Introductory Statement

The Canadian Society of Church History presents herewith a selection of papers delivered at its meeting held in May, 1978, at the University of Western Ontario. The reproduction of these papers is essentially for the convenience of members of the Society, although a limited number of copies are available to interested persons and institutions and may be ordered from the Treasurer, Prof. C.F. Johnston, St. Andrew's College, 1121 College Drive, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7N OW3. Distribution in this form does not preclude publication of these papers elsewhere, and copyright remains the property of the authors.

The paper given by Fr. Brian Hogan, C.S.B., will appear in the Study Sessions of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association, and that by Prof. John W. Grant will be published in Studies in Religion.

The next annual meeting will be held in June, 1979, at the University of Saskatchewan. Persons interested in membership or seeking more information about the Society and its work are invited to write to the Secretary, John S. Moir, 167 Main St. N., Markham, Ontario, L3P 1Y2.

President Prof. John Netten
Department of Educational Foundations.
Memorial University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A HOUSE DIVIDED AGAINST ITSELF:
THE DENOMINATIONAL ANTAGONISMS OF THE GRAND RIVER MISSIONS.

Richard C. Ruggle

The story of the christian missions on the Grand River during the first half of the 19th century is one where the denominational antagonisms of the age were writ large. Despite the long association of the Mohawks, who were the largest of the Six Nations, with the Church of England, the missionaries tended to regard the indians as being, unlike the surrounding white settlers, religiously neutral. The missions, which undertook the task of providing schooling on the reserve, had more visible authority than did the churches in the neighbouring communities. Missionaries were provided with the rôle of being intercessors between white and indian communities. These factors may have combined to make the missionaries more uncompromising than usual in furthering the interests of their particular denominations.

The Church of England continued its connection with the Mohawks, and in 1784 their former missionary at Fort Hunter, New York, John Stuart, held services at the church they had built at their village some nine miles from Niagara. This land fell into American hands by the treaty of Versailles, and the government assisted them in building a new church at Brantford the following year.

When Robert Addison was appointed to Niagara, he began a program of regular visitation. Joseph Brant thought

> that the Indians will be better pleased with 3 or 4 visits from Mr. Addison, in the year, than to have a Residential Missionary; but Mr. Stuart's opinion is--that they are afraid of the restraint which the Continual residence of a Clergyman would necessarily lay them under, and he is verily persuaded, that occasional visits are to be considered more as matters of form, than productive of any lasting good effect.[1]

A few years later, however, Captain Brant tried to arrange for an old friend of his, Davenport Phelps, to be ordained and live among the Mohawks. When Bishop Mountain refused to go along with the plan, Brant is reported to have said, "Very well, then I shall turn Methodist."[2] Addison reported what was at least as bad, that Brant seemed "determined to have a Romish Priest."[3] The threats seem more indicative of Brant's piccue than his policy. In later years he was willing to invite a passing Baptist preacher to visit the Mohawks,[4] but he did not persue his agitation for a resident cleric.

That want was not supplied until long after Joseph Brant's death, when Alvin Torry came out in 1822 at the direction of the Genesee Conference of the American Methodist Episcopal Church. When Torry wrote his autobiography, he styled himself the "First Missionary to the Six Nations...

of British North America." The reader is a little uncertain whether he is intended to assume that the adjective "methodist" should be inserted between "first" and "missionary." Besides the Anglicans already mentioned, the American Baptists had also sent missionaries through the valley of the Grand, though they decided not to begin a work there.[5]

So when Terry arrived to spend five years on the Grand, he was the first resident missionary to the Indians in Canada. But the ambiguity of his phrase is typical of the outlook of many commentators of the time: the only efforts worth noticing, they seemed to feel, were those of their own church. So Archdeacon Strachan on his 1828 visitation could speak of SPG missionaries having "been settled among them for upwards of a century,"[6] conveniently neglecting the absence of an SPG missionary settled among them for upwards of four decades, and neglecting also the presence of a Methodist missionary for the past few years. Even James Beaven, one of the early Anglican exponents of christian unity in Canada, confused the work of the New England Company and the SPG, and seemed unaware of the presence of two sorts of methodists as well as Baptists during his 1846 visit, when he described the work of conversion on the reserve.[7]

When other missionaries were acknowledged, there was no indication that they were engaged in a common endeavour. As Addison got older, Ralph Leaming from Lancaster took on the responsibility of providing Anglican services on the reserve, and started a school there. But Terry's only mention of the Anglican work is to repeat whatever slander he has heard. The missionary, he wrote:

> only visited them once or twice in a year, and after the Sabbath exercises closed in the church, it was his custom to go with the Indians to their horse-racing and card-playing, where they had plenty of the fire-water to drink, and I have been informed upon good authority, that he has often become so intoxicated as to be unable to leave the ground.[8]

There were a few exceptions. John West in 1826 reported to the New England Company some of the good work being done by Methodists, and won the applause of the Christian Guardian for his perceptiveness.[9] And the Anglican Robert Lugger spoke highly of the devotion of the Baptist Richard Scott.[10] But these were rare exceptions, and did not involve people who were in direct competition with one another.

In the summer and fall of 1823, there took place a great melting of hearts as the Methodists undertook a revival at the extremities of the reservation (about 30 miles apart). The presiding elder of the (Upper Canada) district claimed they "did not commence this Mission professedly for the conversion of the Indians (though they were had in the view and prayers of the pious), but for the benefit of the scattered white population on the Indian lands. But, blessed be the Lord," there resulted 24 in society in one place and 4 in the other, besides whites.[11]

It was about this time that a prominent Mohawk chief who had been baptized in the Church of England, Thomas Davis, was converted. Two years later, in June of 1825, the Grand was visited by an Anglican travelling missionary who was shortly to become Bishop of Quebec, Charles James Stewart. Stewart noted with concern:

> Methodist preachers have lately introduced themselves on the Grand River. I endeavoured to prevent their sowing the seeds of contention, and making divisions among the Indians, by exhorting the tribes, to the best of my power, to maintain and cultivate unity with our Church, which has instructed them ever since the days of Queen Anne.[12]

During his stay, Stewart met Davis, and their conversation is reported by Torry (who has prospectively consecrated the priest). Stewart enquired of the old chief why he had joined the Methodists, and Davis replied,

> "Bishop, you know your ministers preach to Indians forty years. No see at all: all dark--no feel any good. All drink fire-waters--get drunk--all bad. But the Methodist minister come preach to Indian: he feel sorry, then glad. He put away all the fire-waters; begin to pray--be sober--work--have plenty to eat--all very happy. What you think of the Methodist religion, Bishop?"
>
> The Bishop sat listening attentively to him, till he finished, then with a shake of his head replied, "I don't know anything about this Methodist religion." The old chief quickly replied, "You not know anything about this Bible religion? I very sorry." And then warming up with the subject, he gave him such an exhortation that the Bishop was glad to bid him "good day," at the first chance he could get.[13]

This conversation, Torry alleges, prompted the sending of a resident Anglican missionary at long last to the reserve. And though Torry may be slightly biased in his account, in the same report that Stewart worried about Methodist incursions, he also expressed hopes for the beneficial residence of a clergyman on the Grand.

Stewart was not the first to express that hope. In 1822 Thomas Morley had been appointed the SPG missionary to the Mohawks on the Grand River. Morley was the son of an English clergyman (and the grandson of a bishop) who had taken orders in the Roman Catholic church. When he expressed a desire to return to the Church of England, "his case was investigated and he was sent to Canada...."[14] He went to the Grand River, where (reported Mr Addison) he "appeared much disheartened, and has been unwell since he reached his destination."[15] Morley became a non-resident resident missionary to the Mohawks, and removed to Chatham, where he did good work.

With an eye for a replacement for Morley, Stewart met with a council of the chiefs and "advised them to appropriate the 600 dollars they had formerly promised to contribute to the repair of the church, to the building of a parsonage, it having been lately ascertained that the church is so far decayed that it is not worthy of the expense of repair."[16] The chiefs agreed, and resolved to build the parsonage on 200 acres which they engaged as a glebe.

Stewart was consecrated at Lambeth on New Year's day of 1826. On his return to Canada, he arranged for William Hough to come to the Grand. Hough had come to Kingston in deacon's orders, and acted as chaplain there in 1824. The next year he succeeded Mr

and Suddard, who had been dismissed from the Gaspé; but he was "much afflicted...by a determination of blood to the head,"[17] and his physician suggested a change of location for the sake of his health. After being admitted to priest's orders at York, he arrived at the Grand River in September 1825, where he was introduced by John Brant to an assembly of the chiefs, and great rejoicing was expressed that they at last had a minister to live among them. After some months, he ventured the following estimate of his flock:

> Many, I trust, are Christians "indeed"; but far too many, I regret to say, are unworthy of the name they bear, being addicted to drunkenness in a great degree.... I am happy, however, to say, that this vice is by no means so prevalent amongst them as when I first arrived.[18]

According to his Methodist rival, Corry, Hough's reproofs sparked hostility rather than reform, and the Indians said to him, "We not want you to preach to us--we not have you." So discouraged was he that he called on Corry (said the latter)

> and wished to know how it was that we reformed the poor drunken Indians, and brought them under religious discipline. I said to him, "In order to get more Indians converted to God, we must go among them, visit them, eat with them, converse with them, pray with and for them, and look to God for his Spirit to accompany his truth to their hearts, then there is no difficulty in leading them to Jesus Christ, who saves them." He said he believed in being religious, and in attending to the means of grace, "but," said he, "the wonderful change of heart you speak of, I don't understand." He wished me to give him the charge of the converted Indians, while I should go among the wild ones again, "for you have such success," said he, "in converting Indians, you can soon establish another society equal to the first." This I declined doing, and he left me, and in a few months returned to England.[19]

Hough's only mention of the Methodists in his report was that they superintended one of the five schools on the river, "with which I do not interfere."[20] His health did not, however, improve; and this (rather than his failure to copy Corry's example) led him to return to England.

About that time a former artillery officer, the Reverend Robert Fuller (1793-1877) was appointed to replace him. Bishop Stewart persuaded the S.P.G. to support him briefly, before the New England Company assumed responsibility for the mission. The Company was non-denominational, and had invited a Baptist missionary from New Brunswick, Richard Scott, to settle with the Six Nations or at the Credit. When he arrived, Scott discovered that the Methodists were looking after the Mississaugas on the Credit and that the Six Nations were being cared for by Fuller. Not wanting to interfere with work being done by another church, he met first with Brant and Fuller, then with Governor Maitland, before deciding to start a mission on Rice Lake.

Though supported by the New England Company, Fuller quickly put an uncompromisingly Anglican stamp to the mission on the Grand. A passing Presbyterian, William Proudfoot, commented on him:

> He appears to be anxious to do good not only to the Indians

but to the white people of Brantford, but his mode of doing good is in the style of the high churchman, consequently he is not a match for the Methodists who work around him.[22]

Lugger did not have to wait long before crossing swords. William Hess had been a schoolmaster for the SPG since 1822, receiving an annual salary of £20. He had about 20 children under his care, and impressed both John West and George Ryerson on their visits. But he united himself "pertinaciously with the Methodists," said Bishop Stewart, "who have intruded themselves on our Indians in a manner by no means acceptable to some of them."[23] Thereupon Lugger desired him to discontinue teaching the school, and directed him not to draw again on the Society, except for the amount owing him; and the bishop backed up the missionary. Hess and another Grand River Mohawk, William Doxtader, went to begin a work of conversion amongst their fellows on the Bay of Quinte.[24]

This was an inauspicious prelude to a visit made by a number of Methodist Mohawks, led by Doxtader and Peter Jones, to Lugger in March of 1828. They asked for the privilege of holding meetings at the Mohawk church, in return for granting him a similar liberty at Salt Springs. The Anglican said he had no objection to their attending his Church for divine service, but he "considered them unqualified to preach, and consequently in danger of spreading erroneous doctrines, and causing enthusiasm and wildfire, etc." Doxtader felt compelled to warn his brethren to flee the wrath to come. After much discussion, they agreed not to interfere with one another. Peter Jones advised the Methodist Indians "not to speak evil of the Church of England, but go peaceably on in the way they thought right, and rejoice if the Church of England Minister did any good amongst the Indians."[25]

About this time Torry left the Grand River, to be replaced by the less-known Joseph Messmore, a young man who had been raised as a Mennonite, and converted in the Thames country. With his advent, the mission seemed to grow amazingly. His converts, said John Carroll, were "living epistles...better than all the self-eulogy in the world."[26] Presumably the contrast to Torry is not just one of figures, but of attitude as well--Torry's autobiography had been out ten years when Carroll wrote those lines.

After two years of having two missionaries on the Grand, the Methodists experienced a shortage of manpower, and the Grand was combined for part of 1829 with the Dumfries Circuit. The numbers reported remained high, but some of the momentum was gone. George Ryerson, who had visited the area in 1826 and reported his observations to Governor Maitland, was appointed to the circuit. In the spring of 1831 he accompanied Peter Jones to England, to collect funds for Indian missions. When he got caught up in the Irvingite movement and failed to return to Canada, he was struck from the rolls.[27]

Meanwhile the mission was not left unattended. In March, Case reported enthusiastically to the Christian Guardian that about thirty Mohawks and others had "been reclaimed from their drunken habits and become praying people...." At the same time Lugger was writing with disdain to the New England Company about "a sect of Methodists, termed Jumpers, having lately come to the Grand River; such are their extravagant actions and gestures,

that Mr. L. has thought it right not to have anything to do with them, except visiting and supplying them with medicine when sick." (Jugger was supplied by the Company with medical supplies, and acted as a doctor on the reserve.)[28]

The Methodists had appointed a local preacher who, Carroll admitted, "did not succeed well," and he was replaced by an American, Richard Phelps. Phelps had been discontinued from his first charge because he wanted "some of the minor graces;" but he had had experience on the Grape Island mission, and he braved the rigours of life on the Grand. He had to revive the shell of an old house near Salt Springs for a parsonage, and when he was seized with cholera at a meeting in John Brant's house, he attributed his recovery to letting Captain Brant feed him brandy--after being suitably persuaded.[29]

Captain Brant had approved Jugger when, as agent for the New England Company, he reinstated a school teacher whom the Anglican cleric had dismissed. This was on the upper part of the river which, with Davis's hamlet and the parsonage at Salt Springs, was the Methodist stronghold amongst the Mohawks. The lower Mohawks objected to this challenge and petitioned the governor for a white man as agent in place of Brant, whom they accused of barring them from the council house.[30] The problem was avoided only when Brant died during the cholera of 1832. He was quickly buried, away from the family vault and on the west side of the church, lest the contagion spread. At the request of Brant's sisters, Phelps officiated at the funeral.

It was not just churches and schools over which people disagreed. In 1831 Peter Jones and (George?) Ryerson had applied to the New England Company for a grant towards a saw mill near Salt Springs, under the direction of Moses Walker and other Indian chiefs. The Company authorized a grant of £100 "upon condition that such mill should be for the use of the Indians generally, and not exclusively for Methodists." Jugger reported that the Methodists refused the offer "with condition annexed," and suggested that the Company build another mill elsewhere.[31]

Walker seems to have been a prominent man: when the council of chiefs handed over their lands in trust to the government, to prevent further intrusions by whites, his name headed the list of signatures to the treaty.[32] When he was dying in 1838, he sent a message to the Methodist minister, Rowley Heyland, that he wished him to attend to his funeral. With the agreement of the widow and family, the place and time of interment were set. But some of the family made other arrangements with the two Anglican ministers, Abraham Nelles and Adam Elliott. When the body was being taken from Walker's home the five or six miles to the graveyard, the group had to pass the Anglican church. "When opposite the door of the said house, they were ordered to stop. The coffin...was unceremoniously taken out of their hands and, to their great surprise and mortification was conveyed by other hands into the aforementioned place of worship and the funeral service of the Church of England was performed by Messrs. Nelles and Elliott."[33]

The grant for Walker's saw mill had been turned down during the time of Richard Phelps. He seems to have had his share of difficulties, for during his time there, Jugger was speaking of "the prospect he then had of a union between the Church and the Methodist Indians...."[34] By union he meant (as Anglicans so often have meant) absorption. He had selected from the most

nious chiefs indiscriminately (that is, regardless of whether they were Anglican or Methodist) a number of counsellors and catechists to be employed as native preachers. Uncertain what the attitude of the New England Company would be to his scheme, he was willing to pay the catechists £200 a year from his own pocket until the Company's wishes were known. The counsellors would contribute their services for the honour it brought them. With Brant dead and a white (William Richardson) appointed as the Company's Indian Agent, Ryerson seems to have felt that he could seize the initiative in asserting the Company's (and the Church of England's) supremacy on the reserve. And he seemed to have some success: in February 1833 he reported that every chief who from late disputes had left the church had now returned.

Messmore, who had previously had such success on the Grand, was reappointed to the circuit, and Ryerson seems to have forgotten his plan. Messmore introduced a young Englishman, John Douse, to work on the reserve. Douse was one of a party of six who had just come to Upper Canada at the request of the Canadian Conference, and he viewed the mission through the eyes of a newcomer. "Methodism," he ventured, "has got pretty good hold of the population in this colony generally, but it is rude, and, like the country, requires a good deal of improvement." Though religion had made the Mohawks sober and prosperous, he saw them as haughty, and he blamed the slow progress of christianity amongst other tribes like the Onondagas partly on their prejudice against the converted Mohawks. He was disconcerted by the excitement and crying that went on during prayer--whether this was typical of Indian services or of Canadian revivals is not certain. But he can report in a matter-of-fact way that about 150 attend the Methodist services and about twice that number go to the Church of England.[35] Jealousy seemed to disappear for a while, though in a few years there was to be a more agonizing rivalry.

In 1840 the union between Canadian and English Wesleyans was dissolved. The father of Methodist missions to the Indians, William Case, stayed with the English conference, while Peter Jones, who had charge of the Credit Mission, was to visit all the Indian missions. After some uncertainty on the Grand,[36] Kennedy Creighton was appointed there. Creighton was a native of Northern Ireland, where he had studied with the intention of becoming a Presbyterian minister. On coming to Canada he was converted, and travelled with the Wanites for a while, before coming into the Canada Conference. Now he was sensitive to division, here to the division caused by the "so-called British Missionaries," who had attracted a few of their Indians, though most had returned. These "so-called British Missionaries" were the British Wesleyans, who maintained a church in Brantford and considered the Grand River part of their circuit. They included another Irishman, Henry Byers (whose education and talents Carroll thought were limited),[37] then Thomas Fawcett. The latter was a short, dark Yorkshireman who held the Brantford appointment from 1844 to 1846, and who later returned to the Grand for three years before being killed in an accident on the Great Western Railway.[38]

There had always been a lot of movement on the reserve,[39] and one of the major shifts in population was from the north to the south side of the river. The shift was particularly vexing to the Canadian Methodists, whose mission was on the north. What

made it almost unbearable was that the British Wesleyans had a log chapel on the south. In 1847, however, there was no school on that side, so the Canadians moved theirs over. They must have set a good example, for in a few weeks the agent of the Canada Company commenced another school immediately in the rear of them. The despondent missionary, Hamilton Biggar, reported:

> We had no desire to compete with one who had such ample resources at command; nor were we jealous by whom the children of the Indians should be instructed....[40]

The school was moved back, and served the white as well as the Indian population. So great was the influx of whites that in 1845 the Indians surrendered to the government the land on which the mission was located. Most of the Indians by then resided on the south side, and Biggar procured ground there to join them. Then "to our surprise, the bounds of the Indian reservation, which we had supposed permanently fixed, became unsettled...." He does not say just how they became unsettled, but the effect was to delay their acquisition of land.

Though they seemed to keep the majority of their Indians, the Canadian Methodists were very sensitive to the work of the British Wesleyans. "The astonishing efforts made to proselyte these simple sheep of the forest," complained Hamilton Biggar, "to me appear...dishonourable...." But he was hopeful of a speedy termination of the conflict. His hopes were disappointed, and the next year he reported, "Sectarianism prevails," and expressed his pain at the continued jarring. When he was away to a missionary meeting, his rival decided to do a little missionary work himself, and "got up a Camp-meeting, usurping a piece of their neighbouring vineyard." Finally a reunion was effected in 1847, and the chapel on the north side of the river was abandoned.[42]

While the Methodists were fighting amongst themselves, the Anglicans were having trouble on their Muscarora mission. Some of the Indian lay leaders sought increasing recognition of their importance. They wanted to be the first to partake of communion, and one suggested they should kneel around the Lord's table to communicate. One, who had been attached to the Methodists, wished to exhort from the pulpit. When this was denied to them, a division took place. One of the leaders had belonged to the Baptists when he dwelt in the United States, and the splinter group on the Grand now united themselves to the Baptist church. They included three chiefs and twenty-five warriors, and the chiefs found themselves deposed from their office.

Since this paper has described only the relations between the various missions on the Grand River, it has passed by much of the good work--both religious and secular--done by those missions. The white man has sometimes been accused of bringing division into an otherwise harmonious Indian society. Often here, however, he seems merely to have blessed the divisions that already existed, and given them a religious cloak. In doing so, the missionaries frustrated their primary goal of conversion. They devoted so much energy to trying to reap where others had sown, that little energy was left to prepare new ground on which to sow the seeds of the gospel.

1 Report of a letter from Stuart to the SPG, 10 October 1793, in "The Rev. Robert Addison," Ontario Historical Society Papers and Reports, XIX (1922), p. 175.
2 Ibid., p. 178.
3 Quoted in Charles M. Johnston, The Valley of the Six Nations (Toronto 1964), p. 242.
4 Stuart Ivison and Fred Rosser, The Baptists in Upper and Lower Canada before 1820 (Toronto 1956), p. 47.
5 Cf. Mrs D.C. Brown, Memoir of the late Rev. Lemuel Covell.... (Brandon, Vt, 1839), passim.
6 Ernest Hawkins, Annals of the Diocese of Toronto (London 1848), p. 111.
7 James Beaven, Recreations of a Long Vacation.... (London and Toronto 1846), pp. 30-55.
8 Wm. Hosmer (ed.), Autobiography of Rev. Alvin Torry (Auburn 1861), pp. 59-60.
9 Johnston, op. cit., pp. 253-254; Christian Guardian.
10 New England Company report, 1840, p. 6 (letter of 3 July 1831).
11 Letter in the Methodist Magazine, New York (November 1823) quoted in John Carroll, Case, and His Contemporaries (5 vols, Toronto 1867-1877), II, p. 444.
12 SPG report for 1825, p. 123.
13 Torry, Autobiography, p. 94.
14 T.R. Milliman, The Life of...Charles James Stewart (London 1953), p. 211.
15 "The Rev. Robert Addison," Papers and Records of the Ontario Historical Society, XIX (1922), p. 180 (letter of 1 July 1824).
16 Hawkins, Annals, p. 69. The New England Company later did repair the church, though at greater expense than they anticipated.
17 SPG report for 1827, p. 173.
18 Ibid., p. 174.
19 Torry, Autobiography, pp. 95-96.
20 SPG report for 1827, p. 175.
21 NEC report, 1829, p. 6.
22 "The Proudfoot Papers," Transactions, London and Middlesex Historical Society (1922), pp. 54-55.
23 SPG report for 1828, p. 120.
24 Carroll, Case, III, p. 187. Carroll describes a visit by William Case and Peter Jones to the Bay of Quinte in 1826: they "started for the Mohawk settlement, but met opposition to their opening their evangelizing efforts at that time there, where religious service was maintained under the auspices of the Church of England. This repulse led them to turn to those who were heathen indeed." Ibid., p. 71.
25 Peter Jones, Life and Journals.... (Toronto 1860), pp. 116-117.
26 Carroll, Case, III, pp. 150-151.
27 "George Ryerson to Sir Peregrine Maitland, 9 June 1826," Ontario History, XLIV (1952), pp. 24-29; Carroll, Case, III, p. 294. George Ryerson had helped tutor Peter Jones in English. He eventually became a minister of the Catholic Apostolic Church in Toronto.
28 Christian Guardian, 17 March 1831; NEC report, 1832, pp. 19-20 (letter of 10 March 1831).
29 Carroll, Case, III, pp. 81-82, 107, 202, 330, 333.
30 Elizabeth Graham, Medicine Man to Missionary (Toronto 1975), p. 45.

31 NEC report, 1840.
32 Johnston, Valley of the Six Nations, p. 192.
33 Missionary Society of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada report, 1848, p. xii.
34 NEC report, 1836, p. 10 (letter of 1 January 1833).
35 A.J. Clarke, "Earliest Missionary Letters of Rev. John Douse," Ontario Historical Society Papers and Records, XXVIII (1932), pp. 41-46.
36 Carroll, Case, IV, pp. 320-321.
37 Ibid., p. 150.
38 George H. Cornish, Hand-book of Canadian Methodism (Toronto 1867), p. 27; Carroll, Case, III, p. 384.
39 The first settlement was along the clear banks of the river. And though Brant chose white farmers to settle among the Indians as models, though the New England Company bought agricultural implements to lend out to them, and though the Methodists gave some the sobriety to fence the farms and sow the fields (Christian Guardian, 28 May 1831), they did not quickly take to agriculture. Partly this was because they had no secure tenure for the land they worked. Other factors led them to continue their limited nomadic existence. When dams were built near the mouth of the river, to obtain a feeder for the Welland canal, a number of families found their lands flooded (NEC report, 1832, letter of 14 October 1830). The Company school for the Oneidas was discontinued in 1837 when the Indians moved into the woods to be closer to fuel (NEC report, 1840, p. 28). One group who were tired of the various attempts to proselytize them even petitioned the government for a remote piece of land where they could be left alone by the Christians. The removal of whites in the late 1840's caused further disruptions, as Indians reclaimed lands that had been usurped.
40 Missionary Society of the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Canada report, 1844, p. ix.
41 Ibid., 1846, p. xiv.
42 Ibid., 1844, pp. viii, ix; 1845, p. xiv.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CONGREGATIONALISM IN EARLY NINETEENTH-CENTURY ONTARIO

by John Kenyon

Anyone coming new to the study of Congregationalism in Canada must be struck by the apparent lack of interest in it. Apart from the pioneer work of Earl B. Eddy, to which I owe a considerable debt of gratitude in the preparation of this paper, there is nothing to match that which has been and is being done on the histories of the Methodists and Presbyterians for example. This is all the more surprising if we compare it with the comparative situation in Britain where the history of Congregationalism has always been regarded as an important, even essential part of the historiography of Nonconformity as a whole.

Why have Canadian Congregationalists been ignored in this fashion? The reason is clearly the failure of the denomination to maintain the dominant position it had seemingly established in the middle of the eighteenth-century in Nova Scotia. Following Governor Lawrence's Proclamation of 1758, promising free land and freedom of worship to all Protestants, thousands of New England fishermen and farmers had responded.

> Many of these groups brought their own Congregational ministers with them or elected one of their own numbers to lead them. Thus by 1761 Congregationalism was firmly established. It had built its own meeting-houses, called its own ministers, elected its elders and deacons, divided its followers into church and society, and disciplined them for their many lapses. With the constant reinforcement of immigrants from their home colonies the future looked bright for Congregationalism.(1)

There is, and has never been any doubt about the reason for the failure of these extremely optimistic expectations. It was the American Revolution, or War of Independence according to one's point of view. Here is one explanation given in the middle of the nineteenth century:

> In the early days of Nova Scotia Congregationalism got a large foothold and but for the American Revolution it would in all human probability have been one of the foremost bodies in the land. That the Revolution was the cause of its almost extinction there is the strongest ground of belief. First of all, owing to that Revolution, more than half of the Puritan settlers left Nova Scotia for the colonies: second a number of ministers abandoned the field, and ministers could not be obtained from any quarter to watch over the flocks: third, the New Light Movement spring up at the very worst possible period, and received strength from the very exciting circumstances of the times and the churches were therebye rent: fourth, at the close of the war, the Loyalists came, all or nearly all of another faith and obtained possession of the country, crying down all the old inhabitants as disloyal and rebellious. Weakened by the removal of so many to the old colonies, without ministers to lead them, and such as they had either of little account or disposed to undermine the faith and carry them to other bodies, the churches rent asunder by the New Light Movement, was it any wonder that they one by one abandoned the field or became absorbed in other causes? (2)

This identification between Congregationalism and disloyalty was to persist through the first half of the nineteenth-century. When the Rev. John Roaf, for example, came out to Canada in 1837 to act as one of the agents for the Colonial Missionary Society and was invited to become the Minister of the newly established Zion Congregational Church in Toronto, he had the following experience:

> I was cordially received by both parties that had applied to the society for a minister... But political disturbances suddenly arrested our progress: for a large proportion of the congregation was understood to belong to the party, a section of which had broken into insurrection. The immediate consequences were that one of our most influential friends was banished; another had a price put upon his head; several were imprisoned; and a large number came under suspicion. Their spies were sent to

> attend our services - rumours were general that I was to be forbidden to preach - the cause was popularly called 'the radical chapel' and hence the congregation was almost scattered. However 'the Lord of Hosts' was with us ... I am happy, too, to tell you that not one member of the church remains under suspicion, and not one has been offended and withdrawn, while of the congregation only two continue to be suspected. Still we must for some time retain much of the political character given to us. Some, too, of our warmest and most efficient friends are irrecoverably gone from the province. Many are leaving, others have lost their situations: all are suffering from the overthrow of commercial business; while the spirit of the ascendant party and their laws is such as must depress and diminish the classes within which we have worked for attention and success... No secular object could keep me here another week, but the good people; and the better cause of Christ must not be abandoned; and I am ready to retain my post so long as I can be usefully employed. It would be an honour to bear suffering for Christ's sake, but to be in the midst of the meannesses and cruelties and dangers of this fratricidal conflict is uncompensated misery. (3)

It is interesting to compare Roaf's unhappy experience in Toronto with that of his colleague, the Rev. Henry Wilkes in Montreal. Wilkes, as their agent for Eastern Canada, also made a report to the Colonial Missionary Society. He had no doubt that the riots and bloodshed in the Province of Quebec were the result of a long conceived plot by the French Canadian militants to seize power by force and that as a consequence it was necessary for the British of all religious persuasions to combine together in order to meet this challenge. And as he hastened to add in order to emphasize the contrast between the two situations, in Upper Canada "the mass of the Reformers are not rebels."(4)

Under these circumstances it was not surprising that the major purpose of most Congregationalists in Upper Canada was to emphasize the strength of their loyalty and that they would in future look to Britain rather than the United States for assistance and financial aid.

There was in fact one British institution at this time which had already started to show concern for the religious problems not merely of the indigenous people but also to the growing number of white settlers in British North America. This was the London Missionary Society which had been founded in 1795 as an interdenominational body whose primary aim was to carry out Protestant missionary work in the South Seas, Asia and Africa, although it did in 1799 appoint a mission "for Canada or any of the Indian tribes in or bordering upon the British possessions in North America" and subsequently "to the Indians mentioned in Vancouver's Voyages to the West Coast of North America when the providence of God shall facilitate our intercourse with that part of the continent."(5) In their report of 1811, however, the Directors of the Society described how they had received an urgent appeal from the residents of Elizabethstown in Upper Canada, who had been for "long destitute of the Public means of Salvation, the natural consequences of which is (sic), declention, lifelessness, carnality, and carelessness about Spiritual concerns."(6) The Directors felt they could not fail to respond to such a plea and the same year they sent out a newly ordained minister, David Smart, who by 1817 had established his own church at Elizabethstown.

It seems significant, however, that although by this time Congregationalists constituted a majority of the membership of the London Missionary Society, Smart did not belong to this denomination but was in fact a Presbyterian. Whether this choice as the result of a definite bias amongst the

Directors is not clear, but there is evidence that even as early as this there was a growing feeling amongst Canadian Congregationalists that they needed their own missionary society to look after their interests. As we shall see, they would have to wait for another fifteen years, however, before this was achieved.(7)

It is certainly true that the London Missionary Society apparently played little if any part in the formation of the first two Congregational Churches in Upper Canada: the first at Frome in 1819, the second at Brantford sometime between 1823 and 1825.(8)

Both, in fact, were established by laymen. Joseph Silcox, born in 1789, had emigrated to Canada in 1817, leaving his wife and children in England. As a youth he had been apprenticed to a glasier, but he found little opportunity to exercise these skills in North America. On arriving in New York he had made his way to Port Talbot, where he was granted a two hundred acre plot of land. As was the custom, he was expected in return to clear a certain number of acres of forest, build a house and work on the Talbot Road. It was, therefore, fortunate that Silcox was a man of strong constitution. He has been described as

> a rugged Christian of the Calvinist type with an iron frame who made the forest ring with both his axe-strokes and exhortations. (9)

At the same time, he clearly possessed qualities beyond those of physical strength. He was better educated than most of the other settlers and thus was made the first teacher in the settlement. In his youth in England he had

been a constant worshipper at the local Congregational church and, as a result he had acquired an extensive knowledge of the Bible and an impressive gift of prayer. It was not surprising that when he took the initiative in organising a Congregational church at Frome, named after his former residence in England, he was chosen its first minister. He was able to establish a powerful moral authority over his congregation. This was even able to survive the fact that between 1821 and 1829 he was absent in England, settling his business affairs and arranging to bring his family out to Canada. As a result, during the crucial political crisis of 1837, although there were certainly dissension within the church between Silcox who, always essentially a conservative, took the side of the Establishment, and many of his congregation actively aiding the Reformers, there was never any final disruption. After this crisis had been resolved, the church was re-united by a revivalist movement in 1842. Silcox retired from the active ministry in 1850, but he was not to be forgotten by the Congregational church, mainly as a result of the work of his sons. He was to be the founder, indeed, of one of the most notable dynasties in Canadian nineteenth-century religious history.

The counterpart at Brantford of Silcox at Frome was John Ashton Wilkes. Unlike Silcox, Wilkes was essentially a businessman. He had been a gunsmith in England, but when he came to Canada in 1819 he settled in York as a general merchant. He expanded his business in 1823 by establishing

a branch at Brantford which he left under the charge of his two younger sons. His eldest son, Henry, had already left in 1820 for Montreal in order to make his own fortune. Sometime during the early eighteen-twenties, Wilkes and his wife themselves moved to Brantford from York.

Like Silcox, Wilkes was a man of deep religious commitment. In his youth at Birmingham he had been a member of Carr's Lane Congregational Church. Even before its great days under the ministryships of John Angell James and R.W. Dale, Carr's Lane Church had already gained a major reputation in the tradition of British Nonconformity, and Wilkes was always to be influenced by the experience of his membership within it. It was not surprising, therefore, that, like Silcox, he made himself responsible for organising a church amongst his neighbours. The local congregation would, indeed, worship at times in his warehouse. It was Wilkes who persuaded the Rev. Adam Lillie in 1834 to become the minister at Brantford, doing so on the advice of his son, Henry, who had met Lillie while training for the ministry at Glasgow University. Lillie would exercise an important influence on the development of Canadian Congregationalism during the rest of the nineteenth-century.

It was the work of men such as Silcox and Wilkes which was so essential for the establishment of congregationalism in Upper Canada. It became clear, however, that this alone would not be sufficient. It would have to be complemented by far more help, and especially financial assistance, than such efforts had received previously. This was, in fact,

one of the major conclusions reached in the report of two British ministers, Andrew Reed and James Matheson, who had been sent in 1834 by the newly formed Congregational Union of England and Wales in order to investigate the conditions of the churches in North America. (10)

It was the original intention that these two ministers should visit the United States only. They were persuaded, however, to go to Canada as well, and as a result have left a very revealing picture of the contemporary situation in that country. At the end of their report they maintained that these were two necessary requirements if the very evident problems were to be solved. In the first place, the British people as a whole must recognise their responsibility towards their fellow-countrymen in North America:

> The duty of furnishing the colonies with suitable religious instruction, then devolved on the Christians of this country. It is for them to decide in what way and to what extent this assistance is to be given. That we have hitherto been culpable no one who looks at the present destitution of the Canadas can for a moment deny ... Persons from all the communities of Christians have settled in these provinces. They have gone from the congregations of Episcopalians, the societies of Methodists, the churches of Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Baptists. A necessity was laid upon them to seek support for their rising families. They would gladly have remained at home. No discontent with the civil constitution of their country drove them away. It appeared to be the path of duty and trying as it was to leave the loved associations of early life and of matured affection, yet they submitted to the providential arrangement and went. They have foresaken eternal privileges and religious enjoyments, and they and their children are in danger of suffering for lack of knowledge. Look at these claims of country and kindred, of our common humanity and of christian duty, and say if the present condition of the Canadas is not a reproach to the christians of Great Britain.

And the authors went on to warn that if the appropriate action was not soon taken, then an infidel Canada might soon be separating itself from the Mother Country.(11)

Secondly, they believed that Congregationalism itself had its own special mission in these circumstances:

> While we thus consider it the duty of every denomination to be active in this work of christian benevolence, we would especially urge upon the one which we are more immediately connected the peculiar claims which are made on its members. We consider the system of Congregationalism to be scriptural and well fitted to convey to destitute countries the Gospel of Christ whatever may be the civil policy of those several nations as it does not interfere with the political arrangement of any land. But, especially it is fitted for a new and destitute country like the Canadas, where a pressing necessity exists for immediate exertion: for men who could go through the breadth and length of the country unfettered by geographical limits, canonical laws or conference restrictions, preaching the gospel to all who are willing to hear it, and leaving the people themselves, when converted to God, to decide as to the forms of church government which these religious societies should assume. In addition to this, it may be said that in many parts of the Canadas persons holding our sentiments are to be found and remain still attached to the great principles of civil and religious liberty which they loved in this country. We cannot therefore but earnestly desire that the zeal of christians of our order may be awakened in some degree corresponding with the magnitude of the object presented to them. (12)

As a result of these arguments, it was decided in 1836 to form a Colonial Missionary Society whose purpose would be "to establish churches of our denomination in the British Colonies." (13) After a certain amount of controversy it was agreed that this society should be linked with the British Congregational Union, and it would be for the next decades responsible for financial assistance and the provision of ministers to the growing number of Congregational churches in Upper Canada.

It must be said, however, that the relationship between the Society and Canadian Congregationalists did not prove always a happy one. There could be harsh criticism by either side about the activity of the other, especially over the question of finance. In 1865, for example, the then secretary of the Society, the Rev. J.L. Poore, made a visit to Canada and reported his impressions in a letter to the Canadian Independent, in which he said in part:

> I found the ministers in general able men and in more comfortable circumstances than I had expected: indeed better off, apparently, than many of those, who in England help to provide the funds. The chapels are neat, adapted and well-kept; but there seemed to be a want of vigorous life in the churches and the absence of aggressive effort. The chief characteristic of some places is feebleness which has contined for so long that the people are contented... A long habit of reliance - help taken for the support of Gospel ordinances as a matter of course, and to be continued, has rendered some churches seemingly unable to exert themselves... The want of missionary spirit, the contentedness of Congregationalists to be regarded as a sect instead of representing the free, spiritual and aggressive life of the church caused many pangs of regret. In some places we are weaker now than we were twenty years ago - not relatively only but in fact: the work we have neglected to do, others have performed, and whereas I have been told that in some towns we are weak because other Protestant communities are strong, I found in one such town of nearly three thousand inhabitants one church would contain all who worship in public on Sabbath evenings - proving the need and scope for evangelistic agencies. The statement made by the Treasurer of the Colonial Missionary Society that some of the churches have sunk into the condition of annuitants... I find to be fully justified, and the surmises of neglect and selfish ease have been verified. The time has come for a change of policy and pecuniary grants to some stations which through long years have proved fruitless, should speedily cease". (14)

As might be expected this attack provoked a hurt and bitter rejoinder, which was written by the Rev. J. Climie. Climie maintained that Poore had betrayed the cause of

Congregationalism in Canada by making public such vicious criticism, giving its enemies a wonderful opportunity for attack, and suggested that Poore had indeed a devious motive behind his actions in that he wanted to transfer the Society's funds from Canada to Australia where he himself had been a missionary in his youth.

Soon after its foundation, the directors of the Colonial Missionary Society decided that if its work was to be at all effective it would be necessary to appoint an agent in Canada. Their choice was Henry Wilkes, the eldest son of J.A. Wilkes of Brantford. By 1828 Henry had decided that his true vocation was as a minister rather than a businessman, and had spent the next four years as a student at the Congregational Academy attached to Glasgow University in Scotland. After he graduated, he became minister of Albany Street Chapel in Edinburgh. In 1836 he received a call from the struggling St. Maurice Street Chapel in Montreal and decided to accept it, especially as the society at the same time offered to pay his travelling expenses across the Atlantic if he would act as its agent. His first experience of the amount of travelling in Canada itself which would be involved in this kind of work, however, convinced Wilkes that the amount of ground to be covered was far too extensive for one man, and he persuaded the Society to send him a reinforcement. They selected the Rev. John Roaf, who, as we have seen, arrived in Canada in 1837. He agreed with Wilkes that Kingston should be the dividing line between their two spheres of labour, Roaf being responsible for everything west, Wilkes for everything east of that point. On his arrival at Toronto, which he had

decided to make the centre of his activity, he was invited to become the Minister of the newly established Zion Congregational Church, then situated on George Street but which would move in 1840 to Adelaide Street. Here he was to remain until his resignation in 1855 under somewhat unfortunate circumstances being according to his obituary in the Canadian Independent "financial embarrassments".(16) I would like to finish this paper by saying something about certain aspects of the personality and career of this extraordinary and certainly controversial man.

Roaf was the son of a naval officer, He himself however was apprenticed to a London printer. During his youth he went through a conversion experience and decided to become a Congregational minister. After graduating from Hoxton Academy, he became pastor of the Congregational Church at Wolverhampton in 1823. Here he remained until he left for Toronto in 1837.

When he became its Minister, Zion Church had been in existence for four years. Roaf was to find that his future mission lay amongst a congregation consisting - according to the church records - of people like bookkeepers, salesmen, painters, watchmakers, postmasters, butchers, carpenters, tailors - people who in the English social context would be described as lower middle class. Working with his deacons, he would become closely involved with their moral problems and failures. To take one example:

> At a church meeting, 30th January 1840: Miss Crawford having become (unmarried) the mother of a child it was ordered with much grief and solemnity that the elders erase her name from the roll of church members and that a letter advising her of the order and offering suitable advice should be sent by the Pastor.

and a second:

> At a church meeting, 2nd September 1841: Mr. Fullerton having been proved guilty of drunkeness and admonished , and not submitting to the admonition was separated from the church. "May God restore him by his free spirit."

Roaf, however, was himself to become the centre of a major controversy during the last years of his ministry, which was to cause a serious division amongst the congregation. This was caused by a somewhat obscure series of events caused by Roaf's position as Commissioner of the Toronto temporary lunatic asylum. I have not been as yet able to sort out the full details of this, but it appears that at the end of 1848 Roaf wrote a series of articles attacking the conduct of the asylum's doctor. This caused a storm of charges and counter-charges in which Roaf, the doctor, the other commissioners and even the government became involved. As a result some members of his church accused Roaf of unchristian behaviour because of the bitterness of his writings. At the request of Roaf, a special committee was appointed by the deacons to investigate the situation. The result was a majority report supporting Roaf, but also a significant minority report at least partially convicting him. The next few weeks seem to have been ones of bitter recrimination between the parties, the consequence of which was the secession of 24 members of the church who determined to form a second Congregational church in Toronto, which in time would be known as the Bond

Street Church.

Roaf was certainly a man who could maintain a grudge. Convinced that the main purpose of the seceeders was to make a public attack on his moral integrity, he carried on a running vendetta against them during the last years of his ministry. He refused to grant them the normal letters of demission, usually given to members leaving a church to show that they were in good standing, doing so on the grounds that they were not in fact leaving to join another church and thus the letters would have no relevance. When at the meeting of the Congregational Union in 1851 it was proposed that the new Church should be made a member, Roaf used all his influence to veto it. The next year, after some diplomatic manoevering, especially on the part of the Rev. Adam Lillie, it was decided that the church should be admitted if its pastor, the Rev. Archibald Geike, should make it clear that its members had full confidence in Roaf. Even this was not satisfactory for Roaf, and as a result he withdrew from any contact with the Congregational Union and indeed from public life as a whole.(17) His last years as a minister were sad ones, involved as he was in a number of financial scandals and in 1855 he was forced to resign - a very sick man.

The ways in which Roaf in the years before his death in 1862 continually persecuted his successor, the Rev. T.S. Ellerby, is perhaps something which can be left for discussion at another time.

REFERENCES

1. E.B. Eddy, "The Congregational Tradition in Canada," The Churches and the Canadian Experience. A Faith and Order Study of the Christian Tradition. (Toronto, 1968) pp.30-31.

2. Canadian Independent, XII (1866), p. 388. Quoted in S. Simpson, Some Notes on the Early Years of Canadian Congregationalism in its Second Stage: 1801 to Confederation. Unpublished typescript (Toronto, 1966) p.2.

3. J. Waddington, Congregational History. Continuation to 1850... (London, 1878), pp.496-497.

4. ibid., pp. 499-500

5. J. Brown, The Colonial Mission of Congregationalism: the story of Seventy Years (London, 1908), p.11. Most of this information about the work of the L.M.S. in Upper Canada is taken from this book and from L. Kitzan, "The London Missionary Society in Upper Canada" Ontario History, LIX (1967), pp. 39-44.

6. Kitzan, "The London Missionary Society in Upper Canada", p.41.

7. Brown, The Colonial Mission of Congregationalism, p.14.

8. The best account of the establishment of these two churches is in E.B. Eddy, The Beginnings of Congregationalism in the Early Canadas. A Thesis offered ... in Partial Fulfillment of the Work required for a Th.D. Degree in Church History in Emmanuel College, Toronto, Ontario. (n.p., n.d.), pp.209-280.

9. C.D. Ermatinger, The Talbot Regime, p.281 as quoted in Eddy, The Beginnings of Congregationalism, p.211.

10. A. Reed and J. Matheson, A Narrative of the Visit to the American Churches by the Deputation from the Congregational Union of England. 2 v. (London, 1835), V.2, pp. 305-370.

11. ibid., pp. 365-366

12. ibid., p. 368.

13. Brown, The Colonial Mission of Congregationalism, p.21.

14. J. Waddington, Congregational History, 1850-1880. (London, 1880), pp. 505-506.

15. ibid., 507-510.

16. Canadian Independent IX (1862-63) p. 135. Most of the following biographical information is taken from this obituary.

17. ibid., p. 137.

King Sugar and the Prophets

Geoffrey D. Johnston

The most important single factor in British West Indian history is sugar. In the beginning the British colonies were not substantially different from those on the mainland. They were settled by small farmers who grew tobacco as an export crop. But in the seventeenth century the Virginians drove West Indian tobacco out of the British market and the colonists had to look for alternatives.

The crop that caught their fancy was sugar, introduced from Brazil by the Dutch in the middle of the seventeenth century. Because sugar became immensely profitable it drove all competitors from the field. But the introduction of sugar had tremendous social consequences. Because it could not be shipped as cane it required a mill. Because at the time refining was not separated from cultivation a sugar establishment had to be large enough to support a factory, about three hundred acres. Because sugar cultivation is back breaking work no Englishman would work another Englishman's fields if he could avoid it. But labour was essential. When the cane was ripe it had to be cut, when it was cut it had to be milled. The planters therefore set looking for other sources and eventually settled on the African slave trade.

Thus sugar was largely responsible for the makeup of British West Indian society both during slavery and to a great extent after it. Sugar converted the islands from communities of small farmers into communities of plantation owners. Sugar introduced slavery, slavery in a particularly barbarous form, and its barbarity was compounded by the fact that the slaves were black and the owners white.

The initial Christian presence in the islands was provided by a rather lackadaisical Church of England, which saw itself primarily as providing a chaplaincy to the planters. A notable exception of course was the Anglican plantation at Codrington in Barbados, but for the most part the Church of England did not become a significant factor in the life of the West Indies until it was prodded into action by events associated with the coming of the Evangelicals.

The first evangelicals in the West Indies were the Moravians, who arrived in St Thomas in 1732. Their work grew slowly in rather difficult circumstances for the next seventy years but they were able to establish themselves in a number of islands, especially for our purposes, in Jamaica in 1754. Also in 1754 Methodism began filtering into the islands becoming very widespread through the energetic labours of Thomas Coke after 1786. Four years earlier, in 1782, the Baptists arrived in Jamaica. Finally in 1824 the Scottish Missionary Society established work on the north coast of the same island. These four varieties of evangelicals, Moravians, Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians form the focus of the first part of this study, which for reasons of space and the availability of sources will be limited to Jamaica. (1)

But first something should be said about the evangelical approach. As is well known the evangelicals in England were closely associated with the campaigns for the abolition of the slave trade and later of slavery itself. It is less well known that their case against slavery rested less on evangelical theology than on natural law. The evangelical message concentrated on the acceptance of salvation through Christ,

followed naturally by the cultivation of a sober godly and a righteous life in this world and eternal belessedness in the next. When they came to put the case against slavery in ethical terms they argued from natural justice, from that natural law which Locke said was discoverable by reason rather than revelation. The ethical concerns of the evangelicals were primarily personal concerns. sobriety, industry, chastity, honesty, problems which could be handled by individual decisions. Such a concern followed naturally from their theology. Salvation was an intensely personal matter; it is not surprising that ethics would be personal as well. But their theology did not seem adequate to deal with social ethics; in this field the case rested on philosophy rather than theology. (2)

If a question like slavery therefore was handled in terms of philosophy rather than theology it is not surprising that the evangelicals differed among themselves, especially when they moved to the West Indies and found themselves caught up in the ambiguities of actually living in a slave society. By 1824 it is hard to find any missionary prepared to defend slavery in principle, but they differed over what to do about it. The Baptists were probably the most consistent opponents. William Knibb, one of the best known of the Baptist missionaries in Jamaica noted in his diary in 1824, on his first trip out, that he had met a slave owner on the ship. He described the man as"an odious example of the brutalizing and immoral tendency of the execrable system, which calls loudly . . . for the curse of every friend of common decency, " and went on to pray that he might " never view with indifference a system of so infernal a nature." (3) His prayer was answered. J.M. Phillippo, Knibb's colleague would sometimes purchase a slave when the alternatives were worse, allowing the person to work off his or her emancipation on fairly generous terms. Knibb conceded that Phillippo had a point, but on balance felt that the practice did more harm than good.

The Methodists were a good deal more cautious. Many of their men came to the islands young and unmarried, often finding their wives among the daughters of West Indian families. Some of these women owned slaves, or acquired them by inheritance. Their husbands were put in an awkward spot, for while they believed slavery was bad they also believed that indiscriminate emancipation was worse. Freeing a slave was expensive, for the owner had to post a sizeable bond against the pauperism of the freed slave, and even if the slave did not become a pauper there was no guarantee that he would be any better off in freedom than he had been in slavery. To make matters worse the English Methodist Conference ruled in 1807 that no minister could hold slaves, and the ruling was extended to include their wives. A number of good Methodist ministers, unable to square their domestic responsibilities with the Conference ruling had to leave the service.

But whatever their differences in tactics all the evangelicals shared certain fundamental principles in policy, principles which were admirably stated in the Baptist instructions tho their missionaries. Whatever their personal views missionaries were to have "nothing to do . . . with civil and political affairs". The gospel of Christ "far from countenancing a spirit of rebellion or insubordination, has a directly opposite tendency." The missionaries were to conduct themselves after the example of the Divine Teacher so that " none will justly be

able to lay anything to . . . (their) charge." (4)

Two observations may be made on these instructions which apply equally well to the Methodists Moravians and Presbyterians. (5) First, it is perfectly intelligible in terms of the evangelical understanding of the gospel. Salvation was personal; ethics was personal as well. Secondly, and probably of greater significance for the missionaries, staying out of politics meant staying out of trouble. The planters controlled the island; they could make life difficult at any time. The support, or at least the acquiescence of the plantocracy was essential to their work. Further, the road to the slave quarters was private property. Not only did the planters as a body control the island, as individuals they contreolled access to the slaves. Thirdly, Jamaica was a very volatile society, and the last thing any missionary or missionary society wanted to was to become implicated in a slave revolt.

The missionaries then could agree that slavery had to go, and th at they should have nothing to do with the process. They also agreed that whatever method was chosen it had to be constitutional. This point can be illustrated by missionary activity during the Jamaica slave revolt of 1831.

The revolt was limited to a few parishes on the north coast. The slaves fired a number of cane pieces raight after Christmas 1831, the planters withdrew to the coastal towns and after a few mistakes put down the revolt with more than their usual ferocity. Murray and Bleby, the two Methodists in the district heard of the affair a few days before it happened and urged upon their people the immorality, the illegality and the futility of resisting authority. Rather they should leave their liberation in the hands of God. Hope Waddell, the Presbyterian, came upon a group of malcontents during the emergency and used very similar arguments, except that in addition to urging them to trust in God he pointed out that their cause was being urged with every prospect of success in England, and that the revolt would only embarrass their friends. Providence, he was suggesting, was already at work in England. (6) The slaves' part was to behave like peaceful God-fearing citizens. The missionaries were in full sympathy with the slaves' cause, but in total disagreement with the means chosen. Revolt was not just immoral, it was illegal.

So persistent were the missionaries in the pursuit not just of non-violence, but even of non-action, that one wonders how they ever became associated with emancipation at all. Their direct participation in the campaign was rare, but when it came, it came not because of an attack on the liberties of the slaves, but because of an attack on their own freedom of action.

The revolt of 1831 was followed by the formation of a reactionary white man's organization called the Colonial Union. The Union, blaming the revolt on the missionaries set fire to a few Methodist and Baptist chapels. This attack on the liberty of preaching goaded the Baptists into sending William Knibb, one of their best platform orators and a man thoroughly familiar with the events of 1831-1832

to plead their cause in England, the cause, not of emancipation but of freedom of preaching. (7) When Knibb reached England he argued for the final solution: only with emancipation would the mission be free to operate. The Baptist Committee was divided, but when Knibb forged ahead and got a tumultuous response to a speech in June 1832 the hesitant came around. Knibb and a few others then took to the stumps for emancipation. Although the missionaries are remembered as friends of the slaves it took an attack on their own liberties to bring them out into the open as advocates of emancipation.

Since the evangelicals believed that salvation was essentially a matter between God and individuals, since they were strictly enjoined to stay out of politics and since they were constitutional reformers anyway, it is at first sight difficult to see why the planters bothered with them at all. Most of the time they didn't; most of the time the work went on in peace. But the Bible is a dangerous book. To put it in the hands of sincere but somewhat intemperate men was a risky business. Sam Sharpe, the slave who led the revolt of 1832 was a Baptist deacon, one of whose favourite texts was "No man can serve two masters." While the missionaries might be able to maintain their political innocence, the same could not be said of their converts.

But the missionaries were dangerous simply because they were there. Ministers must take their people seriously, as human beings for whom Christ died. To take the slaves seriously as human beings was to introduce an element of moral equality into slave society, an equality which was itself subversive, especially when Jack turned out to be a better man than his master. A revolutionary interpretation of the Bible might be a kind of occupational hazard, something the missionaries would take pains to avoid, but the acceptance of slaves as people was essential to the preaching of the gospel. It was probably a dim appreciation of this fact that led the planters at times to take arms against the evangelicals, or more commonly, try to outflank them with the Church of England.

But it was to no avail. Emancipation came in a partial form in in 1834 and without restrictions in 1838. But while emancipation altered it did not eradicate the basic structure of West Indian society. It remained a world of white planters and black labourers, hierarchical and shot through with racial bias. and it would remain so as long as the fundamental economic unit was the plantation. In many islands there were no alternatives. All the arable land was held down in sugar. But in Jamaica a different approach to making a living was possible. It is a mountainous island and in the years before emancipation sugar had been retreating from the mountains to the river valleys where it could be grown most profitably. The 1840s saw the beginning of a movement which lasted for most of the nineteenth century, a movement of erstwhile sugar workers off the estates to become either small farmers or agricultural labourers living in their own houses on their own land.

Evangelical response to this development varied from enthusiastic to sceptical. The Methodists were the most cautious; H.B. Foster's comment on the movement stressed the additional labour and expense

it involved rather than the challenge of working with an independent peasantry. (8) The other evangelicals were more positive, especially the Baptists, who have a long string of "free" villages to their credit, villages which were established through missionary initiatives, and often with missionary financing.

But a consideration of the motives which led missionaries to found villages reduces somewhat one's enthusiasm for them as agents of social change. Some, like Knibb, were concerned because reactionary planters were raising the rents on estate housing or expelling the workers altogether. George Blyth, the Presbyterian, established villages so that he could keep people who were going to move anyway within reach of church and school. Clark, a Methodist, was worried about the dismal quality of estate housing and its effect on home and family life. The Moravians, following their own peculiar experience tried, with indifferent success, to found Moravian villages, as distinct from secular villages with a Moravian church. (9) But none of them became active in the movement out of the conviction that the social health of the island depended on the dethroning of King Sugar. As might be expected Knibb came closer to it than anyone. Jamaica, he declared, would never be "truly prosperous or happy while she is entirely dependent on a foreign market for nearly all the necessities of life . . . (She) . . . will be much improved when the necessaries of life are more plentifully grown even though a few tons of sugar less leave her shores." (9)

But even with Knibb this is a secondary argument. Missionaries became involved in freehold settlement for ecclesiastical reasons, or, in districts where rack renting and expulsion were widespread, out of a sense of common justice. This sense of common justice was the nearest the missionary community ever got to a Christian social philosophy. It remained instinctive, rudimentary and uninformed by any rigorous theological analysis. Insofar as these men thought about social questions at all they thought in secular terms. Insofar as they acted on social issues they were guided both during slavery and after it only secondarily by a sense of common justice. For the most part they acted in the interest of the mission, in the interest of the gospel as they understood it, the good news of individual salvation.

Part II

The Canadians in Trinidad

Emancipation found two colonies in the British Caribbean, Trinidad and Guyana with a sugar frontier still open to the enterprising. The free slaves reacted to sugar cultivation much as the free English had a century and a half earlier; almost anything was preferable. Once again the planters cast their nets abroad for labour and this time they found it in India. If Africa supplied the labour for the first Empire, India supplied it for the second.

Indians were brought to Trinidad and Guyana from 1846 to 1917 under a system of publicly supervised contract labour. Indenture, as

it was called varied widely from time to time and place to place, but in general men, and women, were recruited to work for a specified period, normally five years, although the last two could be bought off at three pounds a year. Employees were entitled to the minimum wage, free housing and medical care and after ten years "industrial residence" to a free, though later only an assisted, return passage. On the other hand they were subject to a number of onerous disabilities, usually related to freedom of movement off the estates.

While contract labour is rarely a pleasant system this one at least tried, by the standards of the time to be fair. Its critics have fastened not so much on the principle as on the practice. Eric Williams has charged that even in its later more refined stages the system was inefficient unhealthy and oppressive. In was unhealthy because in 1911 there were 24,000 cases reported in estate hospitals out of some 10,000 people under indenture. Many of them were suffering from diseases which could have been prevented, malaria, hookworm and anemia. It was oppressive because while men were supposed to be making twenty-four cents a day, better than fifteen percent could be found making less than twelve. More serious was the high rate of prosecution for breach of contract. Between 1900 and 1912 almost 8000 people were charged and of these less than 1500 were dismissed. If in slavery the taskmaster was the whip, in indenture it was the jail. Finally the system was inefficient because barrack life bred sickness, because the compulsion inherent in estate practice meant that the men's only weapon was passive resistance, and because an abundant supply of cheap labour, supplied partly at the public expense removed pressure on the planters to mechanize, especially in the fields. (10)

Eric Williams is a masterful but not always detached historian. Yet even a more impartial student like Keith Laurence has no illusions about indenture. He points to the incidence of strikes and riots after 1860, from which the "free" Indians kept aloof, and to the extraordinary frequency of breaches of contract in the last years of the system. It is surprising therefore to find that the missionaries most closely associated with the Indians have hardly a word to say against indenture.

The missionaries in this case were Canadians, initially from the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces of British North America, and after 1875, though still largely Maritimers, from the Presbyterian Church in Canada. The mission began with the arrival of John Morton, late of Bridgewater Nova Scotia in 1868. Morton had convalesced in the West Indies a few years earlier and had been struck by the way the churches in Trinidad neglected the Indians. They were a people apart, by language, by caste, by religion, by culture and by race, and the Trinidad churches had been unwilling or unable to bridge the gap. Morton, his colleagues and his successors operated a mission to the Indians and to this day Presbyterianism in the Eastern Caribbean is an Indian phenomenon.

Unlike the evangelicals in Jamaica the Canadians did not have to keep silent. Yet they not only refrained from attacking the system, they defended it publicly. In 1875 Morton argued that the immigrants

could hardly be called slaves because they came of their own free will and were protected by law. (11) In 1909 he declared that while there were failures among the Indians the rate was no higher than in any other system and that on the whole indenture was good for the Indians. (12) Two years later, his colleague, K.J. Grant wrote in a Halifax newspaper,

> to those who would reply that this system of immigration is slavery under another name we reply, and we do it deliberately, and with the knowledge acquired through close contact with it for thirty-seven years, it is free from the distinguishing features of slavery. The interests of the weaker party are wonderfully guarded by wholesome laws, framed as the necessities arose, and these laws are by no means a dead letter on the statute books. (13)

The discrepancy between modern historiography and missionary comment lies in political philosophy. In 1909 George Fitzpatrick, Indian, Presbyterian and lawyer argued for the reform of the system on the ground, inter alia , that it provided for the prosecution at criminal law of a breach of civil contract. Although the distinction is a crucial one, Morton never mentions it. A breach of civil contract is a dispute between individuals prosecuted under civil law with the state acting as arbiter. But in criminal law the state abandons its role as umpire and becomes a party in the dispute . By making breaches of the indenture contracts part of the criminal law the state took up, for the most part, the side of the planters. Morton ignores this question, not simply because he was a preacher and not a lwyer but also because he was a very conservative person.

In 1884 Morton gave evidence before Sir H.W. Norman, who was conducting an investigation into the so-called Hosea riots, in which the police fired into an illegal demonstration killing twelve East Indians and injuring eighty. Morton supported the government's action without qualification. He admitted that work was short; he admitted there might have been other factors, but the principal reason for the riots was Indian "insubordination". Since the shooting, he continued, their conduct had improved enormously. They had realized " that the law had to be obeyed by them as well as everyone else." (14)

Almost thirty years later he commented that while popular government had certain " educative" influences it was " conducive to lies, slander, and evil speaking, and elections cost a great deal in money and strife." (15) A man whose general approach to politics was of this type could hardly be expected to turn up a critic of a system which had brought much of Trinidad under cultivation and provided an opportunity for thousands of Indians to find a better life. At the same time it must be remembered that indenture was a system of its time; many parallels can be drawn between the experience of the Trinidad Indians and Europeans in Canada or the United States. The Empire itself was a system of the time. Morton consistently refused to intervene in labour disputes, preferring to send the men to the officers of the immigration department where he was confident they would get justice. Morton was an imperialist and imperialists assume a high level of virtue among the colonizers.

But if Morton was a conservative he was a constructive conservative. Central to his thinking was the welfare of Trinidad and central to Trinidad's welfare was Indian immigration. In 1877 he argued for systematic importation of Indian women, outside the indenture system, in order to encourage the men to stay on the island. He would not have wanted them to stay if he had not regarded them as valuable citizens.

At first he thought of them as valuable for the sugar industry, and the sugar industry as essential to the island. But his views changed as the years went on. Indians who had completed their indenture did not have to return to India; they were free if they wished to stay in Trinidad. By the early seventies people were taking up Crown land and going into farming, but the real development of a Trinidad Indian peasantry did not begin until the sugar crisis at the end of the century. In 1885 Morton was doubtful whether they would make out " The Hindoo is not as sturdy as the Saxon" (16) By the turn of the century his fears had been laid to rest. In 1899 he was able to suggest the abolition of the indenture system altogether, replacing it was a colonization scheme with a short period of contract labour at the beginning. In the same way he became less dogmatic about the importance of Indian labour for the sugar industry. By 1906 he could see them as important both for sugar and for small farming. (17)

Morton was immensely pleased with the Indian response to hard times. When work became scarce and wages fell in the sugar industry thousands of Indians simply packed up and left, working their way into the mountain valleys to become cocoa farmers or into the Caroni swamp to grow rice. Morton was a free enterprise man; the schools he ran inculcated the standard Victorian virtues, industry, thrift, sobriety, piety, qualities which tend to produce individual prosperity in a frontier society.

Confidence in the Indians, the welfare of Trinidad , and a belief in free enterprise were the poles around which Morton's social thought revolved. But what made him a particularly significant figure in Trinidad and more articulate on social questions than his colleagues was his interest in agriculture. Morton was always a farmer at heart, a successful gardener in his own right, a founding member of the Agricultural Society and for a time Chairman of the local Road Board. But all this activity was a hobby, something he did in his spare time, it did not develop naturally out of his theology. Morton's central theological concerns had to do with sin, with the reconciliation of individuals with God.(18) His contribution to public life in Trinidad was bereft of theology, and his interests did not become part of the heritage of the Presbyterian Church in Trinidad.

After Morton's death social questions ceased to concern the church. If anything they did their best to avoid them. But when, in the late thirties things became so bad on the sugar estates that social problems could no longer be ignored the East Indian leadership stepped into Morton's shoes. But their concern arose not out of theolgy but communal solidarity; it was their own people who were suffering. (19)

No more than the British in Jamaica did the Canadians or the East Indians in Trinidad apply theology to society.

Prophetic preaching is immediate, and it is founded on the word of God. One can say " Love your neighbour", but until that maxim is applied to the concrete conditions of daily life, until accepted patterns of behaviour are revealed as without love, or until it is shown in reasonably specific terms what loving one's neighbour means, we are not dealing with prophecy. Conversely if an interest in social problems on the part of avowed Christians is not based on theology, but on secular philosophy their preaching is not prophetic either. Because the evangelicals in the West Indies, whether British in Jamaica or Canadian or East Indian in Trinidad derived their social thinking from secular sources rather than from the Bible they cannot be described as prophetic. When they did think biblically they were thinking about sin and salvation and the assorted problems of personal ethics. Theology and society were not combined. It follows therefore that King Sugar was not troubled by the prophets. When they were troublesome they were not prophetic; when they were prophetic they were not troublesome.

1. The first part of this paper is based on missionary biography, and, as it has turned out most of the missionaries who published autobiographies, or who had books written about them were from Jamaica. In the Presbyterian case, besides the autobiographies of George Blyth and Hope Waddell, I have gone through the correspondence published in the Scottish Missionary magazines.

2. See John Wesley, Thoughts on Slavery, and Thomas Clarkson, Essay.

3. Cited in J. Hinton, Memoir of William Knibb, London 1847, page 43

4. Philip Wright, Knibb the Notorious , London, 1973, pages 31-32.

5. G.C. Findlay and W.W. Holdsworth, The History of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, Vol II, London 1921, pages 79-80, 86 and following; Peter Duncan, A Narrative of the Wesleyan Mission to Jamaica, London 1849, pages 162-165; Mary Reckord, Missionary Activity in Jamaica Before Emancipation , unpublished PhD thesis, London 1964, page 13; Geoffrey Johnston, Documents Illustrative of the Presbyterian Church of Jamaica, typescript, United Theological College of the West Indies, Document 16; J.E. Hutton, A History of Moravian Missions, London, no date, pages 195-197

6. Henry Bleby, The Death Struggles of Slavery, London, 1853, pages 5-6; Hinton, op. cit., pages 118-119; George Blyth, Remeniscences of a Missionary Life, London 1854, pages 59-66; Hope Waddell, Twenty Nine Years in the West Indies and Central Africa, London, 1863, pages 56-57.

7. Hinton, op. cit., pages 139-140. The Methodist response was similar, see Reckord, op. cit., page 348 and following.

8. H.B. Foster, The Rise and Progress of Wesleyan Methodism in Jamaica, London, 1881, page 98

9. Hinton, op. cit., page 314

10. Eric Williams, The History of the People of Trinidad and Tobago, London 1962, pages 106-109.

11. Sarah Morton, John Morton of Trinidad, Toronto 1916, page 146

12. Report of the Committee on Emigration from India to the Crown Colonies and Protectorates, Cd. 5194, 1910, pages 337-341.

13. The Presbyterian Witness, October 28th, 1911.

14. Correspondence Respecting the Recent Coolie Disturbances in Trinidad at the Muhurran Festival, with the Report Thereon, by Sir H.W. Norman, C 4366, March 1885, pages 68-69.

15. John Morton to Harvey Morton, February 27th, 1910, Morton Papers, Box 3

16. The Maritime Presbyterian, March 1885

17. "Statement by John Morton anent his resolution to the Agricultural Society," 1899, Morton Papers, Box 3; Labour Question in Trinidad, Report of a Special Committee appointed to consider matters related thereto, Council Paper, No 13 of 1906, Appendix A, page 70.

18. Notes on a Letter to the Witness, no date, late 1876, Morton Papers, Box 1; J. Morton, "Some Hindrances to the Reception of the Gospel on the Part of the Coolie", The Presbyterian Record, April 1877, and his speech to the General Assembly, 1900, The Record, July 1900.

19. Geoffrey Johnston, The Canadian Mission in Trinidad, 1868-1938, unpublished DTh thesis, Knox College, Toronto, 1977, page 264

The Fork in the Road: Religious Separatism vs African Nationalism in the Cape Colony, 1890-1910

Wallace G. Mills

The relationship between religious separatism and African nationalism has long been an important topic of examination and theorizing among Africanists. Usually, it has been contended that religious separatism was a precursor of and contributor to African nationalism. This contention is, as far as South Africa is concerned, quite erroneous. At a superficial level, it is possible to see both sets of phenomena as 'resistance' to white domination and control. Nevertheless, it is clear that at a deeper, ideological level, the two manifestations represent antipodal reactions.

By the end of the nineteenth century, Protestantism in the English-speaking world was sharply divided between premillenarianism and postmillenarianism;[1] the point at issue was whether the second coming or second advent of Christ would occur before or after the millennium (the thousand years of peace foretold in Revelation 20). The issue had more than academic interest because the choice had profound implications for one's perceptions of the world and the trend of contemporary events.

Postmillenarianism was posited on the belief that men and society could and indeed eventually would be reformed into a condition of perfection. This involved a very potent optimism and belief in 'progress', that "through the spread of Christianity the world itself was gradually working toward a state of perfection." Of course, the prerequisite in this progress was reform of the individual by conversion to Christianity. However, most adherents to this theology and

eschatology did not limit their activities to evangelization only. Many felt that society must also be reformed, that it was a Christian obligation to work for political and social reform as well; as a result they "engaged in the manifold reform movements of the day with the dedicated, and often self-righteous, zeal of persons assured that they were serving the Lord."[2] Specific evils (drink, prostitution, gambling, etc.) which made people less moral would have to be eliminated. Politics should also be reformed by promoting the election of good, moral men and by pressing for better laws.

Earlier in the nineteenth century, in the United States particularly, postmillennialists were inordinately optimistic about the imminent achievement of the millennium.[3] As the century wore on, it became clear that the perfecting of society and of people was not proceeding at the pace expected. While some became pessimistic and abandoned postmillenarianism entirely, others persevered. It is from this tradition that the social gospel and Christian socialism (at least in Protestantism) originated in the twentieth century.

Premillenarianism, on the other hand, was founded upon a profound pessimism about this world and the direction it was headed. One of its basic tenets was "the belief that the gospel was not intended nor was it going to accomplish the salvation of the world, but that, instead, the world was growing increasingly corrupt and rushing toward imminent judgment."[4] In this context, reform of this world was

futile and one's efforts should be directed toward preparation for the next world.

The second coming itself could come at any moment; gazing at the world with jaundiced eye, the premillenarians felt that the cup of evil was almost full and the second coming was likely to happen sooner rather than later. The duty of the Christian was to save himself by becoming converted and by maintaining a constant state of readiness because only those who were converted and 'ready' at the precise moment of the second coming or death would be saved from damnation. Having assured his own salvation, the other duty of the Christian was to rescue as many other people as possible by timeous warnings and persuasion to become converted. This life was viewed primarily as a preparation for the next, and in as much as one's fate was determined by one's status (converted or damned) at the termination of this life, there was a strong emphasis on personal pietism. Not only did pietism and the obligation to evangelize leave little time for reforming the world, there was also a strong bias in favour of withdrawal; in such a wicked world, prudence commended as little involvement as possible if one wished to remain uncontaminated and in a state of grace. It is from this tradition that modern fundamentalism is derived.

Both millennial traditions emphasize evangelization; revivalism in the two traditions is often identical in its outward manifestations. Thus, the revivalism of a Charles Finney or a William Taylor may seem identical to that of a

Billy Graham or an Oral Roberts. However, the postmillennialism of the former produced a 'this worldly' orientation while the premillenarianism of the latter produce an 'other worldly' orientation.

As I have pointed out in a previous paper,[5] the Christianity which Africans of the Cape Colony began to adopt in vastly accelerated numbers from the late 1860's had a definite postmillennial orientation; quite naturally the primary focus was upon the condition and status of Africans. Some of their activity was (as elsewhere) directed towards the removal and elimination of specific 'evils', especially alcoholic beverages; thus, a strong temperance movement developed among Africans from the 1860's.[6] However, Africans hoped for and expected to achieve much more. They hoped for a more equitable society, one in which colour and race would not be determining factors of one's status and opportunity. The Cape 'liberal' policy of non-racialism gave the promise (or illusion) of a society in which individual talents and ability would be the primary criteria. The first step was for Africans to attain 'civilized standards' by an aggressive acquisition of Christianity and education. Then, the discrimination, inequality and prejudice of whites had to be reduced and eliminated. Since these baneful aspects were usually attributed to ignorance and fear on the part of the whites, they were amenable to change, especially when confronted by the example of educated, Christian Africans. However, at the same time, Africans must be actively

involved in politics and work for the elimination of laws and practices which perpetuated inequality and subordination on the basis of race and colour.

So great was the belief in 'progress' and in the inevitable and perhaps imminent achievement of their utopia that most graduates from the mission schools in the 1870's and 1880's were almost unbelievably optimistic. This was not because they were blind to the real situation in their own day; they almost daily suffered indignities, insults and injustice at the hands of policemen, minor government officials and whites generally. They were aware of annual attempts (some of them successful) to enact more unjust and discriminatory legislation. Their optimism grew from their belief that 'progress', 'history' and even 'the Divine Plan' were on their side and that the result was inevitable.

However, by 1890 and increasingly during the next two decades, the optimism began to wear thin. It was clear that there was no progress and in fact, there was regression in a number of areas. Everywhere in western industrialized societies 1890-1910 was a period of unprecedented racism and brutality, especially in the scramble for Africa and empire. In the Cape Colony also, prejudice seemed to grow rather than weaken. The signs were unmistakable: restrictions on access to the franchise in 1887 and 1892, the Glen Grey Act with its compulsory labour clause in 1894, the annexation of Pondoland, and the brutal (and illegal) treatment of Sigcau. In the press, white politicians, editors and readers were

increasingly extolling the virtues of the 'northern' racial policies of the Boer republics and criticizing the 'soft-minded', 'negrophilist' policies of the Cape. Even in the churches, subordination and discrimination continued.

Opportunity also withered. The relative economic position of Africans declined rather markedly as most of the benefits of gold mining development were retained by whites as their living standards rose. Few good job opportunities opened, and prejudice reduced some of the existing ones. Throughout the 1890's, Imvo chronicled this trend. In Kimberley, efforts were made to replace first the court interpreter[7] and then the letter-carriers[8] with whites. In 1891, some magistrates consistently excluded Africans from even temporary employment as census-takers.[9] In 1895, Alan K. Soga's career was deliberately diverted to prevent his appointment as the first African Resident Magistrate.[10] In 1897, another African, Benjamin Sakuba, was replaced as court interpreter at King Williams Town by a white man.[11]

Then beginning in 1896, the relative decline in the economic status of Africans was aggravated by real declines in living standards. The rinderpest epidemic of 1896 wiped out a large portion of African cattle wealth. While the war (1899-1902) brought high wages in the ports, it also brought high prices, and the war was followed by a severe depression. Then, there followed the worst drought in the Cape Colony in almost a century. The result was poverty and destitution.[12]

In summary, the period 1890 to 1910 was one of

intense pressure and difficulty. With their experiences so seriously at variance with expectations, Africans became bitter and needed to reconsider their position and prospects, and even their analysis of the world. One of the manifestations of this stress was the recrudescence of internecine hostilities among the Xhosa-speaking peoples of the Cape. Increasingly during this period, Xhosa-Mfengu and Mfengu-Thembu hostilities emerged in bitter feuding. The feuding affected religious, political and social affairs. The Presbyterian and Congregational churches (which allowed Africans a much larger voice in church affairs than other denominations) were especially affected. In a plethora of splits, secessions and disputes during the period, these hostilities were almost always one of the factors and, in some cases, the most important one.[13]

The hostilities intruded seriously into African political activities as well. Africans were clearly split by 1898 with the founding of Izwi Labantu as the rival of Imvo and the emergence of two groups; one, under the leadership of Walter Rubusana supporting the Progressive Party, was strongly Xhosa and Thembu and the other, under John Tengo Jabavu supporting the coalition with the Afrikaner Bond, tended to be strongly Mfengu. Clearly, the division was not watertight nor solely the result of intra-African factionalism, but the latter was certainly involved.[14] Rubusana and John Knox Bokwe also founded the Ntsikana Day celebration sometime in the first decade of the twentieth

century. It was clearly a reaction to the Fingo Day celebrations which commemorated the 'emancipation' of the Mfengu from 'slavery' to the Xhosa; it was also strongly anti-Mfengu. I do not wish to exaggerate the significance of this factionalism although it did have baneful effects.[15] Africans were able to cooperate on critical issues (e.g., opposition to the South Africa Act and the 1913 Native Land Act). Its main significance is its indication of a very sharp increase in the level of stress as a result of a deterioration in living standards and prospects.[16]

However, these difficult decades also saw the emergence of two other manifestations which were to be of much more long-term interest and importance--religious separatism and African nationalism. It is with the ideological orientations and the relationship between the two that this paper is primarily concerned.

There has been a very long tradition of linking religious separatism and African nationalism. Hostile white contemporaries immediately branded 'ethiopianism' (religious separatism) as a political movement masquerading as religion. More recent scholarly writing has tended to see religious separatism as the first manifestation of 'secondary resistance';[17] subsequently, this resistance becomes secularized and evolves into political and nationalist organizations. This interpretation has not been based upon demonstrated direct links because, as Saunders admits, "direct connections between the independent church movement and participation,

either in the nationalist movement or Cape African politics, are not easy to find" and "those ministers most active in politics remained in the orthodox churches."[18] Instead, there has been the implication that the link was generic (both are examples of revolt and rejection of white domination) and that "the contribution of religious independency to nationalism was in large part ideological."[19]

It is true that both are examples of rejection of white domination, but they are antithetical, not linked, responses. That this is so emerges quite clearly when the ideological foundations of each is examined. The fact that the ideological foundations of both are in Christianity has complicated the issue.[20] However, the problem is soon solved if it is recognized that the advent of religious separatism in South Africa marked the arrival of Christian premillenarianism.

As indicated earlier, the mass conversion of Africans beginning in the 1860's was in the postmillennial tradition. By the 1890's, the failure of their expectations was forcing Africans (as it was forcing Protestants elsewhere in the world) to reconsider their eschatological beliefs. Some Africans definitely chose premillenarianism. Every description of separatist churches of which I am aware, indicates that separatists have, almost without exception, beliefs and practices which are compatible only with a premillennialist eschatology.[21] Sundkler's entire 'Zionist' category clearly falls within the fundamentalist Pentecostal

tradition.[22] Even where the separatist churches are not characterized by radical departures in theology or worship practices, there is clearly a giving up on this world, a retreat from efforts to change the political and social structures of this world into an inward-looking pietism and an 'other-worldly' attitude.

P. J. Mzimba, the leader of the 1898 secession from the Presbyterian Free Church of Scotland mission,[23] illustrates the process of disillusion and withdrawal. Mzimba was ordained in 1875 and was for many years pastor of the Lovedale Native Congregation. He was the contemporary of Elijah Makiwane, John Knox Bokwe, Walter Rubusana and John Tengo Jabavu; all had attended Lovedale. Like the others, he had participated in political activities in the Cape Colony: canvassed in elections, circulated petitions to Parliament, appeared before parliamentary commissions, campaigned for restriction or withdrawal of liquor licences for canteens in African areas, etc. However, in an address to the Lovedale Literary Society in 1886 (the address was reprinted in Imvo), he stunned and outraged many Africans when he declared, "Let the white man rule, and the South African people be out of politics."[24] He went on to say,

> we shall get nothing at present from politics. If we go into politics, we shall sooner or later be forced out, whether we like it or not.

He quoted at length from a black-authored History of the Negro Race in America which declared that politics had

been a disaster for blacks in the U.S. South and what a blessing it was that they were no longer involved. Asserting that the remarks applied to South Africa as well, Mzimba declared,

> Let the experience of Africans in American [sic] give warning in time to the Africans in Africa to let politics alone at present. Let us be content to be ruled by the colonist. Let us only have to do with politics in order to encourage those white men who desire to give us schools and books. Could we prevent the colonists from depriving the native of the franchise? No. .... The ignorant, poor, and superstitious native cannot rule the intelligent, experienced, wealthy colonists, however few in number.

The remarks created a sensation and were widely quoted an discussed in both English and Dutch newspapers. Africans too responded strongly (letters were still being printed on the subject in Imvo four months later in April, 1887). Makiwane tried to defend his friend (Mzimba was absent, probably supplying at a mission station in the Transkei). Makiwane claimed that Mzimba was misunderstood, that all Mzimba had meant was that Africans should not consider electing an African to Parliament--a proposition Makiwane supported. However, he concluded, "if he meant what is supposed to have been his meaning than I for one cannot agree with him."[25]

Mzimba probably did not make the complete transition. The remarks on politics were made within the context of a Booker Washington-type speech in which he urged Africans to attend first to education and economic matters. Even after

the secession, he participated actively in the campaign to establish a South African Native College (finally achieved in Fort Hare). Thus, he had not given up entirely on this world, but he was clearly disenchanted with political action. Yet Mzimba is one of the few separatists who participated in public or political activities at all.[26]

Saunders notes that a separatist minister made the opening prayer at the first meeting of the South African Native National Congress (later renamed the African National Congress--A.N.C.) in 1912.[27] In 1959 at the founding conference of the Pan Africanist Congress (P.A.C.), "the principal clergyman invited to speak was the Rev. Walter M. Dimba, leader of what was then the country's largest federation of African independent churches."[28] However, these were unusual, atypical events. Sundkler found that most separatist leaders agreed with the sentiments expressed by one, "I tell my people, don't take any interest in this colour bar. Forget about it, forget about politics." There are a few exceptions, but Sundkler states that one does not usually find "radical or even the politically conscious" in the separatist churches.

> Broadly speaking, the politically awake and active, if subscribing still to "Christianity" at all, are found in other Churches, and not among "the Native Separatists". The Separatists go out of their way to state that they take no part in politics.[29]

Thus, under the stress of the disappointment and difficulties of the 1890-1910 period, some Africans rejected

the earlier postmillennial tradition and retreated into a pietist, other-worldly, premillennialism; many of these left the regular, white-led churches to form or join independent churches. However, others reacted very differently to the crisis. Certainly the period disabused them of the illusion that the millennium would be achieved easily or automatically. It became clear that 'progress' and change would have to be worked for and struggled for. The development of political and nationalist organizations were a natural outcome of that recognition. That African nationalism was founded in and remained largely dominated by this Christian tradition up to its suppression in the early 1960's is demonstrated unmistakably by the documents of From Protest to Challenge.[30] Though Marxist and Communist influence did emerge in the period after the first world war and did become a consistent element of African nationalism,[31] it probably never became the dominant element, not even in the final days when Africans, in the early 1960's, in desperation turned to violence and sabotage.[32]

Much of the leadership showed this strong Christian influence. Clergymen (and their children) played an important role in the political and nationalist organizations from John Dube (Congregational) and Walter Rubusana (Congregational) to Zaccheus Mahabane (Methodist) and James Calata (Anglican). A great many others were devout, active laymen from John Tengo Jabavu (Methodist) to Albert Lutuli (Anglican). This Christian influence is not in dispute, but

what needs to be emphasized is that it came almost entirely from those Africans who remained in the regular white churches.

It was not timidity or an Uncle Tom servility that differentiated Africans who remained in the regular churches from those who rebelled and went into religious separation. In fact, neither willingly acquiesced in continued subordination. The major difference between the two groups was whether or not they retained any faith in the prospect of attaining greater equity or justice in this life. One group, many of whom became religious separatists gave up on this life and henceforward centered all their hopes on the next life. The other group, which remained in the regular churches, retained a belief and a determination to change and improve this life; they went on to form the organizations to accomplish this. Thus, while the two manifestations were reactions to the same conditions and crisis, they were antithetical, not linked.

NOTES

[1]See William G. McLoughlin, Jr., Modern Revivalism (New York: Ronald Press, 1959). The growth of premillenarianism is traced in Ernest R. Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism. British and American Millenarianism 1800-1930 (Chicago & London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1970).

The division was not a new one. At the end of the eighteenth century and during the early part of the nineteenth century, postmillenarianism seemed to be dominant, at least in Britain and North America. However, during the nineteenth century, premillenarianism made a strong comeback; by the end of the century the two traditions were in strong and sometimes acrimonious dispute.

[2]McLoughlin, Modern Revivalism, pp. 100-107.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Sandeen, The Roots of Fundamentalism, p. 39.

[5]"The Taylor Revival of 1866 and the Roots of African Nationalism in the Cape Colony," J. of Religion in Africa, VIII, 2 (1976), 105-122.

[6]For a detailed description of the temperance movement among Africans in the Cape Colony to 1896, see my The Role of African Clergy in the Reorientation of Xhosa Society to the Plural Society in the Cape Colony, 1850-1915 (unpub. Ph.D., U.C.L.A., 1975), pp. 151-171. Temperance movements are a chief characteristic of postmillennial revivalism.

[7]Imvo (22 May 1890).

[8]Imvo (9 June 1892).

[9]Imvo (16 and 30 April 1891).

[10]Soga was the youngest son of the Rev. Tiyo Soga and his Scots wife. Alan was educated in Scotland. He was appointed clerk and assistant resident magistrate at St. Marks in the Transkei (Imvo - 10 Jan. 1894). He had passed the required law examination and was well on the career track leading to appointment as resident magistrate. Then in 1895, he was summarily transferred to the Labour Office which was both a demotion and a dead-end street (Imvo - 25 July 1895).

[11] Imvo (6 May 1897).

[12] Rinderpest is a disease of cattle and horses. It began in Central Africa in 1889 and moved slowly south reaching the Cape Colony in 1896. All efforts to find cures failed and animal mortality was high. Up to ninety percent of the cattle in Transkei may have died. See Monica Wilson and Leonard Thompson, eds. The Oxford History of South Africa, II (Oxford, 1971) p. 116. In regard to the effects of the drought which lasted in parts of the Cape Colony until 1910, it was said that "the whole...country...lived on American mealies for several months." Cited in ibid., p. 58.

[13] These 'intra-African' hostilities in the churches are discussed in detail in my dissertation, The Role of African Clergy, pp. 245-288.

[14] Stanley Trapido --"African Divisional Politics in the Cape Colony, 1884 to 1910," J. of African History, IX, 1 (1968), 80-2 --admits that the two groups tended to be factional, but he attempts to argue that that was largely accidental; generation conflicts, economic and social class distinctions, and the conflict between the educated and the traditionalists tended to coincide with the ethnic factions, he argues. These assertions are at best only partly true and some are demonstrably untrue.

[15] The 1914 Tembuland election is perhaps the most notable. Jabavu ran against the incumbent, Rubusana, the only African ever to be elected in the Cape in 1911. The African vote was split and a white candidate elected. That debacle was at least partly the result of over 15 years of personal and factional hostilities; the usual interpretations (i.e., Jabavu as 'Uncle Tom' to Merriman and other white politicians) suffer from ignoring that background. See The Role of African Clergy, pp. 277-8.

[16] However, this internecine conflict does tend to contradict some theories of revolution which argue that revolution comes when misery reaches an intolerable level. In fact, the reverse may be true. The re-emergence of determined and violent protest in South Africa recently follows several years of small improvements in standards of living.

[17] For example, Chris C. Saunders--"The New African Elite in the Eastern Cape and some late Nineteenth Century Origins of African Nationalism," in Collected Seminar Papers on the Societies of Southern Africa in the 19th and 20th Centuries, I (Univ. of London, Institute of Commonwealth

Studies, 1969-1970), p. 54, fn. 48--argues, "religious independency was conveniently a way of asserting African equality which avoided confrontation."

[18]Ibid., p. 55, fn. 54.

[19]Ibid., p. 49.

[20]Saunders obviously found it an enigma; A. P. Walsh--"The Origins of African Political Consciousness in South Africa," J. of Modern African Studies, VII, 4 (1969), p. 592--notes the dichotomy in Christian influence but provides no explanation.

[21]The most comprehensive book on the subject is still Bengt Sundkler, Bantu Prophets in South Africa, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1961).

[22]Walter J. Hollenweger--The Pentecostals, R. A. Wilson, trans. (London: SCM Press, 1972)--discusses the history of Pentecostalism in South Africa at some length (pp. 111-175). The first Pentecostal missionary (from the American 'Christian Catholic Church in Zion') baptized twenty-seven Africans in Johannesburg in 1904 (p. 120). Hollenweger points out that white Pentecostals (especially Afrikaners) object to the Zionist churches being classified as Pentecostal, but his argument is decisive (see pp. 149-175).

[23]Mzimba founded the Presbyterian Church of Africa (P.C.A.) which has maintained a continuous existence to the present.

[24]Imvo (30 Dec. 1886). Italics in the original as a heading.

[25]Imvo (2 Feb. 1887). When the secession occurred, Makiwane, who was also Mfengu, remained in the Free Church of Scotland in spite of the fact that the secessionists were all Mfengu and he was subjected to harassment.

[26]Saunders feels Mzimba "may perhaps have retained some interest in participatory politics"--"The New African Elite," p. 55, fn. 54. Trapido cites a letter from the Merriman Papers indicating that Mzimba was actively involved in the 1903 election--"Divisional Politics," pp. 88, 91.

[27]"The New African Elite," p. 55, fn. 54.

[28]Thomas Karis, et al. eds. From Protest to Challenge. A Documentary History of African Politics in South Africa 1882-1964, v. 3 (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1977), p. 314.

[29]Bantu Prophets, pp. 304-5.

[30]In all, there are three volumes of documents and a fourth volume of biographies published 1972-1977. Tracing that optimism, faith and expectation through those eighty years of disappointment and deterioration is a sad, painful experience--much like reading Anne Frank's diaries.

[31]That Communists and Christians with postmillennial convictions could frequently work together is not surprising; their respective eschatologies are very similar. The Marxist vision of the 'socialist society' and this Christian view of the 'millennial society' are almost identical.

[32]This is the conclusion reached by Karis also; see From Protest to Challenge, v. 3, pp. 680-1.

[33]It is by no means certain that all who became premillennialists seceded and joined the religious separatists. Certainly in North America, many did remain in the traditional churches. In South Africa, many African clergymen and laymen in the regular churches took no active part in politics and were apparently concerned only with 'religious' or spiritual matters.