upper Canada*, ed. Rev. W.J.D. Waddilove (London: J. Hatchard and Son, 1838), 86.

17. When William McMurray first arrived in the Sault, he was only acting in the capacity as lay preacher and catechist. It was in 1833 that McMurray was ordained by the Bishop of Quebec who chased him throughout the townships in Lower Canada (see, "Historical Sketches, No. 43 – Archdeacon McMurray," *Canadian Church Magazine and Mission News* 4, No. 43 [January 1890]: 1; "The Ordination of a Missionary – The Late Bishop of Quebec," *The Church*, 30 March 1839; and *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* [Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1966-], 12: 680).

18. *Canadian Church Magazine and Mission News* 4, No. 43 (January 1890): 2.

19. *Seventh Annual Report of the Society for Converting and Civilizing the Indians and Propagating the Gospel among Destitute Settlers in Upper Canada* (Toronto, 1838), 20-21.

20. *Seventh Annual Report of the Society for Converting and Civilizing the Indians and Propagating the Gospel among Destitute Settlers in Upper Canada* (Toronto, 1838), 20.

21. *Third Report of the Upper Canada Clergy Society, for Sending out Clergymen* (Toronto, 1839), 13.

22. T.G. Anderson, Coburg, to Son Gustavus, 24 July 1848, Anderson Papers, Toronto Metropolitan Reference Library (hereafter TMRL).

23. Native people converted for numerous reasons in addition to the 'attractions' of the missionary. It is my contention that all the aspects of the missionary need to be examined in order to understand conversion, success, and failure.

Missionaries were not simple pawns of colonialism or natives.

24. Letter recorded 4 August 1847, Letterbook, 1844-1847, John Strachan Papers, Archives of Ontario (hereafter AO); and Joseph Forsyth, "Garden River Indian Mission," *Christian Guardian*, 6 May 1857, 123.

25. O'Meara learned the Ojibwa language by having his interpreter translate his English sermons orally. He then copied down what the interpreter was saying while attempting to hear and acquire the correct pronunciation of each word. Come Sunday, he would preach the translation as he had heard it. Eventually, he acquired a thorough knowledge of Ojibwa. He began the translation of the scriptures in this manner with the help of Johnston as interpreter (*Conference on Missions Held in 1860 at Liverpool: Including the Papers Read, The Deliberations and the Conclusions Reached* [London: James Nisbet and Co., 1860], 33-34; Rev. F.A. O'Meara, Mission House Sault Ste. Marie, to the Bishop of Toronto, 6 March 1840, John Strachan Papers, AO; Rev. F.A. O'Meara, Mission House, Sault Ste. Marie, to the Rev. H.J. Grassett, Toronto, 5 June 1839, John Strachan Papers, AO; and *Third Report of the Upper Canada Clergy Society, for Sending out Clergymen* (Toronto, 1839), 13.

26. Janet Chute, "A Century of Native Leadership: Responses of Chief Shingwaukonce and His Successors to Government, Missionary and Commercial Influences on the Ojibway Community at Sault Ste. Marie and Garden River, Ontario," Ph.D. diss., McMaster University, 1985, 124.

27. Fred Landon, "Letters of Rev. James Evans, Methodist Missionary, Written During his Journey to and Residence in the Lake Superior Region, 1838-9," *Ontario Historical Society* 28 (1932): 52.

28. William McMurray, "Mission work among Indians at Sault Ste. Marie in Early Days," *Canadian Church Magazine* [typescript copy], 1891, Missions and Missionaries Binder, Historical Files, Sault Ste. Marie Public Library; *Second Annual Report of the Society for Converting and Civilizing the Indians and Propagating the Gospel among Destitute Settlers in Upper Canada* (Toronto, 1832), 21-22; and "The Ordination of a Missionary – The Late Bishop of Quebec."

29. McMurray, "Mission work among Indians at Sault Ste. Marie in Early Days"; and "The Ordination of a Missionary – The Late Bishop of Quebec."

30. Waddilove, ed., *The Stewart Missions*, 102.

31. T.G. Anderson, S.I.A., Coldwater, to Captain G. Phillpots, A.D.C., 18 July 1835, John Strachan Papers, AO; *Centennial Commemoration: One Hundred Years of the Church of England in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario* (Sault Ste.

Marie: Cliffe Printing, 1932), 7.

32. Mentor L. Williams, ed., *Schoolcraft's Narrative Journal of Travels: Through the Northwestern Regions of the United States extending from Detroit through the Great Chain of American Lakes to the Source of the Mississippi River in the Year 1820* (East Lansing: Michigan State Univ. Press, 1992), 95; and Chute, "A Century of Native Leadership," 101-109.

33. Charlotte Killarly, "Lore and Legend of Our Forbears," Biography Sketches, AO; Stanley Newton, *The Story of Sault Ste. Marie and Chippewa County* (Sault Ste. Marie: Sault News Printing Co., 1923), 103; and Anna Brownell Jameson, *Winter Studies and Summer Rambles in Canada* (London: Saunders and Otley, 1838; reprint Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1990), 454, 467.

34. Williams, ed., *Schoolcraft's Narrative Journal of Travels*, 99. She is also credited with this feat by Charles C. Towbridge, "The Journal of Charles C. Towbridge, Expedition of 1820," in *Schoolcraft's Narrative Journal of Travels*, Appendix G, 1, 469; and Chute, "A Century of Native Leadership," 104.

35. Waddilove, ed., *The Stewart Missions*, 99; and Alan Knight, "'A Charge to Keep I Have': Mission to the Ojibwa at Sault Ste. Marie, St. John's (Church), Garden River," unpublished paper, 1983, 5, Shingwauk Collection, Algoma University College Library.

36. Carol Devens, *Countering Colonization: Native American Women and Great Lakes Missions, 1630-1900* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1992), 71.

37. Jameson, *Winter Studies and Summer Rambles*, 477; Charlotte is also described as "invaluable in interpreting prayers and sermons and leading teaching and singing" (*Canadian Church Magazine and Mission News* 4, No. 43 [January 1890]: 2).

38. Mabel Berkholder, "Devoted Life of Archdeacon William McMurray," type-script copy of article published in the *Hamilton Spectator* (20 March 1954).

39. Waddilove, ed., *The Stewart Missions*, 28, 85; *Canadian Church Magazine and Mission News* 4, No. 43 (January 1890): 2; Jameson, *Winter Studies and Summer Rambles*, 477; and *Fourth Annual Report of the Society for Converting and Civilizing the Indians and Propagating the Gospel among Destitute Settlers* (Toronto, 1834), 23.

40. Jameson, *Winter Studies and Summer Rambles*, 481.

41. Further integrating the McMurrays into the local community was the hiring of a nanny for their children from among the flock (Charlotte Killarly, "Lore and Legend of Our Forebears," Biography Sketches, AO; Karl Hele, "'Only calculated to captivate the senses': The Protestant Missionary Experience of Garden River First Nation, 1830-1870," M.A. thesis, Univ. of Toronto, 1994, 44-45; Diary of T.G. Anderson, Superintendent of Indian Affairs, T.G. Anderson Papers, TMRL).

42. White, "'Give Us a Little Milk,'" 195.

43. Augustine Shingwauk, *Little Pine's Journal*, ed. Shingwauk Reunion Committee (Sault Ste. Marie: Algoma University College, 1991), 3.

44. Chute, "A Century of Native Leadership," 118-119, 121-122, 135-137.

45. Chute, "A Century of Native Leadership," 127.

46. Waddilove, ed., *The Stewart Missions*, 105. John Webster Grant, *Moon of Wintertime: Missionaries and the Indians of Canada in Encounter since 1854* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1984), 91.

47. The alliance between the Ojibwa and the British, as well as all native groups, utilized metaphors such as Father, Brother, to illustrate specific relationships. The term "father" had different connotations in the British and Ojibwa cultures. See White ("'Give Us a Little Milk'") for further elaboration.

T.G. Anderson, S.I.A., Coldwater, to Captain G. Phillpots, A.D.C., 18 July 1835, John Strachan Papers, AO.

49. McMurray, "Mission Work Among Indians at Sault Ste. Marie In Early Days," 4.

50. Drafts of letters and reports by Rev. G. Anderson, Sault and Garden River, T.G. Anderson Papers, TMRL.

51. *Third Annual Report of the Society for Converting and Civilizing the Indians and Propagating the Gospel among Destitute Settlers* (Toronto, 1833), 12; and *Fourth Annual Report of the Society for Converting and Civilizing the Indians and Propagating the Gospel among Destitute Settlers* (Toronto, 1834), 31-32.

52. *Christian Advocate* (11 April 1834). In her article "Of Missionaries and Their Cattle: Ojibwa Perceptions of a Missionary as Evil Shaman" (*Ethnohistory* 41, No. 2 [1994]: 227-228), Rebecca Kugel outlines the spiritual power conferred upon the missionary by the presence of such common European animals as cattle and various paintings, both lacking in the Indian world. In

short, she illustrates the perceptions of the Indians based upon their traditions and life experiences.

53. *Christian Guardian* (5 July 1854).

54. Address of Chinghaconse to Colonel Jarvis on the subject of building houses at the Sault, July-September 1839, Samuel Jarvis Papers, TMRL.

55. This blatant favouritism left bad feelings towards McMurray among the Methodist and Catholic converts (T.G. Anderson, S.I.A., Coldwater, to Capt. G. Phillpots, A.D.C., 18 July 1835, John Strachan Papers, AO).

56. T.G. Anderson, Coburg to Son Gustavus, 24 July 1848, T.G. Anderson Papers, TMRL.

57. Drafts of letters and reports by Rev. G. Anderson, Sault and Garden River, T.G. Anderson Papers, TMRL.

58. Rev. F.A. O'Meara, Sault Ste. Marie, 3 October 1839, John Strachan Papers, AO.

59. Jameson, *Winter Studies and Summer Rambles*, 479. McMurray apparently collected several meta-wa-aun bags, made of owl, wildcat, otter, and mink skins, as well as birch bark. The confiscation of the bags was seen by missionaries as a symbolic acceptance of the new ways and a rejection of the old while ensuring that the convert would not be tempted by his old demons.

60. A pre-contract religious society amongst the Anishinabwe.

61. Johann Georg Kohl, *Life Among the Lake Superior Ojibway* (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1985), 380, 383-384. He notes that Shingwauk never destroyed his medicine until shortly before his death in 1854.

62. Waddilove, *The Stewart Missions*, 104; *Centennial Commemoration: One Hundred Years of the Church of England in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario*, 9.

63. Augustine Shingwauk, *Little Pine's Journal*, 4, n. 4; and James Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1985), 83.

64. Olive P. Dickason, *Canada's First Nations: A History of Founding Peoples from Earliest Times* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1992), 237-238; and J.R. Miller, *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens: A History of Indian-White Relations in Canada* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1991), 103-104.

65. *Seventh Annual Report of the Society for Converting and Civilizing the Indians and Propagating the Gospel among Destitute Settlers in Upper Canada* (Toronto, 1838), 20.

66. McMurray, "Mission Work Among Indians at the Sault Ste. Marie In Early Days," 4. See also Chute, "A Century of Native Leadership," 160.

67. Until his death Shingwauk sought to have the government fulfull its 1832 promise to construct 30 houses. "[O]wing to some hesitation on the part of the Government, "the houses had yet to be built. In 1833, Shingwauk made a speech in which he stressed the promises made to him and suggested that his conversion and his groups conversion were predicated upon their fulfilment. Simply put, "[w]hen I see the houses built, and School-House erected, I will send all my children and all my young men, and all our sisters, to be instructed by our kind Teacher." Shingwauk further associated his conversion with help from the government in protecting his land and stopping whisky traders from taking advantage of his people. Furthermore, if the buildings were built and the implements supplied, he would settle down and farm (*The Fifth Annual Report of the Society for Converting and Civilizing the Indians and Propagating the Gospel among the Destitute Settlers of Upper Canada* [Toronto, 1835], 11; *The Third Annual Report of the Society for Converting and Civilizing the Indians and Propagating the Gospel among the Destitute Settlers of Upper Canada* [Toronto, 1833], 53-54; Speech by Shingwauk regarding Squatters on Indian lands, 27 May 1835, Samuel Jarvis Papers, TMRL; and Waddilove, *The Stewart Missions*, 104).

68. Augustine Shingwauk, *Little Pine's Journal*, 1.

69. Letter Book 1844-1849, John Strachan Papers, AO. Bishop Strachan was one of the proponents and key supporters of this policy, believing that little could be done for the Indians unless relocated to Manitoulin Island.

70. Rev. O'Meara, Statement of missionary endeavours at Manitoulin Island and elsewhere, RG 10, vol. 145, National Archives of Canada (hereafter NAC).

71. Shingwauk once did consent to go to Manitoulin Island, but he remained only for two summers (1841 and 1842). While there he kept in continued contact with his people. Basically, the Chief had no desire to remove from the area of the rapids, specifically Garden River. Rather, he sought to create a homeland here for all Indians if they wished to come and settle. His opinions were thus in direct contrast to those of the missionary (see James Beaven, *Recreations of a Long Vacation: Or A Visit to the Indian Missions in Upper Canada* [Toronto: Hand & W. Rousell, 1846], 2-3; Rev. O'Meara, Statement of missionary endeavours at Manitoulin Island and elsewhere, RG 10, vol 145, NAC; Rev. F.A. O'Meara to the Bishop of Toronto, 19 January 1841, John

Strachan Papers, AO; and Chute, "A Century of Native Leadership," 200, 202, 209).

72. Rev. F.A. O'Meara, Sault Ste. Marie, to the Rev. H.J. Grassett, Sec'y of Society for Converting and Civilizing the Indians, 17 March 1840, John Strachan Papers, AO.

73. Rev. F.A. O'Meara to the Bishop of Toronto, 19 January 1841, John Strachan Papers, AO.

74. Rev. F.A. O'Meara to the Bishop of Toronto, 19 January 1841, John Strachan Papers, AO.

75. Rev. F.A. O'Meara to the Bishop of Toronto, 19 January 1841, John Strachan Papers, AO.

76. Rev. F.A. O'Meara to the Bishop of Toronto, 6 January 1841, John Strachan Papers, AO.

77. Rev. F.A. O'Meara to the Bishop of Toronto, 19 January 1841; and Rev. F.A. O'Meara, Sault Ste. Marie, 3 October 1839, John Strachan Papers, AO.

78. Rev. Wm. McMurray, Dundas, to Bishop of Toronto, 20 June 1844, John Strachan Papers, AO.

79. Letter dated 15 July 1849, Letter Book, 1844-1849, John Strachan Papers, AO.

80. Rev. Wm. McMurray, Dundas, to Bishop of Toronto, 20 June 1844, John Strachan Papers, AO.

81. Carnegie, *How to Win Friends and Influence People*, 3.

Appendix I

The Protestant Missionaries

Church of England

Rev. G. Archbold	pre-1830
James D. Cameron	1831-1832
Rev. William McMurray	1832-1838
Rev. O'Meara	1838/9-1841 (from 1841-1848, visited Garden River from Manitoulin Island)

Methodist Itinerants

John Sunday (Shawundais)	pre-1830, 1832, 1833, 1834, 1838
James Young	1832
David Sawyer	1833
Peter Jones	1833, 1834, 1852
Thomas Frazer	1833
Thomas McGee	1833
William Herkimer	1833
John Cah-beach	1833
John Taunchery	1833
Rev. Thomas Hurlbert	1833, 1839
James Evans	1838-1839
Peter Jacobs	1836

"This Remote Field of Missionary Toil": Christianity at the Pic, Lake Superior to 1900

PETER KRATS

"Indian demonology," wrote the Rev. Thomas Hurlburt in 1840, has a "strong hold on their [Indian] feelings."[1] He and his fellow proselytizers worked long and hard to introduce Christianity to the peoples of the Superior North Shore. Such "Christian assistance" proved in its own way as disruptive an influence as the resource seekers and officials drawn to the real and imagined riches of that rugged land. Indeed, clerics all along the North Shore, however well meaning, were prime contributors to change, for they were among the most vigorous of the new arrivals. Even as they decried the "evils" of the fur trade, missionaries like those at the Pic failed to perceive that they were attacking the very tenets of Indian life.[2] Thus their "successes" reshaped the North Shore Indian culture just as surely as secular forces.

Beginnings

The missionary presence on the North Shore rivalled the fur trade for longevity for the first missionaries to work among the North Shore Indians, though few in number, were indefatigable. In 1636 Father J.A. Poncet established the Mission du Saint Esprit at the site that 32 years later was renamed Saint-Marie-du-Sault. That Mission served as a base for work along the northern coast of Lake Huron until at least 1696. Progress over the great expanse of Superior was slow, notwithstanding Father Claude Allouez's journey to Lake Nipigon in 1667. The North Shore effort

declined with Cadillac's emphasis on Detroit and Michilimackinac: a nominal "mission among the Outaouais" persisted until at least 1756, but the North Shore effort was "silent" from about 1704.[3]

British control and the ensuing withdrawal of the Jesuits left the northern Great Lakes with little Christian missionary work apart from the occasional visit to Mackinac and Sault Ste. Marie by Roman Catholic priests working within the (later) Diocese of Detroit.[4] More specific North Shore work resumed about 1818 when Bishop J. Octave Plessis directed two priests, Fathers Pierre-Antoine Tabeau and Joseph Grevier, to undertake missionary activity on the Upper Lakes. Missionaries intent on travelling farther west provided brief services during their lake shore travels. Bishop Joseph Nobert Provencher, for instance, journeyed along the North Shore in 1822; he wrote to Bishop Joseph O. Plessis of having

> baptized seventy-seven children en route . . . Twenty-three at Drummond Island, forty-one at the Sault, twelve at Fort William, and one at the Pic. It is very necessary that a priest should be sent to the Sault, Drummond Island, and Michilimackinac. Instruction is needed there, which one who is merely passing by is never able to give. The Americans are going to build a fort at the Sault, which will attract many people. I suppose that you can authorize a priest for both sides [of the river] . . . It is necessary to have a Canadian; a priest speaking both French and English would be better still.[5]

Provencher's hopes were partially realized for the extension of Detroit-based Catholic work won a permanent, if thin, presence on the North Shore. Re-established Roman Catholic endeavour at Sault Ste. Marie (1834) provided an operational base for Father (later Bishop) Frederic Baraga. Further west, Father Franz Pierz, travelling Roman Catholic missionary at the Grand Portage Mission, began providing services for the Indians of the North Shore.

> In June, 1838, he [Pierz] started out on a missionary trip . . . After instructing and baptizing twenty-five natives [Michipicoten], he travelled to Okwanikisinong, a large pagan settlement forty-five miles farther north. Here a group of seventeen received Christianity and were baptized on the picturesque shore of the lake.

By 1839 Pierz had established mission substations at Fort William and the

Pic.[6]

Roman Catholic "successes" spurred Protestant missionary work on the North Shore. Inspired by a spirit of evangelism in Great Britain, both the Church of England and the Wesleyan Methodists moved to provide "spiritual assistance" to the Indian populations of the Great Lakes. Of course, such "assistance" was directed against traditional native values and the especially the "men of medicine . . . practitioners [who the missionaries complained] make a great mystery of their decoctions and when administering them, conceal them with the greatest care." The various pressures of European contact saw traditional modes "much neglected" as the missionary effort worked toward Fort William and points beyond.[7]

Methodism Ascendant

First in line stood the Methodists who were already working among the Indian populations farther south. In 1838 James Evans (1801-1846), Thomas Hurlburt (1808-1873), and the Native catechist Peter Jacobs [Pahtahsega] (c.1807-1890) were appointed to missionary work about Lake Superior.[8] Arriving at Sault Ste. Marie in early August 1838, they journeyed on to Michipicoten where the immensity of their task and the relative lateness of their arrival – fall was at hand – surely compounded personal tensions between Evans and Hurlburt.[9] Nevertheless, they set about their work: Evans took up a post at Michipicoten while Hurlburt, on 23 October 1838, continued west to Fort William stopping briefly at the Pic.[10]

Vast distances and a formidable environment were challenge enough; but the Methodists also faced rival clerics. The Baptist James Cameron was working Michipicoten and Pic:

> The Rev. Mr. Cameron, nephew of the late secretary, is about 45 miles from this place on the N.E. He is under the direction of the American Baptist Missionary Society; he is connected with the Indians of these parts by ties of blood, his uncle being regarded as the head man of this region. He is connected with them also by marriage, having taken a pure native woman. He speaks the Indian well, and his influence among the Indians is great.

Cameron, apparently son of trader Dougald Cameron, was at Black Bay during the winter of 1839-40 and at Fort William during May and June

1841.[11]

Far more serious was the "Papist" challenge: on 1 January 1840 Thomas Hurlburt wrote the Wesleyan Missionary Society calling for aid in his North Shore work:

> The call for Missionaries is great. Many of the poor Indians have come to a stand, and are now ready to receive the word of life. This inquiry was caused by the work in Upper Canada, and it has now spread far and near among the tribes speaking the Ojibewa and kindred dialects.The Catholic Priests are taking advantage of this state of things, and are running through the country and baptizing all they can persuade to receive a brass crucifix and a string of beads, with a few pictures of saints; very frequently the Indian is not at all instructed, only he is told that, in times of danger and want, he is to look at the pictures, and he shall have all he desires. A Priest, last summer, on this Lake, baptized an Indian and his *two* wives. These are all provable [sic] facts. Thus the poor Indian casts away his otter skin with his instruments of magic, and substitutes other things of less value; for some of his medicines were really good. Thus he changes the objects, but not the nature, of his worship.[12]

The evident displeasure with Jesuit efforts extended beyond the Methodist clergy to the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC) administration, for Governor George Simpson, after initially opposing all missionary presence had by 1840 taken a determined pro-Methodist stance. As Evans noted "we have, through the Divine blessing found favour in the eyes of the Hudson's Bay Company's factors and as they command the entire influence of the Indian country, our prospects as far as they are concerned are good."[13]

Developments at the Pic

Aid from the HBC was certainly important at the Pic: company support gave Evans an early advantage over such rivals as Cameron and Fr. Pierz. After Evans' and Jacobs' brief stop in early May 1839 they reported much enthusiasm for the planned establishment of a Methodist mission. A second stopover (13-15 July) reinforced Evans determination not least because more than 20 children were baptized on the visit.[14] The success saw a permanent mission established, with Hurlburt assuming the station thus fulfilling his earlier plea for a mission at that spot.[15]

Accompanied by his wife Betsey Almira and two young children, Hurlburt arrived at the Pic "the last of August" 1839, the journey from Toronto having taken nearly two months. Welcomed by post manager Thomas McMurray with "much cordiality," Hurlburt and family lived in one room within the post while proceeding, largely on their own, to build a home. In the autumn of 1839 Hurlburt dug a cellar and built a foundation for the dwelling; the onset of winter saw his attention shift to the cutting and hauling (up to 2 miles) of some 50 logs for its construction. The resulting home was

> a little removed from the trading establishment and pleasantly situated near the river, but still in view of the lake. Our house is 24 feet square, with a cellar 12 feet square and 5 1/2 feet deep. I have the house divided into five rooms. The best room is 14 feet square; this is finished, and the floor painted. One bedroom, 10 by 12, and kitchen the same, both finished. Of the rest I design to have another bedroom 8 by 12, and a study 6 by 10. I have six doors, of six panels each, already made. The sashes for the four of the six windows are made; but as I have but 24 lights of glass, I got a large strong white paper and pasted it over the whole sash on the outside, and then oiled it. This admits a considerable light, and has a very beautiful appearance when the light shines upon it. Even when I get glass, I shall be loath to spoil my paper windows . . . We have had one serious storm of rain, hail, and snow since we came, and still they are as firm as ever. The want of boards has put me to much labour to get a substitute. The whole of my upper floor is made of poles and clay. When I put up the beams I put in cross pieces, upon which I put the small poles, and spread the clay mixed with straw over. I can still put up a ceiling underneath and a floor above without interfering with my mud floor, as it is between the beams. The roof is a temporary one made of cedar bark. The logs are all hewed on the outside, and on the inside I drove in about 2,000 small pegs, and put upright pieces all around to make the walls of equal thickness. The plastering was a heavy job, as the clay was obtained at a distance, and the walls are from one to four inches thick. The clay now appears very solid; the pegs will keep it from falling . . . The whole expenditure . . . will be about L 9 10s 0d.[16]

The Hurlburt's home also featured practical additions including sheds and a garden. Spiritual concerns led to rapid work on a chapel. Timber was

being cut for that purpose by April 1840, and a 21 x 18 foot building was erected "composed of logs flatted, and laid horizontally, with the ends secured in the posts upon which the plates of building rest."[17]

Hurlburt, not surprisingly, proclaimed the buildings "decent for the style of the country, as well as comfortable and commodious." Betsey's letters home hint at greater misgivings:

> This is the holy Sabbath evening; the duties of the day having been performed, I now sit down, with an overflowing heart, to make you acquainted with our prosperity. We can say of a truth the Lord is with us; we feel his divine presence on our little meetings, warming our hearts and the hearts of the poor Indians, who have but lately passed from darkness into light, and from bondage to the liberty of God's people. There are four of these who give good evidence of a change of heart – one Indian man, the Trader's wife (Indian woman), and two of her daughters; and there are several more, who, we have good reason to believe, are anxiously seeking. We have every thing to encourage us in the pursuit of duty. There were two adults baptized this evening, making sixteen in all, besides twenty-nine children. O this is a blessed cause that we are engaged in! I don't lament my situation; I never have done so, nor do I ever expect to, although I highly prize, and often sigh for Christian and civilized society and privileges, both for myself and my dear children. But what are these when compared with the salvation of precious immortal souls!! . . . O pray for us that we may be faithful, humble and thankful!

Whatever her inner doubts, Mrs. Hurlburt did her part in both missionary and practical endeavour: caring for three young children, as well as the garden, a cow and poultry, demanded her (and an active Indian) assistance.[18] Educational tasks, including teaching some of the Indian women to spin and knit the wool from sheep kept by the HBC for mutton, were a further demand on her time.[19]

The work was surely relentless, and conditions difficult, yet by Hurlburt's standards there was progress. In 1840 the British Wesleyan Missionary Society began supplying Hurlburt's work, and a number of the Pic band expressed some interest in his message.[20] Fourteen baptisms and four conversions – "peace through believing" – were achieved rather quickly; a number of other Band members were "anxiously seeking" or "taking up the cross" at prayer meetings. The "successes" reflected the

Rev. Hurlburt's relentless endeavour, including leading at least five services a week.[21] He also instructed some twenty children by day, several adults during the evening, worked on a lengthy "Chippewa grammar" text, and supplied food and clothing to those in need. All this was not enough: Hurlburt sought out the Long Lake Band, travelling inland in August 1840 and in the spring of 1841.

Such journeys reinforced Hurlburt's conviction that more workers were needed to bring not only Christianity but also practical aid to the population. Hurlburt's greatest impact may have been the introduction of both European-style education and especially agriculture among the Pic Indians – within two years a number were planting potatoes and turnips, the seed provided by the HBC.[22] Despite the climate and topography he felt agriculture was the only hope for a population that lived in "about the poorest part of the Indian country." The "affairs of the Indians are growing worse every year," he wrote, pointing especially to the Long Lake Band as among "the most wretched beings that inhabit our world. They suffer very severely from hunger; two or three died last winter [1840-1] purely of hunger. Indeed it appears to me that death from starvation is so common in this country that it does not produce that sensation that it ought."[23] Perhaps the challenge loomed too large, for HBC Postmaster Cuthbert Cumming wrote in February 1842 that the local Indians "seem perfectly indifferent about him [Hurlburt] and the Christian religion."[24] This assessment was in sharp contrast with Hurlburt's claim that about 50 Pic and Long Lake Indians had been converted during his stay. In any event, Hurlburt's work at the Pic was done: he departed late in 1842 due to a combination of circumstances. First, likely, came his wife's poor health; conflict between the Canadian Conference of the Wesleyan Church and the Wesleyan Methodist Society of England cost Hurlburt financial support, sealing the mission's fate.[25]

Those Indians converted to Methodism at the Pic, led by Atickonse, made repeated calls for a new missionary. But a lack of funds saw long years pass before the placing of native missionary George Blaker in July 1854.[26] Blaker, accompanied by his wife and four children, arrived at the Pic early in August 1854; a shanty was erected near the site of Hurlburt's home, which by then was "entirely demolished." The chapel, meanwhile, was a "rotting skeleton," a reminder of earlier failures.[27] It was a tenuous beginning: visiting missionaries, including Hurlburt, joined with

> one of the natives of that place . . . to gather materials to make a house, and before night it was completed, near the ground where the Mission-House had stood. It was, even when finished, a frail affair, but was designed only to answer the purpose till a suitable one would be made, to secure them from the inclemency of the long and dreary winter, which, I have no doubt, Br. Blaker will accomplish before the winter sets in.[28]

Raising new buildings was just one element of Blaker's service to the 40-member Pic River Mission Station, part of a Michipicoten-based circuit. HBC Governor Simpson, for one, found it a peculiar posting.

> The Wesleyans have another station, at the Pic in Lake Superior under the charge of Mr. Blaker: that station was occupied several years ago by Mr. Hurlburt but abandoned in 1842 and I hardly know what inducement there was for its re-establishment, the Indian population being very small while there are not about 5 or 6 servants at the Company's post; but it was probably considered impolitic to abandon a station that had once been occupied lest it might lead to an inference that the Society was unsuccessful.[29]

Naturally enough, the Rev. Blaker saw the posting in a more positive light:

> This new Mission is established at the mouth of the Pic . . . When I received my appointment to this remote field of missionary toil, it was with considerable reluctance and trembling I entered upon it. But I came hoping it was my providential path. Trusting in the Lord, I determined to do all I could to advance the good cause, and for this I have laboured day and night in my weak way. During the year I have visited the Indian in his wig-wam. Last winter, I spent four or five weeks in search of the poor benighted Pagan on his hunting-ground in the interior of this cold country, and have laid night after night on the top of the snow, without shelter; sometimes I have found a foot of snow on top me in the morning . . . At this Mission we have a few that enjoy the comforts of religion, and meet in class regularly. In all, nineteen have renounced paganism, given up their images, and are striving to serve the true God. One who was converted last fall, continued faithfully during the winter, and this spring while on a hunting excursion he died in the triumphs of faith. Three families have

> promised to build houses at the Pic and remain; which we hope will induce others to do the same. My first effort was to build a house with my own hands, 14 feet square, with a cellar, which I completed in September last. I had no shingles, so I made the roof of timbers laid close together, then plastered and covered it with cedar bark. The Hudson's Bay Company kindly furnished me with plank for the floor, and several other materials without charge.[30]

Blaker won praise in the Methodist Reports as local membership rose to over 60 persons. Thus a renewed Mission greeted the Rev. Hurlburt, who visited his old station in 1858:

> Pic, July 16 . . . Towards evening . . . Our boat was seen entering the [Pic] river, and we saw a boy go into a wig wam, and soon three running hither and thither; and when we landed there was a group collected to receive and greet us . . . Here are the foundations of the house I built 18 years ago . . . and still I see remnants of my work, in a table, chair, doors and windows of the present mission-house . . . From this mission has gone forth an influence that has battled the influence of the priests in some considerable degree all along the north shore of the lake, and in the interior also.
>
> Bro. Blaker needs aid to finish his mission-house and to build a little church. He also should be empowered to travel and visit the surrounding bands. I learn from Bro. Blaker that thus far the Company have charged nothing for freight and passage in their vessel. This is a great favour to us, and should not be forgotten.

Hurlburt provided more graphic evidence of the challenges faced by Blaker, noting that he and his family were "entirely destitute of flour, meat, &c., and subsisting for the present almost entirely on fish." Spiritual challenges were as daunting: in the excitement surrounding Hurlburt's visit several new "conversions" were made but their permanence was surely suspect.[31]

Nor was the isolation of the Pic a minor issue: by 1862 Blaker had relocated to Michipicoten, making only irregular visits farther west. In yet another visit, Hurlburt reported on a population hard-pressed to make old ways suit new times:

> The place [Pic] should be occupied by a missionary in the summer for

> the present, as there is no land here suitable for settlement, and the place is not a very good one for fish. Something however should be done for these Indians, or they will more or less of them starve: the country being burned over, much of the game is destroyed, and they have made no preparation either by planting potatoes or by securing a supply of fish to provide for the winter. Their prospects are gloomy. It is of but little avail to come to them and bring them partially the light of the Gospel, and then leave them after a little oral instruction. We have the New Testament, Psalms and Hymns in Indian, and our first and great effort should be to give them access to these. In tribes like those on these great lakes, schools to teach the children English are only productive of evil. If they are kept long enough to acquire the English, they will have become so far accustomed to our modes of life as to be entirely unfitted for the hunter life, and there is nothing besides this for them in this region. But by giving them access to the Scriptures in their own language, we may impart enough of Christian instruction to save their souls.[32]

A Faltering Few

By the early 1860s, then, the challenge of Lake Superior had nearly overwhelmed the Methodists despite the continuing work of the Revs. Blaker and his successor Erastus Curry, or, more often, "Native Assistants" such as Thomas Wahboose and Thomas Sky. In 1873 Curry bemoaned the Methodism's local state:

> Our meeting closed on Tuesday, to meet again at Point Irisquois on the 12th July, 1873, and at Michipicoton on 23rd July, 1873. We purpose to get the Indians from Nippigon, Pic, Batchawana, L'Ance, Grand Island, and Waiskey Bay to attend the latter. If we could secure a small grant from the Missionary fund to provide provisions, and extend our meeting over several weeks, it would accomplish more for these wandering bands than we could in six months' visiting them at the Posts. This would be a saving to the Society in lessening the travelling expenses. We should have an Indian preacher travelling among the five hundred on the Nippigon; another at the Pic, and surroundings, labouring with the three hundred there; a third at Michipicoton, ministering to the wants of three hundred more; a fourth at Batchawana, with Goulais Bay and Ogewaung in his boundaries, partially supplying the wants of the two hundred and

> twenty Indians and whites . . . Then, there should be a missionary at Fort Francis, and another at Lake Saul . . . Nearly all of the above-mentioned posts are asking for a school.[33]

The Rev. Curry concluded his plea with an attack on a persistent rival noting that Jesuits were visiting the various Bands and urging them "to become Papists."

The "Papists" (Jesuits) were no more popular with the backers of the Church of England who even more than the Methodists found the North Shore a challenging frontier. Indeed, the "English Church" long overlooked the North Shore because a flawed administrative structure left it lost between that Church's Rupert's Land and Canadian Dioceses. Church of England missionaries finally found their way onto the North Shore in the late 1850s, with a Rev. "Chase" preaching at the Pic in 1859. This may have been Canon J. Chance, who certainly travelled northwest from Garden River in July 1869; he later reported a stopover at the Pic:

> A few miles south-east of the Pic we found a small encampment of Christian Indians who gave us a hearty welcome. They subsisted chiefly on fish, but they were less fishy and surly looking and more happy looking and cleanly than some other we had previously met with. We had a religious service and ministered to their spiritual wants, then proceeded to the Hudson [sic] Bay factory at the Pic, where we met with a most cordial reception. Most of the Indians were preparing to go away into the interior on a hunting expedition, but waited for Divine service and the administration of The Holy sacrament of Baptism and The Supper of the Lord. We held services in the Fort and in the open air.[34]

Charles Begg, in charge of the Pic post, made sure that the good Reverend formed a favourable impression: "I treated the gentleman well – which will leve [sic] him no room to say anything about the company."[35] The Rev. J. Frost made a longer stay at the Pic a few years later; he reported the majority of the Indians "pagans, and the others only nominally Christian, not having been instructed in the teachings of the Christian religion."[36] Thereafter Anglicanism was without local impact: *Algoma Missionary News* reveals little concern for the by-then wholly native population at Pic river. Only the few whites along the CPR line drew any missionary attention.[37]

The "Papists" Triumphant

Protestant weakness reflected the successes of the Jesuits whose North Shore work benefitted from the strong organization and personal commitment of the Order, their historical seventeenth-century contacts with the region, and especially the sophisticated interpretation of the gap between the sacred and the secular. Put briefly, the Jesuits – unlike the Protestant missionaries – were content that the Indians maintained their long-established lifestyle so long as they accepted baptism.[38]

These circumstances were beneficial to the efforts of individual Jesuits who, in their travels around Lake Superior, provided occasional religious services at the Pic. Pioneering work out of Sault Ste. Marie and Grand Portage was supplemented from 1838 by travellers from the new Wikwemikong Mission (on Manitoulin Island). From 1848 a thin but steady stream of men served the Pic out of the Jesuit mission at Fort William; meanwhile Father Auguste Kohler led the way for priests working the eastern half of Lake Superior by way of Sault Ste. Marie, by 1849 penetrating westward as far as the Pic where he baptized seven adults.[39] The Priests serving in these various locations travelled extensively: Father Fremiot, for instance, ranged from a base at Lake Nipigon to Long Lake, Pic, Michipicoten and elsewhere. Father Fremiot was succeeded by Father du Ranquet who spent a quarter-century at this arduous station.[40] Through untiring and increasingly structured efforts – du Ranquet began regular visits to the Pic River Mission no later than 1862 – and a comparative decline in Protestant activity, the Pic Indian population abandoned its Methodist leanings in favour of Roman Catholicism.

Religious Orientation of Native Pic Population, 1861-1897[41]

YEAR	TRADITIONAL	METHODIST	ROMAN CATHOLIC
1861	——	146	25
1871	184	48	132
1881	——	——	530
1891	——	——	133
1897	——	——	233

Easier access to the North Shore changed the nature of the Jesuit work by adding a non-native element, the so-called *apostolat chez les blancs*, with nearby Peninsula drawing some attention. But in the main, Jesuits like Fathers Hebert, Specht, Chambon and Gagnon continued their work with the native population. Change brought challenges: Father Specht noted in 1883 that the arrival of the CPR – while easing travel on the North Shore – coincided with a much increased incidence of disease among the Indian population along Superior's North Shore. New physical and demographic circumstances had a local impact: Bishop Francois Jamot (1877) urged the construction of a church at the Pic. Progress was slow, but under the urging of Fathers Joseph Hebert and Fr. Gagnon a small building, though a year from completion, was used for Christmas services in 1880. Two large crosses were raised five years later.[42] With a church in place, the Pic mission assumed a larger role among the native missions of the North Shore, and the number of "converted" steadily increased: in 1879 the Fort William Mission claimed all local Indians converted. These conversions included the much-approved-of conversion of Protestant Band members to the Roman Catholic faith. In 1879 Fr. Hebert applauded the "return" of the Pic River Indians to Roman Catholicism; the new church seems to have been an important catalyst in this regard.[43]

But not all was well by Roman Catholic standards, for the CPR (and the liquor sellers and others who followed the line) brought continuing pressures to bear. Population movement was a further complication:

> The heretofore prosperous mission of Le Pic has received a set-back by the division of its 250 Catholics in three groups. The Hudson's Bay Post was removed four miles away to the CPR Station at Heron Bay, and was followed by a good portion of the congregation. Later another migration took place to another point on the CPR called Montizambert, of a number of hunters, to be closer to their hunting grounds. They form with their families a little group of 62 souls; they have their own cemetery, but no church as yet, and are much exposed to the perversion of an active Anglican minister. There is another small group of Indians at White River, who attend services with the Whites in their Church, and are visited in connection with Montizambert.[44]

At the Pic, change became inevitable: by 1888, the chapel was one of just two buildings at Pic post reported in a useable state.[45]

Notwithstanding these difficulties, the Jesuit influence was by now seen by the Indian Affairs Department as having a "wholesome influence" on the Band, a far cry from the attitudes of a half-century earlier. Approved of by the authorities, and providing some services which the band members welcomed, the St. Francois Xavier mission seemed an important factor in local society as the new century took firm hold. Indeed, a new church was built at Heron Bay just after the turn of the century under the watchful eye of Fr. Louis Napoleon Dugas.[46] But appearances could be deceiving: while all but one local Indian professed Catholicism, participation was somewhat spotty. Indeed, the "Status Animarum" for 1897 suggests that of some 233 persons in the Pic mission, only 136 were regular communicants.[47] Maintaining the local commitment to Roman Catholicism in the face of both spiritual competition and secular change would be a continuing challenge for the priests of the St. Francois Xavier mission.

To the Twentieth Century

Change – the CPR brought it in with a rush – proved too much for the lifestyle which had been followed at the Pic for about a century. The Jesuits who served Pic were at once part of, and critics of, that change.[48] In 1886 Chief HBC Factor Peter Bell of Michipicoten, a veteran of the Lake, bemoaned the changes sweeping over the Indian people:

> The Indians are gradually decreasing in numbers. The only change is, in their becoming more corrupted according to their intercourse with the *Whites* and the roving *Missinnaries* [sic] The only *true Indian* is the *Simon pure* (so called) *H. Bay Infidel*; who, has intercourse with the *Company alone*, and, only at *stated periods*.[49]

According to Bell's seemingly bitter assessment, the Pic Indians were unlikely to flourish in the new atmosphere which intermingled the isolation of the North Shore with the "modern age." While HBC officials alternately condemned the Pic Indians as a "bad lot" or worried that the Indians, "having their Church at the 'Pic' will stand by the old place," practical considerations mandated a move, first to track side and, soon afterward, to Montizambert.[50] At that location, farther from the "white" settlements along the railway line – the local white population had fallen below fifty by century's end – the practices of a century and the skills earned over a

millennia could continue for many years to come.

But many members of the Pic band opted to remain. For them the old ways were no longer sufficient; the *Annual Reports* of the Indian Affairs Department provide many illustrations. For instance, in 1879 Amos Wright praised the construction of a "commodious" schoolhouse at the Pic. The Indians, he noted, believed that "in due time the Government will furnish them with a schoolmaster."[51] More physical improvements followed, with work concentrated some distance upriver from the Pic post. Several wood homes were constructed in 1881, and agriculture won a more prominent role. According to newly-appointed Indian Agent J.P. Donnelly:

> The Pic River Indians have settled and built houses on the river bearing their name, and cleared and fenced fields averaging about five acres each, and now under root crop. The land is a rich, sandy loam and yields abundantly. Their improvements commence at the Hudson [sic] Bay Company's post, about a half mile from the mouth of the Pic River, and extend three miles along that river, being about half a mile in width, bounded on the westerly side by a rocky mountain . . . They have a good school house, but as yet have been unable to obtain a teacher, as the allowance for salary is not sufficient.[52]

Funds from the Roman Catholic Church helped overcome the last; a first teacher arrived about October 1885. E.F. Dessaint was the first of many, for low wages and an isolated location saw a fairly rapid turnover in personnel at the Catholic school. Meanwhile, a newly-appointed Indian Special Constable attempted to counter the sale of alcohol by the CPR crews. The Indian Department, for its part, provided a "fine yoke of cattle" which was housed in a "fine stable" albeit obtained and built at the band's expense. The cattle aided in hauling timber for more housing, and in the continued expansion of agricultural pursuits.[53] Thus, from the mind set of the Indian Affairs official, so different from that of the HBC man, the Pic Indians were on the correct course, "a thrifty, industrious class" who "from the various resources of which they avail themselves . . . manage to exist comfortably." Indian Agent Donnelly credited the changes to the granting of a Reserve:

> In 1884 your department gave them [the Pic Band] eight hundred acres of land along the east side of the Pic River at its mouth on Lake Superior. Prior to this they had built a few houses with small gardens,

> their entire potato crop might be one hundred bushels. After their homes were secured to them, living on their own land was a stimulus to improve. They cleared more land and yearly put more under cultivation, and the settlement increased. Your department furnished them with a yoke of cattle, plough, harrow and other implements. In the winter they leave their families at home with plenty of fish and potatoes, etc., in their cellars and go to their hunting grounds and make some money by their fur catches. They keep their oxen well housed and fed, and this year will have nine hundred bushels of potatoes, six hundred of turnips, two hundred of carrots and fifty of beets, and are building six two story frame houses of a good size, and with fine cellars.[54]

Even as paternal Indian Affairs officials congratulated each other on the supposed demise of "old ways" – smaller and smaller fur returns seemed a case in point – they admitted that despite agriculture, pulpwood and tie cutting, blueberry harvesting, house construction, church and school, many problems remained unsolved. Twenty six members of the Band died of "la grippe" in 1891, leaving many families greatly impoverished and in need of assistance. Local economic options were very limited, because the passing of the CPR boom saw outside economic options dwindle. Some work, usually seasonal, could be found on the railway, in the bush camp or the fishery. Then, of course, there remained the continuing fur trade efforts of the independents, the HBC and, from about 1908, the Revillon Frères. So as the new century dawned, the Pic Indians found themselves drifting uncomfortably between two worlds, trying to use the skills borne of many generations, and belief structures ancient and new, to flourish in a world of a very different order.

Endnotes

1. *Christian Guardian*, 21 October 1840. Much of this paper is based on work done for my "The Fur Trade History of Pukaskwa National Park and Environs: The Nineteenth-Century Context" (Parks Canada Microfiche Report Series, Environment Canada, 1992). The aid of Parks Canada, and especially Ron Dale, is gratefully acknowledged.

2. The Pic was a traditional native location and a fur trade location since the latter half of the eighteenth century, located at the mouth of the Pic River midway on the north shore of Lake Superior. The modern community of

Marathon lies a few miles to the west.

3. The key source is R.G. Thwaites, ed., *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents* (Cleveland: Burrows Bros, 1886-1901).

4. Father Gabriel Richard, for instance, visited the Sault in September 1799 (George Paré, *The Catholic Church in Detroit 1701-1788* [Detroit: Gabriel Richard Press, 1951; reprint, Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1983], chapter 25).

5. Grace Lee Nute, ed., *Documents Relating to Northwest Missions 1815-1827* (Saint Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1942), 352. The Bishop again held service at the Pic on 6 September 1830 while on his way "to Canada" (John Swanston, "Pic Journal and Official Correspondence 1830," B.162/a/4, Hudson's Bay Company Archives [hereafter HBCA]). The Pic Post Journals note other missionaries making brief stops in 1827, 1831 (2), 1833, 1835, 1838 (2), 1841, and more often in the mid-1840s.

6. Sister Grace MacDonald, "Father Frances Pierz, Missionary," *Minnesota History* 10 (June 1929): 109-111.

7. On local spiritual values see the fairly sympathetic George Keith, "Reply to a List of Questions to me by Governor Simpson," 29 July 1830, B.129/b/5, HBCA. Father Dominique du Ranquet's journals also detail various beliefs of the Lake Superior Ojibwa circa 1850-70 (See Yvette Majerus, ed., "La journal du Pere Dominique du Ranquet, s.j.," *Documents historique de la Societe Historique du Nouvel-Ontario* 57 [1967]). On rare occasions even those involved questioned themselves. Thomas Hurlburt admitted casting aside tradition was not *always* good: traditional spirit bags contained "really good" medicine ("Extract of a Letter from the Rev. Thomas Hurlburt," *Wesleyan Missionary Notices* 83 [March 1841], 451).

8. For more on Evans and Jacobs [Pahtahsega] see *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press), respectively vol. 7: 275-277, and vol. 11: 660-661. See also Biographical Folders, United Church Archives (hereafter UCA).

9. Evans already doubted Hurlburt: *en route* to Lake Superior he wrote: "Br. Hurlburt joined us the evening before we started – he is still a strong Mississippian, and would prefer going to the States to going up Lake Superior . . . I feel myself associated with a colleague whose heart is not as fully in the work as I could desire" (Rev. James Evans, Goderich, to Rev. Joseph Stinson, Toronto, 18 July 1838, in Fred Landon, "Letters of Rev. James Evans, Methodist Missionary, Written During His Journey to and residence in the Lake Superior Region, 1838-39," *Ontario Historical Society Papers and*

Records 28 [1932]: 48).

10. Thomas Hurlburt was born in the Township of South August, Upper Canada; he married to Betsy Almira, eldest daughter of the Rev. Ezra Adams, and remarried during the 1860s. He began work for the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1828 among the Indian population at Muncey, Middlesex County, and during the 1830s worked at Saugeen and St. Clair prior to North Shore work. He moved on (seemingly confirming Evans' doubts) to Missouri through 1851, and then returned to work in Indian villages in Canada West. In 1854 he moved to Norway House remaining there until 1857, and then returned to Canada West. Hurlburt was noted for his linguistic skill, being able to work without interpreters. He continued his work with the Indian population until his accidental death at Little Current (*Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, X: 372-73; and Biographical Folder, UCA).

11. *Christian Guardian*, 15 May 1839; 24 October 1838; 17 April 1839; 15 May 1839; 3 July 1839; and 24 May 1843. See also letters from Cameron to Livingston, 21 February 1840, 25 May 1841, 1 June 1841, J.L. Livingston Letters, American Fur Company Papers, The Sault Ste. Marie Collection, Bayliss Library, Sault St. Marie, MI.

12. Thomas Hurlburt, Pic, to Missionary Society, 1 January 1840, in *Wesleyan Missionary Notices* 26 (February 1841).

13. Evans, for his part, praised the HBC as far superior to independent traders, who he characterized as "villainous fortune hunters" (Egerton R. Young, *The Apostle of the North: Rev. James Evans* [Toronto: W. Brigss, 1900], 74-75).

14. Evans reported 21 children baptized but the records show 23 children received his attention ("Baptismal Register for the Pic Mission, Lake Superior," in James Evans Papers, Regional Collection, D.B. Weldon Library, University of Western Ontario [hereafter UWO]).

15. On 9 April 1839 Hurlburt wrote Evans urging a mission at the Pic, arguing that "the Peak would be a comfortable situation for a man that had a family, as every necessary [sic] could be easily procured" (quoted in John MacLean, *James Evans, Inventor of the Syllabic System of the Cree Language* [Toronto: Methodist Mission Rooms, 1890], 114). Ironically (or perhaps in Evans' view, predictably), Hurlburt was less than enamoured of the posting: as early as May 1841 he informed Evans of his desire for a posting in the Mississippi valley (Hurlburt, Pic River, to Evans [Norway House], 8 May 1841, James Evans Papers, UWO).

16. *Christian Guardian*, 6 January 1840; and 1 July 1840.

17. Pic Post Journal 1840/41, 12 April 1841, B.162/a/11, HBCA.

18. In 1841 the oldest child, a boy, was seven; his two sisters were five years and just seven months in age.

19. *Christian Guardian*, 3 July 1839, 18 March, 1 July, 21 October 1840, 4 August 1841, 30 July 1862, 2 March 1864 (obituary). Letter from Mrs. Hurlburt to parents, 20 December 1840, in J.E. Sanderson, *The First Century of Methodism in Canada* (Toronto: W. Briggs, 1910), II: 23; and Thomas Hurlburt, Pic, to Rev. Robert Alder, General Secretary of the Wesleyan Methodist Society, 11 January 1841, Letter 2, Box 13, "Methodist Missions, Documents; Papers of the Methodist Missionary Society," MG 17 C1, National Archives of Canada (hereafter NAC).

20. In his letters Hurlburt professed considerable satisfaction at being supported by the British rather than the Upper Canadian Missionary Society.

21. He provided two Native language services and one English service on Sundays, and at least two during the week, believing that constant effort and attention would aid the cause.

22. See Hurlburt's letters to the Wesleyan Mission Society, James Evans Collection, UWO; and *Christian Guardian*, 21 October 1840. On agriculture, see "Pic and Long Lake Report Outfit 1840," Pic Post Journal, B.162/a/11, HBCA.

23. Hurlburt to Robert Alder, General Secretary of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, 11 January 1841, Letter 2; T. Hurlburt to the Secretaries of the Wesleyan Missions, London, 29 June 1841, Letter 49; and T. Hurlburt to the Secretaries of the Wesleyan Missions, London, 23 June 1841, Letter 50, Box 13, Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society Records, MG 17 C1, NAC. See also *Christian Guardian*, 21 October 1840.

24. Cumming, Pic Post, to Sir George Simpson, 23 February 1842, Jesuit Archives, Regis College, Toronto.

25. *Christian Guardian*, 28 September 1842; and 30 July 1862. See also Hurlburt to Evans, from the Pic, 11 August 1842, James Evans Collection, UWO.

26. Atickonse was probably taught English as well as the scriptures by Hurlburt. The re-established "Lake Superior North Shore" effort was initially based under the geographically unlikely "Owen's Sound District" before being established as a separate District in 1857 (*The Minutes of the Twelve Annual Conferences of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada from 1846-1857* [Toronto, 1863], 2: 75, 97).

27. *Christian Guardian*, 18 October 1854.

28. C. Vanduren, "Lake Superior North Shore Mission," *Christian Guardian*, 18 October 1854. As often was the case, the visit prompted "successes": four or more children were baptized while the visitors were at the Pic.

29. Sir George Simpson to Governor and Committee, Fort Garry, 29 June 1855, D.4/75 p.645a, HBCA. On Blaker's arrival see *Christian Guardian*, 18 October 1854.

30. *Annual Report of the Missionary Society of the Wesleyan-Methodist Church in Canada* (1854-55), xxx.

31. *Christian Guardian*, 1 September 1858.

32. *Christian Guardian*, 30 July 1862.

33. *Wesleyan Missionary Notices* (Canada Conference) 17 (November 1872), 271. See also *Christian Guardian*, 25 November 1863.

34. Canon J. Chance, *Our Work Among the Indians* (London: Heal & Fleming, 1898), 28-29; and Elizabeth Arthur, ed., *Thunderbay District, 1821-1892: A Collection of Documents* (Toronto: Champlain Society, 1973), 183, n. 22.

35. Charles Begg to J.S. Watt, Michipicoten, 1 May 1859, MU 1385, HBC General Box 2, Archives of Ontario (hereafter AO).

36. Rev. F. Frost, *Sketches of Indian Life* (Toronto: W. Briggs, 1904), 112.

37. *Algoma Missionary News* 5 (1 May 1882): 27; 9 (1 September 1886): 34; 4 (June 1907): 67 (new series).

38. The Jesuit outlook is summarized in John Webster Grant, *"Moon of Wintertime": Missionaries and the Indians of Canada in Encounter since 1534* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1984), 81, 90-91.

39. Kohler was at the Pic for these baptisms on 15 June 1849 (see extract from letter, Kohler to du Ranquet in "Missions Outside Fort William: Notes taken from Register of Baptisms, etc.," typed copy of St. Andrew's Rectory files, Local History files, Pukaskwa National Park Library [hereafter PNP]).

40. Typically, in the 1860s, du Ranquet stayed at the Pic about a week during the summer (see "Missions Outside Fort William," St. Andrew's Rectory files, PNP; J. Paquin, "The Mission of the Immaculate Conception at Fort William Ontario," unpublished manuscript, PNP; Lorenzo Cadieux, "Fondateurs du Diocese du Sault-Sainte-Marie," Societe historique du Nouvel Ontario, *Document historique* 6 [1944]: 5-35; Lorenzo Cadieux, *Lettres des nouvelles*

missions du Canada 1843-1852 [Montreal: Editions Bellarmine, 1973], 685, 691, 829, 885-86, 888; Lorenzo Cadieux, "Missionnaires jesuites au Nipigon," La Societe Canadienne d'histoire de l'eglise Catholique, *Rapport* [1957-8]: 91-101; Edward LeCompte, *Les Jesuites du Canada au XIXe siecle* [Montreal: Impr. du Messager, 1920], 1: 229-238; Chrysostomus Verwyst, *Life and Labours of Rt. Rev. Frederic Baraga* [Milwaukee: M.H. Wiltzius, 1900], 25, 259-260, 284, 384).

41. Compiled from the manuscript censuses and the "Status Animarum" of Saint Francois Xavier mission. The census figures include the non-native population, who after 1871 make up the "others." The senior HBC figures and their families were usually Presbyterian; later European populations more varied. The higher figure for 1881 reflects changes in the enumeration boundaries.

42. The church was 30 x 22. Fr. J. Hebert to Fr. Baudin, 4 April 1881, in "Correspondence concerning Pic River Mission," PNP. See also Paquin, "The Mission of the Immaculate Conception at Fort William Ontario," 76; Recollections, Ghislaine Lecours Collection, Canadian Museum of Civilization, Ottawa (hereafter CMC); and "Pic Post Expenses from 1874 to 1891," B.162/d/6, HBCA.

43. This discussion is based upon various sources, the most important of which are "Missions Outside Fort William," St. Andrew's Rectory files, PNP; and Paquin, "The Mission of the Immaculate Conception at Fort William Ontario."

44. The movement to the rail line, away from the river mouth, was well under way by 1889 (Paquin, "The Mission of the Immaculate Conception at Fort William Ontario," 94).

45. Peter W. Bell, Chapleau, to S.K. Parsons, Montreal, 30 May 1887, A.11/39, HBCA.

46. The old church was later converted to a school (Letterbook, Vol. 1, 22 March 1906, District Office V-5, Lakehead, Field Office Records, Sub Series V, Series C, Indian Affairs Records, RG 10, NAC).

47. By 1897 the Saint Francis Xavier mission included "Pic Indians" at the Pic, Montizambert (Mobert), Bremner, Amyot, and near White River. Dugas was succeeded by Fathers Lamarche, Belanger, Desautel, Desjardins, Couture and others. For local impressions on many of these priests see Biographies, Ghislaine Lecours Collection, CMC; Jean Boultbee, *Pic, Pulp and People: A History of the Marathon District*, rev. ed. (Marathon: Township of Marathon, 1981), 123; Cadieux, "Fondateurs du Diocese du Sault-Sainte-Marie," 20-22; and John Marsh, "The Human History of the Pukaskwa Park Area 1650-

1975," unpublished manuscript, 1976, Parks Canada, 80-82. Notes in the "Status Animarum" reveal concerns about Protestant "interference" and the continuing hold of both traditional views and the newer, more damaging influence of alcohol. A copy is available in "Indian Genealogical Records," reel 11, MS 871, AO.

48. Among the early twentieth-century priests were the aforementioned L.N. Dugas (Songwebidung/strong voice), Prosper Lamarche (Komistatogus/strong talker) and Charles Belanger (Menoweedung/lovely voice.) Indians names from recollections held in Ghislaine Lecours Collection, CMC.

49. "Michipicoten Post District Reports"; 1 April 1886, HBCA B.129/e/15; emphasis is Bell's. For something of the same, in arguing that the onrush of "white" society was taking a heavy toll on the Indian population of Northern Ontario, see the reports of Stipendiary Magistrate Edward Borron (Ontario *Sessional Papers*).

50. P.W. Bell, Michipicoten Post Records, Report on District, 1 April 1886, B.129/e/15, HBCA. Gilbert Spence agreed with Bell ("Letters from the Pic," Spence to Bell, 7 February 1884, HBC General Box 4, AO).

51. Indian Affairs, 1879, 29.

52. Indian Affairs, 1883, 10.

53. Indian Affairs, 1884, 94; 1885, 94; 1885, 95; 1886, 21, 212; 1887, 288, 303. Later teachers included Angus McDonald (1887-1888), and J.A. Blais (1889-1891).

54. Indian Affairs, 1888, xxvii; 1894, 13.

I Appeal to Caesar

GEOFFREY JOHNSON

Missionary relationships with the government of their host country are rarely simple, but in China they were unusually complicated. Missionaries were normally either foreign nationals residing abroad and working with the tacit or expressed approval of the government, or they were nationals of the imperial power. In China they were both. The purpose of this paper is to examine the thinking of Protestant missionaries in China between 1880 and 1900 on the question of "appeals for redress" as revealed in the pages of the *Chinese Recorder*.

The *Chinese Recorder* was published monthly in English in Shanghai: it tried to be a forum for missionary opinion across the Protestant spectrum. Occasionally the editor would publicly disagree with a contribution, but the magazine's stated policy was to record rather than pronounce. Its columns therefore provide a window into missionary thinking on a variety of issues, one of which was the relation of the church to the civil power. Because missionary activity in China was dependent on the treaty system, with that system I will begin.

Missionary activity began with the arrival of a missionary. But the right of residence was not granted by the Chinese until the Treaty of Nanjing between Britain and China in 1842, and then it was confined to the treaty ports, Guandong, Xiamen, Ningbo, Fuzhou and Shanghai. At the same time the European governments were granted extra territorial powers over their citizens. By means of the "most favoured nation" clauses, whatever was granted to one European country, was extended to the others. The second round of treaty making during 1858-1860 added two new features.

One was the toleration clause:

> The Christian religion as professed by Protestants or Roman Catholics inculcates the practice of virtue, and teaches man to do as he would be done by. Persons teaching it, or professing it, therefore, shall alike be entitled to the protection of the Chinese authorities; nor shall any such, peaceably pursuing their calling, and not offending against the laws, be persecuted or interfered with.[1]

The second, but equally important provision came in through the back door. The Chinese text of the Sino French convention of 1860 contained the provision that Catholic missionaries would be permitted to rent and purchase land in all the provinces and to erect buildings thereon at will. By means of the "most favoured nation" provisions this privilege was extended to all Europeans. Thus, even though this provision did not appear in the French text of the Convention it came to be part of the treaty system. The right of residence and holding of property, was, of course, the precondition for missionary penetration beyond the fifteen or so treaty ports.

The very existence of Christian missions in China thus rested on the treaties, which had been wrung from the Chinese at the point of a gun. For the most part, the missionary community regarded these events as unfortunate but providential. A few, like W.A.P. Martin had taken an active part in the process, but most simply accepted what was given them as an act of God. They could, on occasion be very imperialist. William Ashmore's series in the *Chinese Recorder* during 1897-1898 is typical. For Ashmore the Chinese mandarinate was obtuse and obscurantist. Their mauling at the hands of the Europeans, and then the Japanese, was just what was needed to knock sense into their heads.[2] But too much can be made of missionary jingoism. Most of the time the routine of life had nothing to do with consuls and gunboats.

The treaty system seems to have worked very unevenly. Timothy Richard, in a speech in 1885, spoke highly of the cooperation missionaries received in Chili, Jiangsu, Jejiang and Sichuan provinces, and went on to list a series of difficulties in other parts of the country.[3] Things went wrong often enough to generate considerable discussion among missionaries as to the proper course of action. This is a study of that discussion. The results are indicative rather than conclusive and suggest a rather different

picture from that provided by the received tradition. Paul Cohen, for example argues,

> as a result of the fears and passions aroused by the missionary and his following, anti-Christian conflict was extremely widespread in the late Ch'ing period. During the four decades from 1860 to 1900, there were several hundred incidents or disturbances important enough to need top-level diplomatic handling, while the number of cases that were settled locally easily ran into the thousands.[4]

Cohen is no doubt right, but his examples are usually Catholic cases. The *Chinese Recorder* was a Protestant journal, and it reveals a community for which "appeals for redress" was a serious question, but one that had to take its place alongside more mundane questions of school management, the development of a Chinese staff, and, perhaps the most popular subject of all, studies of the Chinese classics.

The occasions which prompted extended discussion of "treaty rights" were events like the Tientsin massacre of 1870, and the Chengte riots of 1895. In the first case it was alleged that the Catholics were kidnapping children for ritual sacrifice. In June the Tientsin city officials wanted to start an investigation, but the French consul regarded such action as a national insult, and behaved so badly in public that he killed a policeman and started a riot. By the time it was over, the French consulate and the Catholic orphanage had been destroyed. Nineteen foreigners died, ten nuns, two priests and seven French residents.[5]

The reason for the Chengte riot is less obvious. On 28 May 1895 placards appeared in the city alleging that the foreign barbarians had been "hiring evil characters to steal small children (that they) may extract oil from them for their use."[6] Endicott goes on to exhort the citizenry not to let their children outside. Within hours the Canadian Methodist mission was under siege, and within a day or so virtually all mission property in the city, Protestant and Catholic alike, had been destroyed, and the missionaries were rowing down the Yangtze in the direction of Chongqing. No foreign lives were lost, but the Protestants eventually received 40,000 taels ($36,000) in compensation for their buildings, and the Catholics 800,000.[7]

Most of us probably have the impression that China missionaries were sending for the gunboats every second Tuesday. The *Chinese*

Recorder gives quite a different picture. It shows the missionaries as men, exclusively men in this case, of sharply different opinions, trying to act in a responsible Christian way. Nobody was in favour of indiscriminate use of treaty privileges. If anything, opinion tended against any use at all.

The case against use of their privileges was put by Hudson Taylor, founder of the China Inland Mission, in December 1895. Taylor divided the question into two parts. Were appeals to the secular power, ultimately the Europeans, good policy, and were they in accordance with scripture? His answer in both cases was an unequivocal no.

> Often the result of the appeal is not gained, or is so imperfectly gained, that one comes to the conclusion that one would have been better off had the appeal not been made. But where the object is fully gained what . . . is the effect of it? Is it not that the missionary, if more dreaded, is also more disliked and less likely to succeed in winning souls, and that his converts also are more hated?[8]

The idea that people would go to the trouble and expense of living in a foreign country simply for the good of the Chinese, Taylor argued, was utterly foreign to Chinese thought. The missionaries must have some ulterior motive, and the obvious candidate was political. The literati ". . . would insist upon associating the Gospel with the sword, and see in the devoted persons who stood on the highways and preached CHRIST, the men who had battered down the Ta-ku forts and forced opium on China." This would be especially so if the gunboats actually arrived. In that case Taylor's second objection came into play. ". . . numbers of poor heathen Chinese, both innocent of, and unconnected with, the outrage complained of, may be hurried into an awful eternity; and this to avenge the inconvenience and loss of property of servants of the Prince of Peace!"[9]

Further, since no sensible official would want to bring such a calamity upon his district, appeals for redress would seriously increase the difficulties in opening new stations. And finally, appeals suggested to converts that they should rely on human means rather than on God, and even worse, attract people to the mission, not for reasons of faith but simply to secure the powerful assistance of foreigners.[10]

The use of appeals therefore was bad policy; it was also, more seriously, bad exegesis.

> The life, and suffering and death of our LORD, are very fully recorded; and He tells us that as His FATHER sent Him so did He send us. Lest we think that His sufferings were excepted, we have the express teaching of the Apostle Peter that "CHRIST also suffered for us, leaving us an example that ye should follow His steps," who "when he was reviled, reviled not again."[11]

Taylor then went on to quote the Sermon on the Mount, "But I say to you, That ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also," and numerous other sayings in the same vein. The dictum "Be ye wise as serpents and innocent as doves," Taylor argued, "Distinctly forbids the carrying, or use of firearms or other deadly weapons for self-protection."[12] The tendency of the epistles is the same, especially First Peter. Finally, he referred to Paul's conduct as recorded in Acts, texts which crop up again and again in the discussion.

> We have the example of St. Paul in making known to the local governor a threatened danger; and, therefore, have warrant for obtaining the friendly help of local officials, in so far as we can secure it. We have the further example of the apostle in pleading his Roman citizenship on three occasions: 1. To prove that he had been punished wrongfully at Philippi. 2. To prevent his being wrongfully beaten at Jerusalem; and 3. For the protection of his life by appealing to Caesar at Caeserea; but in none of these cases did he demand the punishment of the wrongdoers.[13]

The most Taylor would allow then, was appeal for the friendly assistance of the local officials in self defence, but not to inflict punishment on anyone. Beyond that, the Christian's case was in God's hands alone, who would see to it that all things worked together for good.[14]

Not everyone who wrote on the subject accepted Taylor's exegesis. In March 1896 a contributor simply called "A" replied at considerable length. Central to his argument was the question of biblical interpretation. Taylor had argued for a strict interpretation of a saying like "turn the other cheek." In that case "A" replied, we must be consistent, Jesus also said, "Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes" (Luke 10:4). No missionary, including Hudson Taylor, travelled about China as a barefoot mendicant. In fact, Jesus had other words on the subject. According to Luke, Jesus told his disciples, just as they were leaving for Gethsemane, that his new

instructions were to equip themselves with a purse, a bag, and if anyone didn't have a sword, he should sell his coat and buy one. Self-defence, "A" argued, is perfectly legitimate, as legitimate as carrying cash and a change of clothes. The injunctions of First Peter, he went on, do not always apply. Peter was careful to stress that hardship for the faith should be endured. Further, one of the passages to which Taylor referred (1 Peter 2:19-23) was addressed to slaves "persons who had no recognised rights and no tribunals to which they could appeal."

"A" then went on to assert rather more than his exegesis would allow.

> We hold that while there are cases in which for conscience sake and the good of the cause it is better for Christians to suffer wrong patiently than to insist on their rights, so also there are others where conscience and the good of the cause emphatically demand that Christians vindicate their rights at whatever cost, God showing His servants what His will is as each case arises.[15]

Finally, "A" introduced an argument which was commonly used in one form or another by the advocates of appeals.

> Thus since the Powers that be are ordained of God for our protection and redress, we conclude if we refuse to apply to that quarter we must expect to go without; but no, we have now to learn that if we will only have nothing to do with them "God may deliver in providential ways beyond our thought" . . . We used to think that it was right for evil doers to be afflicted in order that good men might enjoy peace; but now we find that it is better for good men to put up with affliction in order that the wicked may remain undisturbed in their wickedness.[16]

Most advocates of appeals used arguments from "natural" law or from the treaties, with or without references to the powers that be in Romans 13. Governments, they argued, exist to provide public order. Appeals for redress were a form of calling government to account. Some contributors did not distinguish between consuls and mandarins; they were both part of the government. Some people also argued that missionaries did not lose their citizenship when they became missionaries. They had the same right to protection from their home governments as anyone else. Appeals were a means of exercising these rights.[17]

But virtually everybody was agreed on one point. Appeals were a last resort. Griffith John, for example, in a speech to a missionary conference, described at length the procedure he had developed during his long tenure in China. Most court work did not involve missionaries personally. They were cases in which a Christian was subject to persecution. The first step was to be sure the Christian had a good case. Once that was established John concentrated on reconciliation outside the legal system, only using the possibility of going to court as a device when all else had failed. The mere suggestion usually brought recalcitrant litigants to his office and opened the way to reconciliation.[18]

John Ross, the Presbyterian in Mukden, was equally concerned to avoid getting involved in court. The essential problem for Ross was the association of Christianity with foreignness. "As far as religion is concerned, the Chinese are not only `reasonable' but extremely tolerant, till the professed religion assume, or is believed to assume, a political aspect." This was the heart of the problem, but there were secondary reasons for avoiding offence. One did not need, for example to insist that "Confucius is in hell." Quite the contrary; Ross himself had used the Confucian classics in his own schools and found them "of incomparable value both in convicting of sin, in the inculcation of duty, in upsetting idolatry, and in establishing our Christian ideas regarding the Omnipresence, the Almighty Power and the universal care of the one living God."[19] In the same way, one could avoid offence by using ordinary sensitivity rather than insisting on rights in the purchasing of property and the design of churches. The same was true of Chinese etiquette, which should be followed unless there was some violation of truth involved. This point was particularly important for unmarried women whose conduct, while probably acceptable in the west, was decidedly indecent in China. But above all these irritants was interference in the courts:

> . . . interference with the Chinese magistrate in the discharge of his duties, and especially dictation to him in his official capacity, is a perennial source of hatred, overshadowing every other source and lending them whatever influence they have. . . . In the voluminous correspondence resulting from the unhappy and preventible (sic) Tientsin massacre this is the one point to which Chinese officials attached any importance and their removal was their chief aim.[20]

The Chinese surely had a point, Ross went on, "What European people would for a day tolerate such interference?"[21]

Given the repeated injunctions to caution in recourse to the courts, it comes as no surprise to find that appeals were relatively rare. In 1899 the *Chinese Recorder* conducted a survey concerning the question, which gave a sample of 73 missionaries, all men, but representing the main mission societies in central and coastal China.[22] Most of the replies came from regions where significant evangelistic work was in progress, Fokien (Fujien), Shantung and Hupeh. In reply to the question about recourse to Chinese courts, the survey yielded a total of 175 cases, including 20-30 from one man. Only two said they had applied many times, but some of these cases involved securing chapels rather than persecutions. There were 52 cases of appeal to the consuls, most of which, the author thinks probably occurred in treaty ports. Outside the ports, away from consuls, it was easier to deal with the mandarins. In short, with a few exceptions, the survey indicated that litigation was a very minor part of missionary life. While explosions like Tientsin and Chengte were enough to keep the subject on the agenda, they were not enough to give the issue much urgency.

These leisurely discussions were rudely interrupted by the events of 1900. In that year an anti-foreign organization known as the Righteous Harmony Fists or the Boxers started a series of riots across northern China. After some hesitation the empress Dowager gave her support to the movement and ordered the civil service to kill foreigners wherever they could be found. In south China, the senior mandarins simply refused to obey, but in the north, where conditions were rather more conducive to a conservative revolt, the civil service tended to do what it was told. About 180 foreigners died, along with thousands of Chinese Christians, and the loss of property was immense. The movement was eventually crushed by the intervention of the "powers," who fought their way to Beijing, relieved the besieged legations, and drove the government into temporary exile at Xian. The terms of settlement called for compensation for destroyed property, including mission property, the so-called "indemnities." The connection between the missions and the powers suddenly became a hot issue.

The *Chinese Recorder* published two articles by way of theological reflection on the cataclysm, one in July 1900 when the revolt was still in progress, and the other in September 1990 when it had just finished. Then, in November, it got down to cases, publishing a series of contributions

specifically dealing with the indemnity question.

The first line of argument for accepting indemnities was legal, based on the treaties. F.H. Chalfant, for example, argued that malicious destruction of property in China could occur in four ways: mob violence arising from some local cause; burglary; officially instigated mob violence; or looting on the part of soldiers assigned to protect property. In his view, the Chinese government would be liable on any of the four, but in the case of the Boxer uprising damage came from officially instigated violence, or from the soldiery assigned to protect mission property. He was not concerned whether payment came from the imperial or local treasuries, but payment was certainly due. China had entered into international agreements which gave certain rights to foreigners. Those rights had been abused in the rebellion, and China must pay for her failure to uphold her end of the treaties.[23]

Chalfant went on to argue more generally. Indemnity would deter a recurrence of similar events. Justice to the sufferer, whether missionary or capitalist, and justice to the investors, whether in missions or railways alike demanded recompense. The movement was anti-foreign, rather than anti-Christian, and therefore all foreigners should be treated alike. One could not recompense the railways but not the missions, and finally, the uprising had the encouragement, at least of the government in Beijing.[24]

D.Z. Sheffield, carried the argument a step further. In his view, the Boxer affair was essentially a conservative revolt. " . . . the protest of the spirit of blind devotion to the institutions of the past against the spirit of progress that is already widely felt among the people." In the treaties of 1858, China agreed to give protection to her Christian subjects. Neither side, Sheffield argued, really knew what they were getting in to. Ancestor worship, for example, was built into the very fabric of Chinese official life. Yet a Christian could not join in such ceremonies. By signing the treaties, China committed herself to a profoundly revolutionary course, the real nature of which only began to become evident as Christianity spread. Naturally "the rulers of China have made promises which they have no disposition to fulfil, and will not fulfil except under resolute and steady compulsion." The rulers of the west were equally reluctant to pursue the logical consequences of the treaties. Hence, when the "powers" did not respond to attacks on Chinese Christians the Boxers felt able to attack missionaries as well. But why should Christians of either nationality be protected? Because Christian doctrine is a good thing. It is "accepted in

Christian nations as helpful to society and worthy to be propagated." Missionaries "are not the representatives of a narrow propagandism, but rather are they the apostles of human rights concerning man's relations to his Divine Father and his human brother, thoughts that have won recognition among Western nations through long and painful struggle and which need protection and encouragement to secure for them recognition in lower and alien civilizations."[25]

Chalfant and Stuart made their case on fairly narrow grounds. They argued from treaty obligations, or from generally understood notions about the responsibility of governments to maintain public order, and therefore the protection of life and property. Sheffield pushed the argument into more disputed terrain. He argued that Christianity should be protected because it was a good thing in itself. His view is similar to that of contemporary advocates of a common code of human rights for all people. If in 1900 Chinese disrespect for the good should be punished by indemnities, in 1996 it should be punished by some form of trade sanctions.

The case against indemnity was put in the December issue by A. Goold. Goold argued that since it was virtually impossible to find out who was responsible for the riots, an indemnity would likely be paid by many who had nothing to do with the troubles. Such a situation would hardly make the missions popular. But for Goold these were secondary arguments. The heart of his argument was that seeking redress was unscriptural.

> [Christ] did not resist evil, but endured it, committing his cause to Him that judgeth righteously. He had both the right and the power to resist, but He used neither. And this was in accordance with His teachings, as, for instance, the Sermon on the Mount. And did not His apostles walk in His steps? We have no instance of Paul, who was pre-eminent in his sufferings and persecutions on behalf of Christ, ever seeking for redress. And so with Peter, whose First Epistle is so full of exhortation and instruction to persecuted saints that not only should they take it patiently, but they should rejoice and count themselves happy because they were made partakers of Christ's sufferings.[26]

Therefore taking indemnity was wrong in itself, and because it was wrong, it could do the church nothing but harm.

> I ask, would not a heathen Chinese, after the reading of the New Testament with this thought that Christ taught His disciples, both by precept and example, to endure persecutions, losses and afflictions for His name's sake without any hope of present redress or reward? Missionaries in China belong to various countries, but first of all we belong to Christ, and more than that we are here in China as His ministers and His representatives. Shall we not give to the Chinese a misconception of our Master if we demand from them an indemnity for our losses at the present time? Will it not cause them to blaspheme his holy name and all who bear it?[27]

The Boxers thus did not change the arguments much, but they did perhaps cause a shift in prevailing opinion. The contributors to the *Chinese Recorder* were much more keen on treaty rights after the plundering of mission property than before. But the circumstances of the rebellion were unusual. When the country was more or less normal again the missionaries were as reluctant to become involved with Chinese justice, and its treaty entanglements, as they had been in the 1890s. But the situation had become much more serious. C.S. Bousfield, writing at the end of 1901, felt that things had changed radically in the last five years. "Five years ago it was a rare event to be appealed to for help in the law courts and for a native preacher to go to the magistrate in his own name, was practically an unheard of occurrence."[28]

The situation was getting more difficult, even in the 1890s. Then in 1898 the Chinese government made matters much more complicated by changing the rules. It declared Roman Catholic priests and bishops equal to governors and magistrates. People simply would not believe that the Protestants were not, and did not want to be, included in that arrangement. Bousfield continued, "Since the troubles of last years, this has gone from bad to worse, until now our native helpers can go to the magistrates in their own names, and can, as a rule, get done for them all they demand."[29]

Bousfield was careful to insist that not all magistrates could be tarred with this particular brush. But the number who were prepared to do whatever a Christian preacher asked, apparently for fear of foreign influence was sufficient to give ample cause for alarm. His suggestion was that the Protestant missionaries combine to secure a public declaration by the European consuls to the effect that Chinese Christians had no political power or standing "in any respect different from their heathen neighbours." Such a declaration should also make clear what Christians could not do

"along the line of sacrifice to ancestors, etc," should call for strict impartiality in the administration of justice and finally, should publish the terms of the treaties, so that everyone could know what the situation of the missionaries and the Christians really was.[30]

Other contributors wanted much more. If Bousfield recommended steps to make the position of the Protestants perfectly clear, people like F.W.S. O'Neil wanted to change it. The occasion for O'Neil's contribution was the burning of a church in Mukden, an event which caused unusual rejoicing on the part of normally staid citizenry. In O'Neil's view the root of the problem was the connection between the Protestant church and the foreign presence. The cornerstone of that connection was extra territoriality. O'Neil quotes with approval the suggestion of Sir Robert Hart

> that henceforth treaties should be based on the abolition of the extra-territoriality clause . . . In the face of the abounding iniquity of Celestial justice, that is a daring proposal. Yet if a brilliant administrator of unrivalled experience is not afraid to make such a paradoxical suggestion in the interests of commerce, how much more should the herald of peace and goodwill welcome it gladly in the interest of the cause he has at heart?[31]

O'Neil went on to buttress his point with the familiar scriptural arguments. Jesus did not use the power at his command to defend himself against the kingdoms of this world. Paul did, "Yet this does not constitute the irresistible attraction of the Religion of the Cross." "Kenosis for the sake of self-culture," O'Neil contended, "is a feature of Buddhism; self-emptying for God and one's fellow men is a distinctive note of the beauty of our faith." Finally, Paul's use of his Roman citizenship was for the protection of his person, "not that he might be able to petition a Gallio about a case of petty tyranny in Corinth."[32]

O'Neil's reference to Celestial justice suggests one source of missionary hesitation; Chinese courts were not to be trusted. When the *Chinese Recorder* returned to this subject in 1908, the editor carefully separated the paper from Sheffield's restatement of his case for the treaties, and referred with approval to an article by Gilbert Reid. Reid opened his paper with a quotation from the 1902 treaty between China and Great Britain

> China having expressed a strong desire to reform her judicial system and to bring it into accord with that of Western nations, Great Britain agrees to give every assistance to such reform, and she will also be prepared to relinquish her extra territorial rights when she is satisfied that the state of Chinese laws, the arrangement for their administration, and other considerations warrant her in so doing.[33]

What the European treaty makers had in mind, as Reid's article makes clear, was the reform of Chinese law and judicial procedures to conform with western practice. Once those objectives had been achieved, extra-territoriality could be relinquished because it would have outlived its usefulness. Granted, the reference to "other considerations" indicated that the negotiators had not altogether burned their bridges. The "other considerations" were not specified, but could well be brought off the shelf, described, and used as an excuse for not doing anything. They were, as Reid put it, an "x but not exactly a zero."

Nevertheless Reid felt that the new treaties, with Britain, with the USA and with Japan, opened the way to the recognition of Chinese sovereignty as the term was understood in the west. Reid welcomed this development, and was at pains to point out to his missionary readers, that once sovereignty was achieved, the Europeans would have to play by Chinese rules. But the Chinese rules would have been modified sufficiently to be acceptable to Europeans. At that point, treaty protection, whether for Chinese Christians or for missionaries would no longer be necessary.

It is probably safe to say that most missionaries thought about treaty protection simply in terms of their own work. D.E. Hoste, for example, argued that while missionaries had the same legal rights as other Europeans, it would not be expedient to use them. Missionaries were, above all, representatives of Christ rather than their country and should behave as such. For representatives of Christ, intervention in the courts was bad policy. Quite apart from the ever present danger of becoming an unwitting advocate for the wrong party, the very process was inconsistent with the spirit of the New Testament.[34] Others went further, and tried to think of the problem in terms of Chinese society and its relationship with the west. This second group can be divided into the hawks and the doves. Sheffield was a hawk, a straightforward, high-minded imperialist. Christianity was a good thing and deserved the protection of Christian nations. Reid was a dove. He was for the abolition of treaty protection once justice in the

Chinese courts was assured. But Reid assumed a western understanding of justice. In that sense he was a soft imperialist.

Reid's position is similar to the advocates of a connection between foreign policy and human rights. As long as China, for example, conducts its affairs in a manner acceptable to western notions of public propriety, we can trade at will. But if the Chinese choose to establish a political system which does not suit western tastes, they should be sent to Coventry. In the same way Reid approved of the abolition of treaty protection, as long as the Chinese made serious progress in the abolition of what we would today call gross violations of human rights. Like Gilbert Reid, the modern humanitarian left can be described as soft imperialists, Imperial Lite.

Endnotes

1. Treaty of Tientsin, Article VIII (cited in Timothy Richard, "The Political Status of Missionaries and Native Christians in China," *Chinese Recorder*, March 1885, 96.
2. "The Missionary Movement in China," *Chinese Recorder*, December 1897; April 1898; July 1898; August 1898; and September 1898.
3. "The Political Status of Missionaries and Native Christians in China," *Chinese Recorder*, March 1895, 103ff.
4. Paul A. Cohen, "Christian Missions and their Impact to 1900," in *The Cambridge History of China*, eds. Denis Twitchett and John K. Fairbank (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1978-), 10: 569.
5. Frederic E. Wakeman, *The Fall of Imperial China* (New York: Free Press, 1975), 185-186.
6. James Endicott, "The Sz-Chuan Riots," *Chinese Recorder*, August 1895, 392.
7. Alvyn J. Austin, *Saving China: Canadian Missionaries in the Middle Kingdom, 1888-1959* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1986), 58.
8. *Chinese Recorder*, December 1895, 576.
9. *Chinese Recorder*, December 1895, 576.
10. *Chinese Recorder*, December 1895, 577.
11. *Chinese Recorder*, December 1895, 577.
12. *Chinese Recorder*, December 1895, 577.

13. *Chinese Recorder*, December 1895, 578.

14. *Chinese Recorder*, December 1895, 578. See also M.H. Houston, *Chinese Recorder*, August 1896, Correspondence section; and M.H. Houston, *Chinese Recorder*, September 1896, Correspondence section.

15. "Letter to the editor," *Chinese Recorder*, March 1896, 149.

16. "Letter to the editor," *Chinese Recorder*, March 1896, 150.

17. "Letter to the editor," *Chinese Recorder*, January 1896, 44-47; J.C. Whiting, "Letter to the editor," *Chinese Recorder*, June 1896, 296-300; and P.W. Pitcher, "The Uprising on the Part of Literati and the Officials in Fuklen Province. What Can We Do to Frustrate Its Design?" *Chinese Recorder*, December 1896, 579-584.

18. Griffith John, "How to Deal With Persecution," *Chinese Recorder*, November 1898, 527-530.

19. John Ross, "The Riots and Their Lessons," *Chinese Recorder*, August 1892, 381.

"The Riots and Their Lessons," *Chinese Recorder*, August 1892, 385-386.

"The Riots and Their Lessons," *Chinese Recorder*, August 1892, 386.

22. Paul D. Bergen, "Should We Endeavour to Keep All Church Troubles Out of the Yamen," *Chinese Recorder*, June 1899, 262-266.

23. F.H. Chalfant, "An Argument for Indemnity," *Chinese Recorder*, November 1900, 541. See also George Stuart, "The Demand for Indemnity," *Chinese Recorder*, November 1900, 543-544.

24. Chalfant, "An Argument for Indemnity," *Chinese Recorder*, November 1900, 541-542.

25. "Christian Missions in China Should be Protected by Western Nations," *Chinese Recorder*, November 1900, 544-547. See also "Treaty Protection to Christian Missions in China," *Chinese Recorder*, December 1908, 657-671.

26. "An Argument Against Indemnity," *Chinese Recorder*, December 1900, 617.

27. "An Argument Against Indemnity," *Chinese Recorder*, December 1900, 617-618.

28. "Missionary Troubles," *Chinese Recorder*, February 1902, 68.

29. "Missionary Troubles," *Chinese Recorder*, February 1902, 68.

30. Bousfield, "Missionary Troubles," *Chinese Recorder*, February 1902, 70.

31. "A Study of an Incident in the Boxer Rising," *Chinese Recorder*, April 1902, 184.

32. "A Study of an Incident in the Boxer Rising," *Chinese Recorder*, April 1902, 185.

33. "Missionaries as Amenable to Chinese Law," *Chinese Recorder*, December 1908, 676.

34. D.E. Hoste, "The Missionary and his Relation to the Treaties," *Chinese Recorder*, December 1908, 671-675.

CSCH Presidential Address 1996

Texts and Contexts: Meaning and Methodology in Church History

BETH PROFIT

As a student at the University of Chicago, I took a seminar with Martin Marty entitled, "Teaching the History of Christianity." Although I learned little in this course about specific teaching methods, how to write a lecture, or how to put together a survey course in the history of Christianity, and the reading list included no histories of Christianity, I think it was the most helpful course I took at Chicago. While it did not focus on how to be a teacher, as the title had led me to expect, it did something more fundamental: it focused on how to be an historian. The reading list for the course included theories and methodologies of history by Wilhelm Dilthey, Kenneth Burke, Marc Bloch, R.G. Collingwood, Edward Gibbon, Jacob Burckhardt, Johan Huizinga, Jose Ortega y Gasset, and Benedetto Croce. In writing my dissertation, and reading the work of various historians and church historians, and as I struggle with my own project, I am frequently reminded of the issues raised in that class.

Although the issues of meaning and methodology raised by the above authors were not presented in the context of the study of church history, they have particular relevance to our discipline. The empirical study of religion, relies in large part, on human experience as sources of historical knowledge as opposed to, for example, revelation. This presents us, as scholars, with some problems. It is generally acknowledged that

these sources cannot merely be taken at face value but must be examined critically. Selecting, interpreting and evaluating experiential sources are complex processes, with some basic prerequisites. To ask the appropriate questions of our sources, we must first ask appropriate questions of our discipline: How do we approach the past? What is the goal of this particular study? Why study church history?

These basic questions are important because to many outside our discipline, our subject is either misunderstood as primarily confessional (i.e., in the service of our own religious experiences), or considered to be politically incorrect, based on their own negative experiences with religion. Two members of this society, Ruth Compton Brouwer and Randi Warne, have written papers chronicling what has been called "the unacknowledged quarantine" on religion in women's studies and women's history in Canada.[1] Escaping that quarantine involves not only a demonstration of the relevance of our discipline to the larger fields of history and the study of human behaviour, as Randi and Ruth have done, but also the more basic assertion that the study of church history is, as much as any other type of history, a valid, empirical study, not a defence of faith. To uphold the validity of our historical studies we must be vigilant in maintaining a careful empirical methodology. We must formulate thoughtfully and methodically the questions we bring to our sources, while attempting to discover and acknowledge exactly what role our own experiences do play in the formulation of those questions.

How do we approach the past? In his *Meditations on Quixote*, the Spanish philosopher Jose Ortega y Gasset wrote of reality, "I am myself plus my circumstances."[2] The relationship between the self and its context is one of the first issues the historian must face in interpreting historical sources, not just for assessment of their accuracy or reliability but also for evaluation of their meaning. The "self" here refers not only to the historical self who has provided the historical source, but the self of the historian. What presuppositions does the historian bring to the source, and how does the historian's own context affect his or her interpretation? Nineteenth-century historian Wilhelm Dilthey described the relationship between the text and its interpreter as a hermeneutic circle. He pointed out the impossibility of finding a pure starting point for empirical knowledge, because any starting point has its own presuppositions.[3] Thinking, analysing, judging and inferring are only possible if the validity of thought processes for ascertaining facts is presupposed. We cannot pinpoint the

precise meaning of a word without reading its context in a sentence or paragraph, but we cannot know what the sentence means either unless we first understand individual words. Thus all knowledge is necessarily circular. As presuppositions cannot be escaped we, as historians, need to acknowledge clearly the ideas and questions we bring to the text, recognizing that they are products of our time and location in history, just as our subjects are products of their time and location in history. A consciousness of our own context can help us to avoid the commonly-encountered interpretational hazards of presentism and ethnomorphism.

While presentism represents an unconsciousness of, or lack of attention to, the temporal gap between the historian and the historical subjects, ethnomorphism ignores the cultural distance which may exist. This interpretational hazard consists in the conceptualization of the characteristics of another group in terms of one's own experience, usually by making one's own customs, manners and opinions the standards of right and wrong, of true and false. This applies not just in cases of moral judgments: perhaps the best illustration I can think of concerns a behavioral understanding, or misunderstanding. Historian David Hackett Fischer tells the story of how Native Americans, who were observing the Puritans settling in Massachusetts, concluded that the English must have burned up all the firewood in the old country and had moved to find more. This was frequently a reason for their own migration, which they then projected onto the English settlers.[4] To avoid this pitfall we must employ what Dilthey referred to as the "double-focus principle" which says, in part, that any interpretation of history must take into account both the point of view of the interpreter and the point of view of the subject.[5] The historian acts as an interpreter of the subject's own interpretation.

The interpretation of a source must also consider the context of: a) its historical period; and b) the totality of the historical figure's work to evaluate its accuracy, reliability and meaning. This seems basic but, surprisingly, many scholars engage in only a partial analysis of context. They will consider context in terms of the reliability or accuracy of a source, but evaluate meaning in terms of present-day context, falling into the interpretational hazard of presentism. Certainly studies which devalue the contributions of early feminists such as Nellie McClung as a conservative, bourgeois "maternal" feminist commit this sin of omission. Those have been amply documented and discussed by Randi Warne and others, and a corrective has begun to occur in women's studies with regard to evaluating

the early feminists.[6] An incident from my personal experience will serve as another example. When I first began my research on J.S. Woodsworth I went to the Pratt Library at Victoria University and checked out a stack of books. The student working at the check-out desk noticed that all the books were by or about Woodsworth and said, "J.S. Woodsworth. He was a terrible racist, eh?" I was taken aback. Having recently written a paper on the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s, J.S. Woodsworth, by comparison, did not immediately occur to me as a candidate for the title of "terrible racist." I asked the student why it was that he saw Woodsworth as a racist, and he told me that he had read Woodsworth's *Strangers Within Our Gates* and that the person who wrote the introduction agreed with him. I tried to explain something about the purpose of the book (to inform already-settled Canadians about the background of newcomers to their community) and that while Woodsworth might have used language and categories that we do not consider appropriate today, his dedication to the immigrants with whom he worked in North Winnipeg, made it difficult for me to consider him a racist. I do not think I satisfied the student, and I know I did not satisfy myself, so I rushed off to re-read the introduction to *Strangers Within Our Gates*.[7] Marilyn Barber does not call Woodsworth a "terrible racist" but does point out that certainly *Strangers Within Our Gates* divides people up into ethnic groups and make generalizations about them, both positive and negative. It is worth noting, however, that Woodsworth, if he is being "racist," lets his "racism" fall equally upon people who share his own ethnic heritage and those who do not. I suspect, however, that the interpretation of a single word may have played a large part in condemning Woodsworth for my library acquaintance – namely, assimilation.

Interpreted in a late-twentieth-century context, "assimilation" has many negative connotations, such as enforced religious conversions, devaluation of ethnic heritage, and implied superiority of the assimilating group. A historian must, however, to try to discover what Woodsworth and his contemporaries understood the term to mean. This is difficult to do because such assumptions about the meaning and value attached to a commonly understood term are frequently unstated until some crisis in the collective understanding occurs. However, the question of original meaning may be partially answered, at least, by asking a series of questions based on the meaning we attach to the term, and attempting to determine whether Woodsworth shared our understanding. For example, what did Woodsworth say about proselytizing? Did he require church attendance for

those who wished to use the educational, health, recreational, and other services of All Peoples' Mission? What was Woodsworth's attitude toward the customs and culture of the different ethnic groups settling in the North End of Winnipeg? Did he encourage or discourage their preservation? Did he regard Canadian culture as superior?

The answers to these questions indicate that there are some points of difference between our understanding of "assimilation" and Woodsworth's. For example, Woodsworth rejected outright the notion of attempting to turn Catholic immigrants into Methodists, but supported the idea that "we must help them to work out their salvation"[8] through teaching them to think for themselves, and establishing Independent churches. But church attendance at the mission, the Independent church or anywhere else was never mandatory for the use of All Peoples' facilities. Regarding cultural heritage, *Strangers Within Our Gates* demonstrates some sensitivity to the ethnic pride of the various peoples described, highlighting events in their national histories, and achievements in the arts, but has no tolerance for celebrations and feasts that include drunkenness. Substandard levels of cleanliness are described bluntly, if not critically. More information on the question of ethnic identity and heritage surfaces when we turn to the greater body of J.S. Woodsworth's work, where we find that he instituted regular monthly meetings at which immigrants could share the culture of their homeland with others through lectures, exhibits and performances.[9] Thus, we can conclude that his understanding of assimilation allowed for cultural preservation.

The question of implied superiority also yields a yes and no answer. The question that recurs throughout *Strangers Within Our Gates* is, how can we Canadians help these people adapt to Canadian life? The implications of such a question are: a) that the Canadians are in a position to give help, i.e., a superior position; and b) that the immigrants should adapt to Canadian life, suggesting that this is the superior lifestyle. Yet, Woodsworth criticizes Canadians who demonstrate patronizing attitudes toward immigrants[10] and emphasizes that as far as he is concerned assimilation is a two-way process, involving the education of established Canadians in addition to that of the immigrant.

> In Canada we fail to understand the foreigners, or we despise them. They meet with this attitude at every turn. They live in this atmosphere. With what result? They soon come to accept our rating. They

> despise themselves and everything associated with that hated word "foreigner" . . . So, in the zeal to become Canadians, everything of the old world is thrown aside. Becoming head shawls give place to ugly, cheap hats of the prevailing fashion. Exquisitely-worked garments are discarded for ill-fitting cheap quality "store" clothes.
>
> An arts and crafts society recently sought my assistance in their effort to revive lace-making and handicrafts among the immigrants. Their thought was to educate the foreigners. I pointed out that their task was a much more difficult one – that of educating our own Canadians to an appreciation of the beautiful. So soon as we come to value beautiful work bearing the stamp of personality, just as soon will the immigrant find it easy, not to gain, but to retain his inherited standards of the beautiful.[11]

Woodsworth takes pains to point out that "Canadian" includes people who have immigrated from all over the world, not just from the British Isles, but it is clear that the dominant culture of Canada, for Woodsworth, is British. French Canada merits barely a mention. Yet, Woodsworth's assumptions of English Canadian superiority are undercut by the frequent criticisms levelled at both Canadians and the English immigrants.

Another fruitful approach not pursued in this brief discussion of the question of what "assimilation" meant in Woodsworth's historical context would be to consider the interpretation of those whom Woodsworth was assimilating? How did they understand the term? Did they perceive Woodsworth as respecting them? Did they consider Woodsworth's attitude to be one of cultural superiority?

Our brief examination of Woodsworth's understanding of assimilation suggests that it differs from our own in certain important respects. To say that Woodsworth believed in assimilation, as he understood it, does not demonstrate him to be a "terrible racist." There certainly are shared elements in our definitions, and one cannot argue that Woodsworth's attitude towards assimilation would meet the standards of political correctness today. But is that appropriate to ask of an historical figure who lived in a different time and place? Are we like the assimilating group *vis a vis* the text, assuming our own superiority and setting the standards? Do we have all the answers? This teleological understanding of history, the notion that we are progressing towards some great end, or that we are already there looking back at the more primitive stages presents some problems. Nineteenth-century cultural historian Jacob Burckhardt criticized this view of

history because he believed that it allowed a shallow ethical relativism which justified anything and everything as a necessary stage in the process. He argued that everything should be interpreted in its immediate relation to God, or whatever the people of that time saw as God, to see the decisions that were made from the perspective of those who made them. The goal of our study then, to answer our second question, should be to understand the past *on its own terms*. Furthermore, Burckhardt argued, we cannot now see what was *really* happening in a past age any more clearly than could those who lived at that time. We can see how a given event may have worked itself out, but as to exactly why or whether it was a good thing we can have only guesses or fragmentary knowledge.[12]

Just as the temporal gap between historian and subject presents challenges for historical study, so do culture, gender and economics present similar gaps. In fact, there is a prominent school of thought today which argues that these experiential gaps cannot be bridged. In 1988 the Toronto Women's Press, the oldest feminist press in Canada, split into two separate presses over the issue of the acceptability of fiction-writing projects which were written by authors who were not members of the ethnic group they were writing about.[13] Another example of this argument surfaces in the debate over whether men can or should teach women's history. Ruth Roach Pierson pointed out the double-bind that the argument that they cannot or should not places on male historians. They have been castigated for excluding women's experience, or the experience of some other marginalized group from history; yet, if they try to include it, they are criticized.[14] While one can understand from the perspective of power politics these arguments against the dominant group trying to appropriate the voice of the marginalized group and thus maintain or assert their dominance, it has certain logical difficulties and certain difficult implications for historians. If we accept that a man cannot write about women's history because he is a man, and therefore has had a different experience in the world, or that I cannot write about the experience of working-class immigrants because I come from a middle-class family who has been in Canada for seven generations, then it logically follows that none of us can write, for example, medieval European church history because we are products of twentieth-century North America. Few, if any, of us were sent from our homes as youngsters to live and be educated in a monastery without heat, electricity or printed books. Few, if any, of us have lived in a society without modern standards of public sanitation or have had

surgery or dentistry practised on us by barbers without benefit of anaesthetic. We come from a different place, a different time, a different educational system; we have different assumptions about the world. We have different knowledge about the world and a different way of thinking. Yet does this mean we cannot study medieval history, because we do not know the medieval experience? Of course not. We find ways to bridge that temporal experiential gap, such as asking the types of questions outlined in the Woodsworth example. First we must examine our own understandings of the questions we bring to the text. Are they appropriate questions? Would our subject understand them in the same way we do? What can we glean about their understanding of their own situation, or of the questions we ask? What assumptions do we make about the experiences of our subject? Are they assumptions our subject would make? What can we discover about how our subject sees the world that might be helpful in interpreting his or her interpretation of the experience? I believe that the same logic applies to the task of bridging cultural, economic and even gender gaps. We can also bring our own experience to this task. Most of us, however temporarily, have at some time or another been in a setting where we experienced a feeling of "otherness" or powerlessness. While it may not open wide a window into the world of those whose experiences are "other" to us, it at least allows us to peer through a crack between the curtains, and catch a glimpse of that world. It provides at least a starting point for understanding the experience of those who are "other" to our group. Of course, we can never achieve anything approaching a full historical understanding or knowledge of any person, place or time. "'A historian cannot know what *really* happened, but he [sic] has a duty to try.'"[15]

This brings to our third, and final, question. If our knowledge of history can be only partial and non-objective then why study it? For subjective reasons, by which I mean for purposes relevant to ourselves. History can help us to clarify contexts in which contemporary problems exist, not by a presentist method of projecting our own ideas into the past but by conducting an empirical examination into the past with as much objectivity as possible. Our understanding of contemporary problems is enhanced by a knowledge of how they have developed over time. History can also be useful for what it suggests about the future, when trends and directions can be established. Finally, history can help us to learn about ourselves. Many scholars have pointed to similarities between the narrative process in history and the narrative method in Freudian psychoanalysis.[16] We learn

about ourselves through the stories we tell. But even more perhaps we learn about ourselves as historical study forces us to examine our own presuppositions and values that we bring to the historical text.

Endnotes

1. Ruth Compton Brouwer, "Transcending the 'Unacknowledged Quarantine': Putting Religion into English-Canadian Women's History," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 27, No. 3 (Fall 1992): 47-61; and Randi R. Warne, "Further Reflections on the 'Unacknowledged Quarantine': Feminism and Religious Studies," in *Changing Methods: Feminists Transforming Practice* (Toronto: Broadview Press, 1995).

2. Jose Ortega y Gasset, *Meditations on Quixote*, trans. Evelyn Rugg and Diego Marin (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1961), 45.

3. Wilhelm Dilthey, *Pattern and Meaning in History: Thoughts on History and Society*, ed. H.P. Rickman (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961), 67, 73-4.

4. David Hackett Fischer, *Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1970), 225.

5. Dilthey, 129-31.

6. Veronica Strong-Boag, "'Ever a Crusader: Nellie McClung, First-Wave Feminist," in *Rethinking Canada: The Promise of Women's History*, ed. Veronica Strong-Boag and Anita Clair Fellman (Toronto: Copp Clark Pittman, 1986; and Randi R. Warne, *Literature as Pulpit: The Christian Social Activism of Nellie L. McClung* (Waterloo: Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion, 1993), Chapter IV.

7. J.S. Woodsworth, *Strangers Within Our Gates* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1972).

8. Woodsworth, *Strangers within Our Gates*, 256.

9. J.S. Woodsworth, *My Neighbour* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1972), 208; J.S. Woodsworth, "Canadians of Tomorrow, VI – Wanted, Social Interpreters," *The Christian Guardian* LXXXVI, 28 (14 July 1915): 12.

10. J.S. Woodsworth, "Canadians of Tomorrow, III – The Assets which the Immigrant Brings," *The Christian Guardian* LXXXVI, 22 (2 June 1915): 12.

11. J.S. Woodsworth, "Canadians of Tomorrow, V – How to Make True Canadians," *The Christian Guardian* LXXXVI, 24 (16 June 1915): 13.

12. Jacob Burckhardt, *Reflections on History* (Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1979), 33-34, 103-104, 323-324, 327-328.

13. Ruth Roach Pierson, "Experience, Difference, Dominance and Voice in the Writing of Canadian Women's History," in *Writing Women's History: International Perspectives*, eds. Karen Offen, Ruth Roach Pierson and Jane Rendall (Indianapolis: Indiana Univ. Press, 1991), 89-90.

14. Pierson, 86.

15. Fischer, 43.

16. Fischer, 315-316.