HISTORICAL PAPERS 2016
Canadian Society of Church History

Annual Conference
University of Calgary
1-3 June 2016

Edited by Bruce L. Guenther, Todd Webb and Marilyn Färdig Whiteley

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data
Main entry under title:

Historical Papers

June 2/3 (1988)-
Annual.
A selection of papers delivered at the Society's annual meeting.
Place of publication varies.
Continues: Proceedings of the Canadian Society of Church History, ISSN 0842-1056.
ISSN 0848-1563
ISBN 0-9696744-0-6 (1993)

1. Church History – Congresses. 2. Canada–Church history – Congresses. l. Canadian Society of Church history.

BR570.C322 fol. 277.1 C90-030319-0

This periodical is indexed in the ATLA Religion Database® (ATLA RDB®), a product of the American Theological Library Association. For further information email atla@atla.com or check the website: www.atla.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Papers

CSCH President's Address

Please Note

The following papers were presented to the Canadian Society of Church History in 2016, but were not made available for publication: J.R. Miller, "Canada Confronts Its History: Residential Schools and Reconciliation"; Linda M. Ambrose, "Community Engagement and Christian Principles: Bernice Gerard as Pentecostal Pastor and Politician in 1970s Vancouver"; Catherine Gidney, "Breathe in . . . Breathe out: The Appropriation of Eastern Religion and the Creation of Calm Classrooms"; Bruce Douville, "'Tell Me the Old, Old Story'? Conversion Narratives in the Jesus People Movement of the 1970s"; Brad Melle, "Christianity and Canada's First Nations: The Native Evangelical Fellowship of Canada and Indigenous Christian Storytelling since 1960"; Cindy Aalders, "The Reading Lives of Eighteenth-Century Religious Children"; Stuart Barnard, "Evangelical Bible Distribution and Anti-Catholicism in Nineteenth-Century Canada"; Keith S. Grant, "Religious Texts and Emotional Community in Eighteenth-Century Nova Scotia"; Alan M. Guenther, "Defining Muslims: Rev. T.P. Hughes and his *Dictionary of Islam*"; Sheng-Ping Guo, "Pioneering Affordable Health Care Network in Rural China: Dr. Robert McClure and the Huaiqi ng Medical System, 1931-1937"; Rebecca Faye Ralph, "'. . . where can the labourers be found?': An Examination of the Role of Transatlantic Networks in the Building of Ecclesiastical Infrastructure in the First Anglican Labrador Missions, 1849-1876"; David Clements and Rob Clements, "Equality, Education and Good Morals make Model Citizens: The Roles of Canadian-born Siblings Charles S. Smith and Lucy Smith Thurman in Promoting Middle-class Values in the Black Communities"; Sharon Bowler, "Madame Mary Lore: A Lower Canada Baptist Beginning"; James Forbes, "'Spiritual Ancestors' of Canadian Nonconformity: Canadian Congregationalists and Transatlantic Narrative Identity in the 1860s"; Todd Webb, "The Shooting at Yeadon: Methodists, Magistrates, and an Attempted Murder"; and Sharon Bowler, "Mrs. John Gilmour, A Pastor's Wife in the Canadas."

Ernest Manning and Pastoral Politics[1]

BRIAN FROESE
Canadian Mennonite University

On 23 May 1943, while visiting his adult daughters in Vancouver, William Aberhart, premier of Alberta, unexpectedly died. A week later, on 31 May, his successor, Ernest Manning, was appointed premier, and the next day, Mrs. N. Torgrud wrote a letter that soon found its way to his new desk. Torgrud was concerned about the lack of access she experienced distributing gospel literature on trains. Recounting a time she tried, Torgrud described how the conductor stopped her on account of the fact that no one was permitted to circulate tracts on trains. She argued that her tracts were simply gospels, not denominational materials. Furthermore, she continued, with so "many soldiers and sinners on a train" it was a great way to meet people and share the gospel; after all, "God is not going to listen to us if we are hard and disobedient." Torgrud asked Manning to write to Prime Minister William Lyon Mackenzie King to "do something about it . . . It is like keeping Jesus off the train and many a mother's boy will perish because we can't seem to do anything."[2] Manning responded, "I am sorry that the matter of the distribution of tracts on trains is entirely outside the authority of the Province. I am, therefore, afraid there is not anything I can do . . . along the lines that you suggest."[3]

While trains remain the preserve of the federal government, how did the evangelical preacher premier respond to constituents on issues that intersected at the provincial level involving questions of religion, society, and public services? A year later, in 1944, Mrs. Beryl Lee of Fort Assiniboine wrote Manning concerned about the teaching of evolution in the schools. Some families were concerned about the inclusion of "Stone

Age Man in the schoolbooks . . . they describe the first man and picture him as a gorilla monster." As her fervid prose cooled she simply concluded that the curriculum contradicted Genesis' account of humanity created in the image of God.[4]

Manning responded by encouraging Lee to distinguish between disproven theory and established fact. He claimed that "organic evolution is definitely a disproven theory" by both scripture and science. Moreover, regarding schools, he stated that whether it was taught in the classroom as part of a curriculum that teaches the difference between what is true and false was important. However, teaching evolution as established fact "is violating the purpose for which the theory is included in general education, and at the same time is exhibiting an ignorance of the facts established by modern science." Then Manning addressed a specific theological objection, the age of the earth. He argued that it was unimportant in this conversation because between the first two verses of Genesis there was plenty of time when all the geological ages could be found, saying, "[it was] a period in which the earth was in a state of chaos and desolation before it was re-formed as the home of man in the seven re-creative days of Genesis 1 and 2."[5] The theological explanation called "Gap Theory" – by which classical creationists hold to a literal six twenty-four hour days of creation yet maintain that the time between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 is indeterminate and in this "gap" place scientific discoveries – now came from the premier's office.

From these brief examples of Manning's correspondence with Albertan residents, we have a glimpse of a premier engaged as political leader and religious teacher. Ernest Manning, throughout his tenure as premier, mixed his roles as politician, teacher, and preacher and worked the trio pastorally. From legislative change in the areas of the liquor trade to Sunday labour laws to many others, Manning governed pastorally and ministered politically. In this article, following an outline of Manning's political thinking and a broad sketch of his pastoral comportment, I trace this hybridity by examining his political thought and religious convictions when they mingled in two issues selected for their importance to his evangelical constituency: alcohol and the Lord's Day.

Political Thought

Manning's primary political villain was communism or totalitarianism. As he preached, "the totalitarian nations openly renounce all

allegiance to the God of Heaven, and are pursuing with a vengeance their avowed intention of obliterating Christianity from earth. But hear me; the Christian democratic nations are turning their backs upon God in just as positive a manner." On this point Manning implored his listeners to stop calling Canada a "Christian nation," for Canada had long rejected Christ as its sovereign – it was no longer a Christian nation. Finally, he called Canada to return to its heritage "under God," as Abraham Lincoln called upon Americans to do in the previous century.[6]

Throughout his career Manning was concerned with the realities of the Cold War and the spiritual state of his fellow citizens, and both coalesced in a political philosophy grounded in personal and economic freedom. He boiled down his vision of government to "establish a free and open society where you encourage private initiative and enterprise and create an atmosphere where people can see their own enterprise and initiative get the results they want in their society."[7]

A large and growing force within the political system that threatened these ideals were lobby groups. Manning criticized them over the air on his "These are the Facts" program that began in January 1955. He explained to his listeners that, "in a healthy democracy there is nothing wrong with public pressure coupled with public effort to improve and better conditions for the people as a whole . . . Unfortunately there has developed in recent years, a pressure-group complex that . . . is harmful to the best interests of the people as a whole."[8] Presaging President Dwight Eisenhower's "military industrial complex" image in his 1961 farewell address, Manning saw in lobby groups a powerful set of connections between government and narrowly-defined interest groups making claims to the public purse.

The expansion of lobby groups in the 1950s led to an exertion of influence that Manning found troubling on four points: firstly, many lobby groups were trying to push onto government responsibilities that rightfully belonged to individuals and families – such as caring for one's own children and elders. As he explained, "no wonder individual and family life is losing the self reliance and strength that marked the pioneers who opened this country sixty years ago."[9]

Secondly, such groups pitted people against each other as they struggled to acquire what they saw as their share of public money. Thirdly, they treated public money as if it belonged to the government only to give it away and that it did not belong to all people; Manning found that unconscionable. And, finally, lobby groups rarely considered their requests

in relation to their impact on anyone else. Manning saw selfishness in how special interest groups acted as if they were entitled to the public purse.[10]

Since Social Credit first formed government in 1935, Manning observed a trend of "social and political evolution" that only reinforced the growth of lobbies: tremendous scientific and technological progress that brought North America unprecedented wealth and a high standard of living. As a result, Manning noted an ironic development: "individual independence and personal responsibility are giving way to more and more collectivism and acceptance of the socialistic concept of the welfare or paternal state." In fact, more and more people were calling for the state to "provide not only for their actual needs but for their desires in an ever increasing number of fields, and that the state assume this responsibility for the entire span of their lives, from the cradle to the grave." He perceived too many people considered these services "free."[11] This problem was exacerbated by politicians outbidding each other for votes yet only able to pay for these things with taxes. However, the expansion of government was too rapid for the tax base to cover expenditures. Thus, unwilling or unable to raise taxes appropriately to fund promises, government turned increasingly to deficit financing.[12]

For Manning, this development resulted in the "pyramiding of taxation and debt with an inevitable day of reckoning," soon to come. His concern was that such a reckoning would result in several negatives: higher prices making Canada less competitive in trade, further expansion of government bureaucracy, and a promotion of "the progressive loss of individual initiative, independence and freedom." He argued for government spending limits to limit the government's responsibility for an individual's welfare, "thereby avoiding the evil consequences of the present trend." The state should help those who could not help themselves, but only for the basics of life, not all "desires," especially for the aged, infirm, and public schools.[13] Manning continued, "let us not sell the Canadian people short by assuming that the majority want welfare statism rather than the preservation of individual responsibility and independence and freedom."[14]

Waxing eloquent on these themes from a more theological perspective, Manning explained, at length, the relationship between freedom, government, a higher power, and the deleterious effects of materialism:

> a society that adopts the philosophy that man lives by bread alone must not be surprised when the people comprising that society

> demand more and more bread. Only as people recognize that there is more to life than material security will the craving for that security be tempered by an appreciation of the value and importance of things spiritual and eternal, including the priceless assets of personal freedom and independence which man as a created personality inherently desires. In short, when the One who spoke with the authority of Deity said, 'man shall not live by bread alone . . .' He was not only stating sound theology but sound economics for only when men see in proper perspective the spiritual as well as the temporal needs of man will there be lessening of the materialistic pressures which divert their feet into paths which lead to economic and political and social chaos. We would do well to heed His counsel.[15]

In Manning's political philosophy, there existed two extremes to the relationship between government and the people regarding social progress. On one hand, people were simply left on their own to succeed or fail with no responsibilities for the state. He described this as, "based on the survival of the fittest. It surely has no place in modern, enlightened, twentieth-century society." The other extreme, of cradle to grave government responsibility, was also a non-starter and historically incongruent with Canadian society; it was a "relic of the social evolution of past years and the older European countries from whence it was imported to this continent, and is often paraded here as a modern social concept."[16] Invoking the frontier myths of North American development, Manning rejected this approach as antithetical to the western experience: "it is a philosophy alien to this country and this continent, and certainly it is completely foreign to the pioneer spirit of self-reliance and enterprise that was responsible for developing Canada and The United States into countries with the greatest productivity and the highest standard of living in the world."[17] On an individual level this philosophy was corrosive to dignity, freedom, personal responsibility, and enterprise, for it ultimately "reduces all members of society to the lowest common denominator . . . Like extreme individualism, it has no place in a virile, progressive society made up of men and women who cherish their independence and self-reliance, and their freedom of choice."[18] Between these extremes, Manning proposed what he thought to be something more palpable:

> a democratic, responsible, free-enterprise society, in which each individual is free to exercise his own initiative and enterprise to

> secure and improve his position, while the state assists to whatever extent is necessary to bring the opportunities and benefits of modern society within the reach of all.[19]

Moreover, the characteristic of "a genuine, free-enterprise society" included equal opportunity, choice, and freedom for everyone.[20]

Pastoral Premier

The other famous half to Manning's public life was that of radio preacher, contributor to the monthly magazine *The Prophetic Voice*, and pastoral correspondent with listeners and others. Most of his sermons were exegetical lessons on prophetic biblical texts sprinkled over, at times, with political commentary.

On one occasion in 1948, Manning responded to Robert Stuart of Woking, Alberta, who was concerned about a broadcast a year earlier. Stuart wanted Manning's interpretation of Revelation chapter six clarified and Manning explained, "[it] is describing world events of the future that will take place in the period between Christ's personal appearing at the end of the present Age of Grace and His second coming to establish His personal millennium reign of this world." Thus, the four horsemen of the apocalypse join ancient prophecy to current events: "[the] whole trend in world affairs today is towards the centralization of power under one world government"; the rider of red horse "coincides with the universal fear that prevails today in this atomic age in which men realize that another world conflict would precipitate devastation on an unprecedented scale"; the riders of both the black and pale horses represent global famine easily brought about by "the power of chemical warfare and atomic radiation to destroy all vegetation and render large areas of earth incapable of producing any kind of plant or animal life."[21] Such mixing of theological reflection and political realities early in the Cold War characterized Manning throughout his religious and political careers.

Manning often contended for Christian involvement in society: "[Christians] are to stay the corrupting tendencies and exercise a purifying and preserving influence in all contacts of life. They have an obligation to seek the application of Christian principles in community and national life."[22] Yet he did not shy from searing critique of his co-religionists too eager to rest in the power of the state: "how far short we have fallen!! . . . We wrack our brains to provide more formidable laws to curb crime and

crookedness and we strain our purses to provide more police to enforce the laws."[23] Extending his jeremiad to resting on the efficacy of taxes, Manning continued, "we tax our energies and our resources to create outer restraints upon humanity but we are not willing to exert ourselves to bring our fellow man to Jesus Christ, the only One Who can provide him with the inner restraint necessary to help him overcome evil with good . . . [then] we be able to check the sinking of the moral foundations of our nation."[24] In this construction there was no fence between the fields of politics and religious faith.

Having a radio-preaching ministry while premier invited critics. In particular, Gerald Payne, President of the Alberta Conference of the United Church of Canada (UCC), sparred with Manning over UCC's *New Curriculum*. Payne was dismayed by Manning's criticisms of *New Curriculum* on his radio program. He admitted that he did not listen to Manning's program, but nonetheless offered to send him the complete set of books free of charge, and stated that he understood both men to "acknowledge Christ as Lord that we are brothers in Him" but that they differed in approach. Though Payne did have misgivings, "it seems to me that you take advantage of your position as Premier of this province and the weight of that office to which the people of all faiths and no faith have elected you to attack the belief and bring misunderstanding amongst the people. Surely some day you will have to give an account of this kind of action."[25]

Payne rejected Manning's biblical hermeneutic:

> [You] hit out in the name of Biblical Infallibility . . . [and] assert not only an infallible Bible but infallible interpretation of the Scripture . . . all [critics] seem to derive a perverse kind of delight if they can derive a wedge between a family and the local pastor and congregation . . . but the so-called radio pulpits seem to be content to speak to them over the airways as an all-wise Father image. Jesus had some strong words for those who came amongst the flock with wrong motivation."[26]

Payne also understood that arguing theological issues likely would not change either one's mind, but he wanted to make his case and demonstrate his biblical *bona fides*:

> We do believe in Jesus as Lord and accept Him as Son of God. We do take the bible seriously as God's Word. We differ perhaps from those

> who hold that every part of the Bible is infallible so we put Christ first rather than the written word. The Bible, we maintain, contains the Word. It must not be worshipped as a perfect idol which would be to break the First and Second Commandments. The Revelation of God contained in the Record is like a treasure contained in earthen vessels so that the glory can be to God and not to those who convey it.[27]

Payne explained further, "we may have strong differences of opinion about the Bible and even such basic things as the Creation . . . The Virgin Birth and the Resurrection, all, by the way which we accept if you read our Statements of Faith."[28]

Manning wrote a lengthy response to Payne. First he noted that Payne did not listen to his program, "hence your observations are based on the hearsay of others." Secondly, Manning was concerned for the entire Christian community: "nothing is further from my desire than to be critical of the works of others, especially within the sphere of the Christian Church." However, since he believed in the "absolute infallibility" of scripture, Manning argued he had to contend for it as Paul did in Galatians 1:6-9, even if not in as strong terms as the apostle.[29]

He thanked Payne for the offer of the books, but he had already purchased a set, as it "would be most unfair for me to comment on their contents without having perused them personally. I do not, for a moment, doubt the sincerity of those who prepared the material for the extent of research work they did." Then he elaborated that, after reading the *New Curriculum*, he concluded the authors accepted that "while the abstract truths taught by the Bible are important, the specific biblical records through which these truths are taught are by no means accurate." He saw this as a "complete rejection of the Bible's own claims to absolute infallibility" and he believed that it was "absurd" that God would have human writers produce "scientifically and historically inaccurate records for the purpose of teaching mankind the infallible and eternal truths of God." Manning rejected that people could be convinced of eternal truths if they came from "myths and legends and the product of human minds rather than the infallible revelation of an all-wise God."[30]

In defense of his radio ministry Manning responded:

> I have repeatedly emphasized that the Church is God's divinely ordained agency in this world for the proclamation of the Gospel and the edification of the saints. I have repeatedly urged radio listeners to seek out Churches in their community that preach the Gospel and

> stand loyal to the Bible as the word of God and to give those Churches their wholehearted and prayerful support.[31]

Furthermore, he noted that he received many letters from United Church members "deeply distressed" by the *New Curriculum*. Yet, when they expressed a desire to leave the United Church, Manning wrote, he encouraged them to stay and work for change from within, thus rejecting Payne's "all-wise father image."[32]

Manning tried to be consistent in his religious thought and considerate in his governing, even when in conflict with his natural religious audience, though his evangelical disposition typically won out on explicitly religious matters. Mrs. Frank DeMaere, for example, was opposed to the Jehovah Witnesses holding a meeting in Edmonton. She noted the "threat they are to world peace" – they did not read "the true gospel"; not all of them believed Jesus was the Son of God; they did not read the Bible literally; in sum, they should simply not be permitted to gather in Edmonton. In fact, she contended, "their prayers are for one gov[ernment] to control the world," and she reminded Manning that Canadian soldiers were fighting communists in Korea at that very moment. She exclaimed, "I really believe Mr. Manning that such groups should be outlawed. When their freedom interferes with world freedom I can't believe they are entitled to it and I think in the long run a lot of violence would be avoided in this way," though she conceded, "I don't believe they all realize they are a fifth column for Russia."[33]

Coming at this as one naturally sympathetic, both in his dispensationalist evangelicalism and conservative politics regarding the Cold War and Communism, Manning nonetheless deferred to overriding principles of democracy and classical liberal ideals of freedom and individualism in the context of violence against religious belief. He responded, "I quite concur with your views that these people are wholly unscriptural in their teachings and, by their false teachings, do much to undermine not only the true Christian faith but even the tenants of citizenship. Unfortunately, in a democracy there is no way of stopping people abusing freedom of speech as long as they stay within the bounds prescribed by the laws of the nation."[34] Though not especially "pastoral" to Jehovah Witnesses, he recognized their right to exist:

> I do not think that outlawing such groups would accomplish the worthy objective you have in mind. Experience has pretty well established the fact that to make martyrs out of religious fanatics only

> advertises their zeal and enables them to capitalize on what they interpret as persecution to further their own ends. In any event, it is not within the authority of the Province to take action along the line that you suggest.[35]

Regular calls for revival or regeneration in Canadian society made by Manning also invited responses from corners far removed from his evangelical circle. H.F. O'Hanlon, President, Spiritual Regeneration Movement in Calgary, heard him on the radio comment that spiritual revival in Canada was needed. He wrote Manning because he could not agree more. O'Hanlon, in his correspondence, wanted the revival Manning called for to be, at least in part, in line with His Holiness Maharishi Mahesh Yogi of Uttar Kashi, Himalayas, India. To explain himself he sent Manning some booklets.[36]

Manning responded with an appreciation for his concern regarding spiritual revival, though, as with Jehovah Witnesses, he rejected any spiritual vitality in this context:

> While I fully respect your right to subscribe to the teachings of Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, honesty compels me to point out that I regard such philosophy as worthless and incomplete contradiction to the plain and, I believe, irrefutable teachings of Holy Writ. The Scriptures make it abundantly clear that spiritual regeneration in the true sense can be performed only by the divine person of the Holy Spirit in the lives of those who appropriate the finished work of Christ for their present and eternal salvation. There is only one true God, one divine Christ and one divine Holy Spirit.[37]

Going further, Manning took O'Hanlon to task for spiritual deception: "anyone who claims that he can bring about spiritual regeneration by meditation or any other means apart from the supernatural working of the Holy Spirit is either deluded or seeking to delude others. These conclusions are not mine but are the plain and irrefutable teaching of Holy Writ." On the offer to try to arrange a meeting for Manning with Maharishi, "I am sure you will agree that having regard to these facts, there would be no worthwhile purpose served by me meeting Maharishi."[38]

People as far away as Ontario were interested in how Manning threaded the faith and politics needle. Lester Fretz of Vineland, Ontario, a self-identified listener of Manning's *Back to the Bible* broadcasts and member of an evangelical church, asked, in 1958, how a Christian citizen

could participate in government, even to vote. Manning replied, rejecting two-kingdom theology and stressing conversionism: "it is my belief that true Christianity cannot be divorced from any phase of life. Once a man is genuinely and supernaturally born again of the Holy Spirit the new nature he thereby acquires changes his attitude towards every issue of life including . . . the government or management of the country of which he is a citizen."[39] Though he was clear that Christian political isolation was a problem for society:

> One of the reasons we have many of the deplorable conditions of our age is because Christian people have had a tendency to isolate themselves from their day to day responsibilities and reserve the supervision of those things which set the standards of morality under which society operates to men who are either disinterested in spiritual things or who, if they are interested, have nearly subscribed to a Christian philosophy of life but have never had the personal experience of a supernatural spiritual rebirth.[40]

In fact, Manning argued, "all fields of public life and citizenship today are desperately in need of the influence of active Christian laymen. The opportunities for Christian testimony and effective soul winning in those fields are tremendous but, unfortunately, are being avoided or ignored by many professing Christians."[41] Manning articulated the classic Christian axiom that a believer is in the world but not of it, and "there is no Scriptural justification for excluding public affairs and other responsibilities of citizenship from the field of his influence."[42]

It was, however, a common question. In 1964, Mrs. A.F. Gough of Bridesville, British Columbia, wondered how Manning reconciled being a Christian and in politics. To answer her query, he made several points. First, it is a "common misconception that if Christians have anything to do with material administration they are, thereby, advocating it as a solution to the problems which can be solved only through spiritual regeneration . . . but it is obvious to all that man's material needs rightly must be taken care of." Manning noted Christ exemplified this with the miracle of the feeding of 5000. Being a born again Christian changes one's outlook and priorities, but both physical and material needs must be met and, besides, why should the administration of government only be for the "unregenerate . . . who reject Jesus Christ as Savior." Drawing on the long biblical storyline of political engagement, he cited examples of Joseph in Egypt, Daniel in Babylon, and Paul using his Roman citizenship for protection.[43]

Perhaps Manning's most succinct description of the role of faith in politics came from a correspondence interview in 1966 with Paul Nybert, editor of the Christian Service Brigade (CSB) magazine, *Venture*, following a meeting they had in San Francisco at the Christian Businessmen's Committee Convention. Although Manning did not know much about CSB, he was impressed by what he had seen in their work. He wrote Nybert that he thought Christians needed to be in politics where their influence was needed. To this end, Manning's favorite verse was Colossians 1:18; as he explained, the will of God was discovered through "infallible Scriptures [*sic*]," an "intimate fellowship with Christ and the Holy Spirit"; he attempted to incorporate both into his radio ministry. The quadrilateral ambition of his *Back to the Bible* was to teach the Bible as the "infallible Word of God," help guide people to Christ, expand the biblical knowledge of Christians, and demonstrate the significance of world events in light of scripture.[44]

Alcohol

In the practical realities of politics, this attention to liberty, freedom of the individual, and a Christian evangelicalism that eschews the primacy of materialism and highlights conversion, regeneration, and care for physical needs in a pluralistic society were worked out in Manning's correspondence on alcohol and business on the Lord's Day. Manning also had to manage expectations of his radio listeners on legislative matters. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, Alberta's liquor laws were being liberalized to expand licenses for liquor stores and drinking establishments, as well as to end gender segregation laws, and to amend the separation of food and drink in hotels and restaurants. His audience was perplexed. Though he preached against intoxicants and agreed that alcoholism was a serious issue, he wrote a longer than usual response to Mrs. Harriet Lane of Spring Coulee, a fan of his radio ministry. Manning explained that it was a concern of his that no solution had yet been discovered for alcoholism. Furthermore, cures for alcohol abuse could not simply be made via legislation: "I am convinced it is useless to try to legislate people into a state of temperance. No law, however well meaning, is possible of enforcement unless it carries the endorsation of at least a majority of the people affected by it and certainly this is not the case in respect to laws frequently proposed for the curbing of the manufacture or sale of liquor."[45] While he personally desired a dry society, he understood that simply

passing laws to reform lives was no solution.

Mary Carlyle of Red Deer, Alberta, was upset with the government legalizing liquor; she called it "treason" against God, accusing the government of only being after more money. After giving a series of anecdotes of alcohol destroying lives, she concluded that if government made it legal, people would think it was proper behavior.[46] Manning responded:

> My own conviction is the situation never will be remedied by an imposition of man-made laws and restrictions. I believe that only by spiritual regeneration on the part of individual men and women will we arrive at the solution to the problem. Experience has shown that no amount of state-imposed restrictions or secular education can cope successfully with the evil consequences of inherent human depravity.[47]

Manning explained further that the government received more demands for easing liquor laws than tightening them. He also rejected the argument that a provincial run liquor trade lent alcohol a protective layer of moral decency: "I cannot quite agree that the fact the Government does control the distribution of beer and liquor has given the liquor business a status of decency that it otherwise would not enjoy. Certainly so called 'social' drinking is equally as prevalent in those countries and states where the Governments do not exercise such control." If government had a role in reducing alcohol consumption, he considered education the best vehicle for preventing alcoholism and had the Department of Education work on temperance education.[48]

Of special concern to Harriet Lane was how Manning justified his actions as premier on the liquor file as an evangelical Christian. Manning responded by explaining his vision of democracy:

> My efforts to lead people into the Christian way of life being [are], in your opinion, inconsistent with the Government not imposing even greater restrictions on the sale and distribution of liquor. My concept of democratic government is government that carries out the expressed will of the people whom it serves rather than imposing on them its own viewpoint no matter how idealistic that viewpoint might be.[49]

The issue was also important in his religious imagination: "the reason I

give every minute of time that I can to the promulgation of Christianity is because I am convinced that there is no other solution to the liquor problem or any other problem that stems from the debased appetites of men other than the transformation of life that is brought about through the spiritual regeneration of the individual."[50] Going further, he continued on the theme of conversionism:

> If I thought for one moment that the evils of the liquor business could be eliminated or even curbed by preaching temperance sermons, I would preach one every Sunday but I am convinced while such a course would be popular with some people it would not be effective in solving the problem . . . On the other hand, if men and women are led to embrace true Christianity and experience genuine personal regeneration there is no more liquor problem as far as they are concerned.[51]

Mr. and Mrs. Harold Murgatred wrote one of many letters to Manning protesting a proposed liquor store to be established in Innisfail. Though against the store, the Murgatreds were distinct in their attempt to see the issue from both sides. They explained that they understood that business was already going to nearby Red Deer for liquor, thus the local business community desired a store of their own. However, that business argument held no weight for the Murgatreds: "if people would fight as enthusiastically for the right things . . . we might ultimately have a town to be proud of, and one to which Christian people could take their families on a Saturday night without being subjected to vile and indecent language openly used on the streets and in public places." Profit motive in the liquor trade carried no water for them:

> 'What does it profit a man – if he lose his soul.' [*sic*] Apparently some of our businessmen are more concerned about their personal profits than the souls of their fellowmen. That being the case there are some of us who feel called upon to act the role of being 'our brother's keeper' – especially to youth. While we know your own personal stand on these matters, we also realize that even as premier, your are only one man against many, perhaps even the 'lone voice crying in the wilderness.'[52]

In conclusion, they called upon Manning to help stop the spread of alcohol.[53] Manning responded that "the desires of the people of the various

communities are naturally divided. The Government cannot ignore the fact that the manufacture and sale of liquor is a legitimate business . . . and we therefore cannot discriminate against this particular business any more than another irrespective of what our personal views may be."[54]

Evelyn Thompson of the United Church wrote and called for a ban on gender "mixed" drinking establishments to continue in Edmonton and Calgary. To allow mixed drinking in the beer rooms was to invite three specific problems: more consumption than would occur otherwise, "moral 'let-down' was more pronounced among both men and women when drinking together in public places," and "beer-rooms were not fit and safe places to which men may invite their wives, daughters and women friends."[55] Manning responded that there was much pressure on government by many people and organizations to lift the ban in Edmonton and Calgary, especially as it was permitted everywhere else in the province.[56] Thompson, nevertheless, opposed mixed drinking in addition to the above letter as it would increase problems in the home and "mixed drinking salons would provide happy hunting grounds for women with designs of bank rolls and money bags."[57]

Most correspondence exchanges were with women and women's groups over a fairly consistent litany of problems, sexual crimes and drunk driving being the most common. Throughout 1953, for example, the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) actively wrote Manning about the dangers of liberalized alcohol laws, targeting such changes in the law as "an increasing amount of liquor advertising." They also wanted government to ban drinking scenes in movies, radio, and television programs.[58]

Defending government involvement in the liquor trade to the WCTU, Manning argued that it was not about revenue: "I can assure you that the Alberta Government would gladly lose all the revenues accruing to the public treasury from the sale of liquor if, at the same time, all problems associated with liquor were removed. It is not the Government which insists on selling liquor but the majority of the people who will obtain it in spite of anything a Government can do."[59] Despite Manning's pragmatic view of government and liquor, it still bothered the teetotalers in his base that he listened to both sides of the issue while being clear in his own perspective and values on the issue. He maintained the ban on mixed drinking, though he conceded that the proposal that "the compulsory supper hour closing as applied to beer parlors by the Alberta Liquor Control Board be extended to clubs, would not be feasible." These places

also served meals so closing them at mealtime was "not practical," but he maintained the supper closing for the beer houses.[60]

Constituents opposed to a new liquor bill going before the legislature noticed that in Manning's radio sermons he said nothing against the liquor traffic, but he did offer commentary about the Social Credit government. According to M.H. Hagen, general merchant in oil and gas, the premier was "intend[ing] to legislate a bill which is going to ease or make it possible for the public to get this cursed stuff any place and any where. As a Christian leader of our fair province and people, this is going to be a washout of all the radio sermons you broadcast in a hundred years. So I trust by the grace of God you have courage to fight this bill. To a finish."[61] Manning was on the defensive and responded; the bill introduced by the government "provides for greater control and enforcement of the Liquor laws of this province than the control and enforcement provided in the former Liquor Act. The Government has no intention whatsoever of making traffic in liquor 'wide open' as you seem to think."[62]

In a happier moment with the United Church, A.C. Forrest, editor of the *United Church Observer*, wrote to Manning about writing an article on what it was like being a person in high office who did not drink alcohol. His reason, "I often hear young people say that they find themselves handicapped socially and in their work because they don't drink" and he wanted Manning's perspective since Forrest doubted those youthful claims.[63]

Manning supported Forrest's idea of the article and encouraging young people to "realize that it is not necessary for them to drink in order to be successful, either socially or in their chosen occupation." He called the idea that without alcohol one was handicapped "subtle propaganda that has no real foundation in fact." As premier, he knew of what he spoke; as he circulated with "innumerable people socially and otherwise, I have never found the fact that I am a total abstainer any handicap or source of embarrassment. On the contrary, I have found that people respect the right of an individual to abstain as much as they respect the right of another man to drink, if he so desires." He had also seen "the far-reaching injurious effects of excessive drinking on family, community and business life" and "I have yet to meet a man who has been made a better man, a better husband or father, or a better business man by the use of alcohol. I have known many where the reverse has been obvious. My advice to all young people is – leave it alone. It will never do you any good. It can do incalculable harm."[64]

His constant refrain was that Christians should be doing those things that encouraged spiritual revival rather than simply seeking the righteousness of others through "man-made laws."[65] And this continued as pressure developed to relax commercial restrictions on the Lord's Day.

Lord's Day

The issue of work on the Lord's Day for Manning was raised by the Lord's Day Alliance of Canada (LDAC) in March 1946. George Webber, general secretary of the LDAC, sent him a copy of their 1944 annual report stating, "in doing so we are prompted by the conviction that the future of Sunday in Canada is closely related to the building of a Christian democracy."[66]

They gave examples of the toll of Sunday work, made evident already with the war effort now consuming six-years-worth of Sunday labor, in addition to longer workdays, all documented by the LDAC. They discovered that production efficiencies needed workers to have rest days, so some took a seventh day off, while others set up shifts to keep production on a seven-day week with workers staggered to have a seventh day of rest. Thus the idea of a Lord's Day of rest was already recognized and practiced by industry operating at full-time war capacity. The LDAC recognized social pressures to open theatres on Sundays so troops could have some entertainment and they called for Sunday entertainments for troops to be performed as a service to servicemen and not for financial gain. They suggested that one theatre in "each of four Canadian cities" should be opened on Sunday to provide free movies to servicemen. The LDAC met with the National Defense Council and expressed their appreciation for their courtesies in discussing the issue of Sunday entertainment and working with movie production companies and theatre owners to make this possible. The purpose of the LDAC was to protect a regular rest day for Canadians, citing health benefits to body and soul, and they were especially concerned that, with the end of war, the loosening of Sunday laws during wartime would continue. Despite talk of protecting workers' "Sunday freedom," they wanted the suspension of Sunday sale of gasoline during the war years to continue after the conflict was over, even communicating with oil companies to protect Sunday worker freedom on this point. Members of the LDAC held discussions with the CBC to halt commercials on Sundays to help cut down on commercial activity one day a week.[67]

In a Lord's Day Act (LDA) case, Manning responded to Mr. Littman, a constituent of A.O. Fimrite, Member of the Legislative Assembly, who was charged with violating the LDA in running his sawmill. Manning responded that there was no choice but to prosecute as there was an accident that Sunday at Littman's sawmill that necessitated an investigation that led to the charge: "as you know, it is not our practice to designate police officials to run down such cases of Lord's Day Act violations but where they are reported, or if circumstances such as the accident at Mr. Littman's mill brings them to light, we have no alternative but to prosecute." That Littman was Seventh Day Adventist had no bearing as Sunday was Sunday and there were no exemptions made on religious grounds – the LDA barred commercial business on Sunday. If religious exemptions were made to Seventh Day Adventists or Jews, for example, while others were forced to remain closed that would not be fair.[68]

Manning also rejected the argument that coin operated laundries be permitted to open on Sundays as they were the same as vending machines; rather, they were judged fixed businesses at fixed addresses. Manning concluded: "I quite frankly admit my inability to understand the arguments sometimes advanced that the operation of laundries on Sunday is necessary because people haven't the time to attend to these matter during the week. It seems strange to me that in an age when we have shorter work weeks and more leisure time than ever before in history this has become the case."[69] He continued, observing the coming slippery slope:

> I am, and I am sure many others are gravely disturbed by the progressive tendency towards an ever greater degree of commercialization of Sunday. Each additional step in that direction is used as an argument for going a step further until the ultimate end can only mean the complete abandonment of the concept of Sunday as a day free from general commercial activities and as a day respected as a time of worship and relaxation.[70]

Manning wrote in spring 1962, "we as a government are also concerned about the pressures today for a relaxation of provisions of The Lord's Day Act."[71] He stressed the point that "the government has never had the slightest intention of allowing bars to open on Sundays."[72]

In response to Alberta Bible College President Ernest Hansell's concern over commercial Sunday sports, dated 4 November 1965, Manning explained that though he and Hansell shared concerns about the

commercializing of Sunday, "I do think we must recognize, however, the difference between our personal Christian convictions and the right of citizens in a free society to hold contrary views and to have them respected as far as governments are concerned, if they are the wishes of a majority of citizens." As with alcohol, he stated his view of morality, Christianity, and society: "If it were possible to legislate morality of the proper Christian observance of Sunday, it would be a different matter but I know you will agree that respect for Sunday which is forced by law rather than the attitude and desire of the individual citizen is meaningless and hypocritical . . . God didn't build a fence around the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in the Garden of Eden because forced obedience to His will would have been meaningless."[73]

Conclusion

Manning's pragmatic view of government and liquor, born from a view of society shaped by a Cold War emphasis on individual freedom and evangelical conversionism, ironically bothered the teetotalers in his base who embraced similar values on human depravity, individual freedom, and the primacy of a democratic political system. Religious convictions animated many of Manning's correspondents, and he responded, walking a fine line of political reality and evangelical convictions. There were confluences but also divergences in how to bring both to governing. Manning was socially conservative, but he did not wish to legislate a Christian society into existence; rather, he pursued that desire through his radio ministry, hoping to draw people to evangelical Christianity as converts and then to grow in that faith. Binding all these elements together was his overriding belief in freedom, non-intrusive government in social matters, the preeminence of the individual, and the importance of Christians being active in government but respectful of its role and limits in society.

Endnotes

1. This project was supported by research grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) and Canadian Mennonite University.

2. Letter from Mrs. N. Torgrud to Premier E.C. Manning, 1 June 1943, p. 1-4. Quote p. 4 and punctuation corrected. 69.289, Microfilm Roll 126, File 1178, Premier's Papers (Ernest C. Manning) 1921-59, Provincial Archives of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta [PAA]. Older naming conventions for women are only used as used in the original documents and where the name itself cannot be determined.

3. Premier Manning to Mrs. Torgrud, 14 June 1943, 69.289, Microfilm Roll 126, File 1178, Premier's Papers (Ernest C. Manning) 1921-59, PAA.

4. Beryl Lee to Ernest Manning, correspondence, 1 May 1944, 69.289, Microfilm Roll 126, File 1179, Premier's Papers (Ernest C. Manning) 1921-59, PAA.

5. Ernest Manning to Mrs. Beryl Lee, Fort Assiniboine, AB, correspondence, 6 June 1944, 69.289, Microfilm Roll 126, File 1179, Premier's Papers (Ernest C. Manning) 1921-59, PAA.

6. Ernest C. Manning, "Wake Up and Live: Highlights from The Back to the Bible Hour Broadcast," *The Prophetic Voice* 15, no. 5 (December, 1956): 3, 7; and Ernest C. Manning, "Wake Up and Live: Highlights from The Back to the Bible Hour Broadcast," *The Prophetic Voice* 9, no. 6 (November, 1950): 2-3, M1357, Box 3, File 16, *Prophetic Voice*, Calgary Prophetic Bible Institute fonds, The Glenbow Archives, Calgary, Alberta (GA).

7. "Social Credit in Alberta and British Columbia," Ernest Charles Manning interview, 13-14.

8. E.C. Manning, "These are the Facts," #5, Week of 7 February 1955, 1, PR 1986.125, File 406 Radio Talks by E.C. Manning, These Are the Facts #1-20, Jan-May 1955, PAA.

9. E.C. Manning, "These are the Facts," #5, Week of 7 February 1955, 1, PR 1986.125, File: 406 Radio Talks by E.C. Manning, These Are the Facts #1-20, Jan-May 1955, PAA.

10. Manning, "These are the Facts," #5, 2-3.

11. Ernest C. Manning, "The Fork in the Road," Address to the Toronto Canadian Club, Tele-Facts, Edmonton, Alberta, 2 December 1963, p.2. PR 0071, Ernest C. Manning fonds, ACC. No. 85.437, Box 1, File: 85.437/3, PAA.

12. Manning, "The Fork in the Road," 3-4.

13. Manning, "The Fork in the Road," 6.

14. Manning, "The Fork in the Road," 6-7.

15. Manning, "The Fork in the Road," 8.

16. Ernest C. Manning, "Some Ground Rules for a Free Society," *Tele-Facts* 3:8, 4 January 1966, 3-4, PR0071Ernest C. Manning fonds, ACC. No. 85.437, Box 1, File 85.437/3, PAA.

17. Manning, "Some Ground Rules for a Free Society," 3-4.

18. Manning, "Some Ground Rules for a Free Society," 3-4.

19. Manning, "Some Ground Rules for a Free Society," 4.

20. Manning, "Some Ground Rules for a Free Society," 6.

21. Manning to Robert Stuart, Woking, AB, 6 July 1948, Microfilm Roll 145, File 1482, PAA.

22. Ernest C. Manning, "Wake Up and Live: Highlights from The Back to the Bible Hour Broadcast," *The Prophetic Voice* 19, no. 2 (September, 1960): 3, M1357, Box 3, File 16, *Prophetic Voice*, Calgary Prophetic Bible Institute fonds, GA.

23. Manning, "Wake Up and Live: Highlights from The Back to the Bible Hour Broadcast," 3.

24. Manning, "Wake Up and Live: Highlights from The Back to the Bible Hour Broadcast," 3.

25. Gerald W. Payne, President, Alberta Conference of the United Church of Canada to Ernest Manning, correspondence, 30 October 1964, GR 1977.173 Office of the Premier, Box 39, File 395a, PAA.

26. Payne to Manning, 30 October 1964. All caps and ellipses are in the letter.

27. Payne to Manning, 30 October 1964.

28. Payne to Manning, 30 October 1964. All caps and ellipses are in the letter.

29. Ernest Manning to Gerald W. Payne, President, Alberta Conference of the United Church of Canada, correspondence, 17 November 1964, GR 1977.173 Office of the Premier, Box 39, File 395a, PAA. The passage cited by Manning reads, "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Galatians 1:6-9, King James Version (KJV).

30. Manning to Payne, 17 November 1964.

31. Ernest Manning to Gerald W. Payne, President, Alberta Conference of the United Church of Canada, correspondence, 17 November 1964, GR 1977.173 Office of the Premier, Box 39, File 395a, PAA.

32. Ernest Manning to Gerald W. Payne, President, Alberta Conference of the United Church of Canada, correspondence, 17 November 1964, GR 1977.173 Office of the Premier, Box 39, File 395a, PAA.

33. Mrs. Frank DeMaere to Manning 3 June 1951, 1-2, Microfilm Roll 179, File 1908, PAA.

34. Manning letter to DeMaere 19 June 1951, Microfilm Roll 179, File 1908, PAA.

35. Manning letter to DeMaere 19 June 1951.

36. H. F. O'Hanlon, President, Spiritual Regeneration Movement, Calgary to Ernest Manning, correspondence, 6 July 1964, GR 1977.173 Office of the Premier, Box 39, File 395a, PAA. The booklets were unnamed.

37. O'Hanlon to Manning, 6 July 1964; [Manning quotes from] Ernest Manning to H.F. O'Hanlon, President, Spiritual Regeneration Movement, Calgary, correspondence, 21 July 1964, GR 1977.173 Office of the Premier, Box 39, File 395a, PAA.

38. O'Hanlon to Manning, 6 July 1964; and [Manning quotes from] Manning to O'Hanlon, 21 July 1964.

39. Lester C. Fretz, Vineland, ON, to Manning, 22 July 1958; and Manning to Fretz 24 July 1958, Microfilm Roll 198, File 2187, PAA.

40. Fretz to Manning, 22 July 1958; and Manning to Fretz, 24 July 1958.

41. Fretz to Manning, 22 July 1958.

42. Fretz to Manning, 22 July 1958.

43. Ernest Manning to Mrs. A.F. Gough, Bridesville, BC correspondence, 11 March 1964, GR 1977.173 Office of the Premier, Box 39, File 395a, PAA.

44. Paul D. Nybert, Editor, *Venture*, Christian Service Brigade, Wheaton, Illinois to Ernest Manning, correspondence 26 January 1966; and Ernest Manning to Paul D. Nybert, Editor, *Venture*, Christian Service Brigade, Wheaton, Illinois, correspondence 18 February 1966, GR 1977.173 Office of the Premier, Box 74, File 799a, PAA.

45. Ernest Manning to Mrs. Harriet Lane, 6 February 1951, correspondence, 69.289, Microfilm Roll 169, File 1788A, Premier's Papers (Ernest C. Manning) 1921-59, Provincial Archives of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta (PAA).

46. Mary Carlyle to Manning Red Deer, Alberta, 7 May 1949, correspondence, Microfilm Roll 168, File 1786, PAA.

47. Manning to Carlyle 14 May 1949, correspondence, Microfilm Roll 168, File 1786, PAA.

48. Ernest Manning to Mrs. Harriet Lane, 6 February 1951.

49. Ernest Manning to Mrs. Harriet Lane, 6 February 1951.

50. Ernest Manning to Mrs. Harriet Lane, 6 February 1951.

51. Ernest Manning to Mrs. Harriet Lane, 6 February 1951.

52. Letter from Mr. and Mrs. Harold Murgatred to Manning 19 December 1949, correspondence, Microfilm Roll 168, File 1786, PAA.

53. Mr. and Mrs. Harold Murgatred to Manning 19 December 1949. Letters throughout this file on this issue are from individuals, churches, including the United Church and Presbyterians, against this store and its possibly corrupting influences especially on children and young people. Written in often spiritual or Christian language, this is a similar story articulated throughout Alberta on this issue in this file.

54. Manning to Mr. and Mrs. Harold Murgatred, 23 December 1949, correspondence, Microfilm Roll 168, File 1786, PAA.

55. [Evelyn E. Thompson] W.M.S.S. The Edmonton Presbyterian of the United Church of Canada to Manning [29 Jan. 1949], correspondence, Microfilm Roll 168, File 1786, PAA.

56. Manning to Evelyn E. Thompson 7 February 1949, correspondence, Microfilm Roll 168, File 1786, PAA. This is one example of several such exchanged by various people/groups though most are from women and women's groups citing a consistent litany of problems: sexual crimes and drunken driving being the most common.

57. Evelyn E. Thompson to Manning 29 January 1949, correspondence, Microfilm Roll 168, File:1786, PAA. Manning response 7 February 1949 is virtually the same as above to Evelyn, giving a stock response.

58. Lillian Berrecloth to Manning, 16 May 1953, correspondence, Microfilm Roll 179, File 1909, PAA.

59. Manning to Minerva A. Smith President, WCTU, Grande Prairie, AB 22 Sept. 1953, correspondence, Microfilm Roll 169, File 1788B, PAA.

60. Manning to Mrs. Caroline A. Nicoll, 10 April 1953, correspondence, Microfilm Roll 169, File 1788B, PAA.

61. M.H. Hagen, General Merchant in Gas and Oil, to Manning 21 March 1953, correspondence, Microfilm Roll 169, File 1788B, PAA.

62. Manning to Hagen of Valhalla, AB 23 March 1953, correspondence, Microfilm Roll 169, File 1788B, PAA.

63. A.C. Forrest, Editor, *United Church Observer*, to Ernest Manning, 23 August 1957, PR 0071 Ernest C. Manning fonds, ACC. No. 85.437, Box 1, File 85.437/7 Correspondence, PAA.

64. Ernest Manning to A.C. Forrest, Correspondence, 27 September 1957, PR 0071Ernest C. Manning fonds, ACC. No. 85.437, Box 1, File 85.437/7 Correspondence, PAA.

65. Ernest Manning to Mrs. H. Congo, Sr, Three Hills, AB, correspondence, 3 July 1964, GR 1977.173 Office of the Premier, Box 39, File 395a, PAA.

66. George Webber, general secretary, Lord's Day Alliance of Canada to Manning, 1 March 1946, Microfilm Roll 126, File 1179, PAA.

67. The Lord's Day Alliance of Canada Annual Report 30 November 1944, 2-4 [part of letter George Webber, general secretary, Lord's Day Alliance of Canada to Manning, 1 March 1946,]. Microfilm Roll 126, File 1179, PAA.

68. Ernest Manning, Premier, Attorney General to A.O. Fimrite, MLA, Wanham, AB, correspondence, 18 July 1962, GR 1977.173 Office of the Premier, Box 5, File 47, PAA.

69. Ernest Manning, Premier [and Attorney General] to J. E. Sydie, Edmonton, AB, correspondence, 27 April 1962, GR 1977.173 Office of the Premier, Box 5, File 47, PAA.

70. Manning to Sydie, 27 April 1962.

71. Ernest Manning, Premier, Attorney General to Mrs. Evan R. Stewart, Church Clerk, Nanton Baptist Church, Nanton, AB, correspondence, 4 April 1962, GR 1977.173 Office of the Premier, Box 5, File 47, PAA.

72. Ernest Manning, Premier, [and Attorney General] to H. Ballerini, Calgary, AB, correspondence, 28 February1962, GR 1977.173 Office of the Premier, Box 5, File 47, PAA. Throughout this file, he made clear, passim, that as it was a federal statute, Alberta could not simply change it or outright ignore it

– thus the enforcement that occurred, even if not vigorous.

73. Ernest Manning, Premier, [and Attorney General] to Ernest G. Hansell, President, Alberta Bible College, Calgary, AB, correspondence, 15 November 1965, GR 1977.173 Office of the Premier, Box 5, File 48b, PAA.

Searching for Sara Libby Carson

ELEANOR J. STEBNER
Simon Fraser University

Sara Libby Carson is a well-known name among scholars who study the history of the settlement house movement in Canada. Carson, along with her friend, Mary Lawson Bell, opened the first Canadian settlement house, the Young Women's Settlement, in Toronto in 1899. It became Evangelia House in 1902. Later, in 1912, she was hired by the Presbyterian Church in Canada's Board of Social Service and Evangelism to work with Dr. John G. Shearer (1859-1925) in organizing a string of houses across Canada. Over the next six years she was the driving force behind establishing five settlement houses associated with the Presbyterian Church: St. Christopher's House in Toronto, Chalmers and Saint Columba houses in Montreal, Robertson Memorial Institute in Winnipeg, and the Community House in Vancouver. While in Canada she was also sought after as a consultant to other nascent neighbourhood houses and their leaders, lectured in the newly formed University of Toronto social work program, and worked for the Dominion (National) YWCA.

While numerous Canadian scholars note her importance, especially during the second decade of twentieth century – a period when the so-called "problem of the city" was on the agenda of concerned citizens and church leaders – little is known about her. In this essay I provide an overview of what historians do know about her and then discuss some reasons for the obscurity that surrounds her life and thought. Probable reasons include her American-Canadian nomadic lifestyle, her lack of long-term ties to any institutional organization, her scant number of publications, and her apparent lack of formal familial ties.

The problem of inadequate sources regarding a historical figure (or figures and movements) is not new. Yet after almost twenty years of researching Carson and delving into numerous archival collections in Toronto, New York City, Winnipeg, Vancouver, and elsewhere, I have succeeded in uncovering only scant tidbits of information that are probably unknown to other scholars. And, sadly, I have not found enough to shed important light on her contributions as a leader within the Canadian context. Ultimately, then, this is a paper about failure. Yet I hope it is an interesting and even an enlightening paper because it shows how difficult it is adequately to place women within the normative historical narratives and, consequently, the improbability of historians being able to transform these narratives to be more fully inclusive of women's contributions in their time and place.

Let's begin with what historians do know about Carson and why they point to her work as significant in Canada. Carson was born in 1867 in the United States. The place of her birth and the names and occupations of her parents are unknown. Her contemporaries, however, always identified her as a New Englander. She died in 1928 in New York City and was buried in Woodbury, Connecticut.[1] In her last will and testament, Carson left $500 to Mary Lawson Bell (1867-1956), her long-time friend who worked with her at the Toronto Young Women's Settlement and then became the head worker at Evangelia House. She bequeathed the remainder of her estate, including her house and all her belongings, to Helen Love Hart (1890-1936), who was her younger and long-time friend and the first headworker hired for St. Christopher House upon Carson's recommendation.[2]

Mary Jennison (1892-1970), a leading social worker and committed socialist and pacifist, wrote the earliest known history of settlements in Canada. In her unpublished 1965 manuscript on settlement houses, she wrote that Carson was a "Quaker in belief, a puritan by inclination . . . [and] a graduate of Wellesley College for Women."[3] But, as historian Cathy James noted almost twenty years ago, there is no evidence that Carson attended Wellesley College or any of the northeastern women's colleges; perhaps she attended a college but simply did not graduate.[4]

By the mid 1890s Carson was in New York City. Christina Isobel MacColl (1864-1939), with whom she co-founded Christadora House in 1897, stated that Carson had been a "business girl" in Harlem before they met while both working for the YWCA.[5] Carson was considered a good public speaker and conducted evangelical YWCA meetings and organized

clubs at various colleges throughout the northeastern United States. She was especially welcomed at Syracuse University, which was a co-ed university from its founding. In 1897 she was invited by the Toronto YWCA to hold ten meetings for working women, which led to the opening of the Young Women's Settlement.

Carson's adult life was one of geographical and institutional movements. She split her time between New York City and Toronto during the late 1890s and early 1900s, working for New York's Christodora House and Toronto's Evangelia House; but, during these years, she also worked for the New York YWCA and the Dominion (National) YWCA. By 1908 she was back in New York City and is listed as the first head worker at Wesley House, a settlement house established by the Madison Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church.[6] She appears to have held this position until she accepted the invitation of the Presbyterian Church in Canada to help them organize their settlement houses.

While employed by the Presbyterian Church (1912-18) she kept a permanent room at St. Christopher House. Even though she had a permanent residence in Toronto, she was most often in other cities – such as Montreal, Winnipeg, and Vancouver – where she conducted neighbourhood surveys to determine where a house might most be needed, trained local leaders (including clergy), and organized the initial staff and programs of the houses themselves. Once she deemed everything to be in place, she moved on.

During her tenure as General Supervisor of what was called the "evangelical settlement work" of the Presbyterian Church, she wrote three short articles. In a 1914 article published in the *Social Service Congress*, Carson opens with a quote from renowned American settlement house leader Professor Graham Taylor (1851-1938), a professor of applied Christianity at the Chicago Theological Seminary and founder of the Chicago Commons settlement, who defined a settlement as a "group of Christian people who choose to live where they seem most needed, for the purpose of being all they can to the people with whom they identify themselves."[7] She then goes on to say that settlement residents need to be of "trained mind and developed character" and must exhibit "clear thinking" and "steady living" in order to help their neighbours "learn to meet their own needs." She notes that settlement residents do not necessarily need to be university graduates – perhaps because she herself was not one. She touches on how settlements work with various community groups to address problems of housing, industrialization, and corrupt

politics, and help individuals to access medical services, for example. She highlights the work of Evangelia Settlement, St. Christopher House, and Chalmers House because their various clubs and activities enable people to engage in "wholesome recreation, good citizenship and civic righteousness."[8]

A second short article written by Carson appeared in the *Canadian Woman's Annual and Social Service Directory* in 1915. Here she once again reiterates Professor Taylor's definition of settlements, their work in communities as places of advocating for basic needs (such as parks) and providing social and educational outlets. She concludes her article by repeating that such places provide opportunities for "wholesome recreation, good citizenship and civic righteousness."[9]

Also in 1915 an article appeared in the *Presbyterian Record* entitled "How Settlement Work Began." In this publication the author is identified as "S.L. Cowan," but the author can be no one else but Carson.[10] She paraphrases what she had said in the earlier two articles, but it is clear that she is consciously writing for a Presbyterian audience – in other words, for her employers – and that she is concerned about convincing them of the Christian worthiness of settlement house work. She writes that settlement houses made "Canadians" out of recent immigrants, that they were taught to pledge alliance to the British, and, through club participation, that they learned parliamentary skills. Yet in this article she adds – immediately after her line about settlements providing opportunities for "wholesome recreation, good citizenship, and civic righteousness" – that settlement work is done "through the power of Christ, by telling in new ways 'the old, old story of Jesus and His love.'"[11]

The addition of such deliberate evangelical Christian language was clearly her attempt to appease the Presbyterian Church leaders who were unconvinced about the worthiness of settlement houses organized and supported by the church institution itself. Indeed, there was division among Presbyterian leaders: some saw settlement houses as an extension of the Christian gospel, where the very teachings of Jesus were put into practice, while others believed that they were not overtly religious enough. Ethel (Dodds) Parker, a prairie-born Presbyterian and a member of the first graduating class at the University of Toronto who went on to become the head worker at St. Christopher House in 1917, remembers that there was a significant protest by some Presbyterian leaders regarding the "lack of religious teaching" in settlement houses. Parker said that such people asked: "Why were they not conducting Sunday services, opening every

meeting with prayer, and bringing members into the church?"[12]

Carson's three articles were the work of someone who did not appear to be interested in theology or in theological debates. Rather, she reported on activities and how individuals found community within settlement houses and how these houses became places to promote necessary urban reforms. She was an administrator, an organizer, and a doer. She clearly had a strong personality and loads of energy. As Mary Jennison put it, "Miss Carson came like a meteor" into Canada. While Jennison had much praise for Carson, she stated that Carson's lack of a critical inquiry was because she "did not and could not at that time connect knowledge learned from books about the working out of the capitalist system with the squalour surrounding her."[13] (In this comment, Jennison was showing her own socialist perspective.)

Yet, much earlier, in 1935, Jennison stated that the opening of Presbyterian settlement houses across Canada "owes much to the vision and leadership" of Dr. Shearer, but "still more perhaps to Miss Sara [*sic*] Libby Carson who, under Shearer, organized the work." She then added a tribute "to Miss Helen Hart, who as head resident of St. Christopher House, trained workers to go out to the other houses bearing with them the torch of friendship and transcendence of class distinctions."[14] Jennison saw Carson, as well as her friend and colleague, Hart, as critical in establishing the first Canadian settlement houses and, interestingly, she assigned Hart a special role in establishing the tone of settlement work as being about neighbourliness and the crossing of class barriers.

Although apparently loved by the children and the mothers, the latter of whom she organized into White Shield clubs – a popular group at St. Christopher House comprised of wage-earning mothers – Carson was not an easy person with whom to work. Ethel (Dobbs) Parker said of Carson that she had "warmth and merriment" and was skilled in "teaching the social work students the fine points of good leadership," but she was autocratic and exhibited a military style of management:

> [A]s a student or staff member you did what you were told. Workers were moved from place to place like men on a chess board. You were never asked whether you cared to go or not; you just went, and did your best.[15]

Ethel Parker also illustrated Carson's commanding style of leadership by describing the first meeting of the men's club at St. Christopher House:

"Suddenly one Scotsman flung himself out of the room saying, 'it's no fair, it's no fair, Miss Carson is coercing the members.'" Parker continues: "And she was. To Miss Carson democracy was less important than laying proper foundations.[16]

Even Helen Hart, Carson's friend and handpicked first head worker at St. Christopher House, in writing a letter to Dr. Shearer in 1915 about establishing a supervised playground, education classes, and popular lectures in the Ryerson area of Toronto, said: "Miss Carson may not agree with this view of the subject, in which case, of course, she is right and I am wrong."[17]

Given the independent and dominating leadership style of Carson, it is not surprising that when the Presbyterian Church decided to make local presbyteries responsible for the houses and the houses directly accountable to them – and not to the central board via Carson and Shearer – she resigned and returned to New York City. Back in the States she worked for the War Camp Community Service agency and, in this position, she organized institutes throughout the country to train people so that they could provide recreational activities for troops stationed in camps. She then worked for the State of Delaware as the Supervisor of Community Americanization, in which role she organized home English classes for immigrant women and recreational night programs in schools for immigrants groups.[18] She subsequently took up a position training students at the East Side Settlement House in New York City, where her friend Helen Hart was then the head worker.

In a 1924 exchange between Hart and the head worker at St. Christopher House, Marion Yeigh, Hart writes: "The Canadian work is very dear to our hearts, and both Miss Carson and I would make a special effort to be of service to any Canadian worker in the city, especially yourself." She concludes by adding: "Miss Carson has been quite ill, but is much better. She sends her very best wishes to you."[19]

Carson retired in 1926 and moved to a house in Woodbury, Connecticut, a community in which she had never before lived. In a considerably long obituary printed in the *Social Welfare* journal, Carson's many accomplishments as an organizer were upheld as well as the "extraordinary personal influence she exerted – usually unconsciously – on everyone with whom she came in contact. Literally hundreds of social workers owe their inspiration to her."[20]

The influence that she exerted, however, almost vanished with the deaths of her friends and former students. Therefore, scholars who are

interested in digging deeper into what motivated her work and what she really thought of the social gospel movement, for example, or of socialism or of women's suffrage, are left with next to nothing on which to base their judgments. Scholars do not know how she defined "civic righteousness," an often used term by social gospellers of her day, yet one that was differently understood among them. Scholars also do not know if she was aware of, or supportive of, or contributed to the development of social work away from its early Christian base in North America and into the secular profession that it became. Clearly she combined the goals of Christianization and Canadianization (and Americanization) – what is now called the assimilation of immigrants – as did many of her contemporaries, and yet she is said to have believed that "religion would be caught and not taught," and therefore she avoided direct evangelism.[21]

Furthermore, although being identified as a Quaker, she never seemed to be connected with any particular religious institution or denomination. She did not join the Presbyterian Church when she was in Canada, and this lack of formal association may have been part of the problem that more conservative and evangelical Presbyterians had with her leadership. That said, she did have ties with the American Presbyterians through her earlier association with Christina MacColl (a daughter of a Presbyterian minister), and they received financial support from members of the Madison Square Presbyterian Church in the early years of Christadora House (NYC).[22] Yet she also had associations with the Methodist Episcopal Church while she was the head worker at Wesley House (NYC). Furthermore, although her peers always identified her as a Quaker, there is no evidence that links her to any specific Quaker meeting or association. Not having a clear institutional base within a Christian denomination or community or even within a government agency resulted in the unlikelihood that any speeches, records, and papers would find a natural place to reside after her death. Her movements between Canada and the United States – and within both countries – and her relatively short length of employment with each of the various organizations with whom she had worked, including the Presbyterian Church in Canada and the YWCA, added to her lack of being "claimed" by anyone.

There are a couple points, however, that can be said in regards to Carson. First, if one considers a person's last will and testimony to indicate a degree of close attachment to specific individuals or causes, then it appears that Carson's closest humans were Mary Bell and especially Helen Hart. This would be quite similar to other single, professional

women of her time, such as Mary Rozet Smith and Jane Addams, for example. Interestingly, Hart, to whom Carson left almost the entirety of her estate, was listed in her will as also residing in Woodbury, Connecticut, which makes it likely that Hart and Carson lived together in Carson's home. Further connecting this probable friendship/familial relationship is the fact that the Rev. Dr. Hastings Hart of New York City assisted at the funeral service of Carson, and he was Helen Hart's father.[23] Carson's final will and testament also appears to indicate that she had no living relatives, or at least relatives with whom she was connected.

Second, it is reasonable to accept the word of Carson's contemporaries who speak of her significance in the early twentieth century Canadian context. She founded the first settlement house in the nation, and she organized settlement houses across the country in her work with the Presbyterian Church. (Only two still exist today: St. Christopher's House in Toronto, which is now named West Neighbourhood House, and St. Columba House in Montreal). It can also be affirmed that she was influential in teaching the first wave of university-trained social workers at the University of Toronto. But this is about all that one can say because of the lack of historical records.

The problem of Carson brings to mind the groundbreaking 1975 article by historian Gerda Lerner entitled "Placing Women in History: Definitions and Challenges."[24] Lerner argues that the first level or stage is to identify the women who are worthy to be included in history; this is compensatory history, the naming of noteworthy women who are added to the traditional storyline of history. Compensatory history is important even though such exceptional women do not represent the experiences and history of most women of their time. Carson's name and work is included in the historical narrative of the settlement house movement in Canada, so Lerner's first level is achieved, but scholars are stumped when moving on to her second level, namely that of contribution history.

This stage highlights how particular women have aided in the advancement of particular movements. In the case of Carson, while scholars know that she made a contribution to the settlement house movement and to the educational formalization of social work, not enough sources exist on her – and from her – to enable an accurate judgment. Was she, as a doer, more important (as Jennison suggested) than her male clergy colleague, Dr. Shearer? One cannot say with any degree of certainty. Furthermore, this stage does not take into account other contributions such women may have made which were outside of the

male-defined norms of their day or matters that male-defined historians usually uphold as important. Lerner gives as an example the fact that scholars highlight the importance of Jane Addams in contributing to American Progressivism but ignore her contributions in creating supportive women networks. If the obituary on Carson is worth any weight, then perhaps Carson's most important contribution was not in organizing settlement houses but in training and inspiring the first generation of women social workers. Not enough is known, however, to do more than speculate at this contribution level, let alone go on to Lerner's third and final stages which would transition women out of the margins of history and then seek a synthesis between female and male experiences that would result in a truly inclusive "new universal history."[25]

The example of Carson indicates how almost impossible is such a goal of seeking a synthesized and universal history for women and men. Yet, the search for Sara Libby Carson will continue. The Smith College Sophia Smith Collection holds the YWCA archives and something important may be found on Carson related to her early working life. The Marjorie C. Smith papers at Syracuse University (SU) has a box of newspaper and magazine clippings from 1888 to 1900 which may include something on Carson's speaking engagements, and SU also has a photograph collection on the YMCA/YWCA, so perhaps even a photo of Carson exists! Her death certificate has been ordered from New York City, and this may provide the names of her parents and her place of birth. The search can certainly continue.

*****

The death certificate arrived from the New York City Department of Records and Information Services, Municipal Archives. It states that Carson was a single white female who died at the Presbyterian Hospital at the age of sixty. It lists her occupation as a social worker. Her father is named as Charles W. Carson and her mother as Elizabeth Libby – Libby being her mother's maiden name. Birthplace is given as "WS" (West Side, New York City?). Cause of death: Carcinoma with metastasises (primary) and cardiac failure (secondary). Place of burial identified as Woodbury, Connecticut. Most interestingly, a "Mrs. Helen Heart" [*sic*] is identified as the "sister" of the deceased and is the person who hired the undertaker to prepare Carson's body for burial.

Endnotes

1. Shirley J. Yee, *Immigrant Neighborhood: Interethnic and Interracial Encounters in New York Before 1930* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011), 208, footnote 20 notes that Carson was the daughter of Elizabeth and Charles Carson and was born in New Jersey in 1861. This is incorrect. For her obituary, see *Social Welfare* 11, no. 5 (February 1929): 113.

2. Mary Bell was born in Montreal and it is unknown how she and Carson met and became friends. Bell was headworker at Evangelia until 1906 and, in 1911, was headworker at the Ottawa Settlement. Also see 'As it begins 80th season Ladies' Club now accepts men,' *Montreal Gazette*, 2 October 1971, on her founding of the Ladies' Morning Musical Club in Montreal in 1892. Helen Hart was only twenty-one years old when she was hired as the headworker at St. Christopher's House, a position she held until 1917. She was a 1912 graduate from Mount Holyoke, where she was awarded honors in English. "Mount Holyoke Graduates; the college celebrates its seventy-fifth commencement," *New York Times*, 16 June 1912, 15. For Carson's will see Probate Estate File #5314, Sara Libby Carson, 1929, State Archives Record Group #004:168, Records of the Woodbury Probate District, Connecticut State Library.

3. Mary Jennison, *Study of the Canadian Settlement Movement* (unpublished manuscript, ca. 1965), 46.

4. Cathy Leigh James, "Gender, Class and Ethnicity in the Organization of Neighbourhood and Nation: The Role of Toronto's Settlement Houses in the Formation of the Canadian State, 1902 to 1914" (Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1997), 22-23, footnote 1.

5. "History of Christodora House (as told by C.I. MacColl), 1933," Box 3, #1, Christodora House Records, 1897-1991, Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Columbia University.

6. Robert A. Woods and Albert J. Kennedy, *Handbook of Settlements* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1911), 239.

7. Sara Libby Carson, "The Social Settlement," in *Social Service Congress, Ottawa – 1914, Report of Addresses and Proceedings* (Toronto: Social Service Council of Canada, 1914), 134.

8. Carson, "Social Settlement," 136.

9. Sarah [*sic*] Libby Carson, "Social Settlements in Canada," in *Canadian Woman's Annual and Social Service Directory*, ed. Emily P. Weaver (Toronto: McClelland, Goodchild & Steward, 1915), 283-85.

10. Cathy James also notes this in "Reforming Reform: Toronto's Settlement House Movement, 1900-20," *Canadian Historical Review* 82, no. 1 (March 2001): footnotes 36 and 76. See S.L. Cowan, "How Settlement Work Began," *Presbyterian Record* 40, no. 6, 245-46.

11. Cowan, "How Settlement Work Began," 246.

12. Ethel (Dobbs) Parker, "The Origins and Early History of the Presbyterians Settlement Houses," in *The Social Gospel in Canada*, *Papers of the Interdisciplinary Conference on the Social Gospel in Canada, March 21-24, 1973, at the University of Regina*, ed. Richard Allen (Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1975), 110. Also see Cathy James, "Practical Visionary: Tracing the Life of Ethel Dodds Parker," *Touchstone: Heritage and Theology in a New Age* 25, no. 1 (January 2007): 41-49.

13. Jennison, *Canadian Settlement Movement*, 47.

14. Mary Jennison, "Current Trends in Canadian Settlements," 3 June 1935, 1, Box 7, Folder 12, Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.

15. Ethel (Dobbs) Parker, "The Origins and Early History," 100.

16. A. Ethel Parker, "50th Anniversary Committee – Reminiscences of Former Staff, 1961-2, St. Christopher House" (September 1961), Box 137032 (SC 484 Box 4), File 4, 4, St. Christopher House Fonds 1484 (formally SC 484), City of Toronto Archives.

17. Helen Hart to Dr. Shearer, 19 June 1915, Book D, Part II, Toronto Playground Association, 1915-1919, Baldwin Room, S54 (History of Canadian Settlements), Metro Toronto Reference Library.

18. *Social Welfare* 11, no. 5 (February 1929): 113. In 1919 and 1920 she also conducted a survey of the "foreign districts" of Wilmington, Delaware, for its Americanization Committee.

19. Helen Hart to Marion A. Yeigh, 10 October 1924, Box 137037, File 13 (SC 484 Box 9), "Executive Directors-Head Workers Reports," St. Christopher House Fonds 1484 (Formerly SC 484), City of Toronto Archives.

20. *Social Welfare* 11, no. 5 (February 1929): 113.

21. "Canadian Beginnings," Book D, Part II, Metro Toronto Reference Library.

22. "Club for Working Women," Scrapbook 1898-1904, April 1898, Box 24, Columbia University.

23. Obituary, *Social Welfare*, 113. Hasting Hornell Hart (1851-1932) was a respected social worker especially known for his work in delinquency and penology and with the Russell Sage Foundation. The officiating minister was the Rev. Clinton W. Wilson, a Congregational minister in Woodbury, Connecticut.

24. Gerda Lerner, "Placing Women in History: Definitions and Challenges," *Feminist Studies* 3, no. 1/2 (Autumn 1975): 5-14.

25. Lerner, "Placing Women in History," 13.

Agatha Streicher (1520-1581): Schwenkfelder, Networker, and Physician in Ulm

DOUGLAS H. SHANTZ
University of Calgary

It is well known that women played key roles as leaders and networkers in the community of Schwenkfelders in southern Germany in the sixteenth century. Significant scholarly attention has been paid to Sibilla Eiselin (Sybilla Eisler), wife of Augsburg councilman Stephan Eiselin.[1] She received more letters from Caspar Schwenckfeld than any other person and played a major role in preserving his correspondence.[2]

In this essay, I focus on Agatha Streicher (1520-81) in Ulm, the youngest child in a family devoted to the reforming ideas of Caspar Schwenckfeld. Agatha's mother, Helena Streicher (d. 1549), was a central figure in the south German network of Schwenkfelders, receiving letters and questions that she passed on to Schwenckfeld. A noted physician, Agatha Streicher was present at Schwenckfeld's death in her family's home in 1561, and wrote an account of the last weeks of his life.[3] Agatha became the leader of the Ulm Schwenckfelders after her sister Katharina's death in 1564.

In this study, I highlight the challenges faced in researching Agatha's life and career in Ulm, her family's involvement in the network of Schwenkfelders in southern Germany, and Agatha's reflections on Schwenckfeld's last days. I argue that Agatha illustrates the empowerment that women experienced in Schwenkfelder conventicles in the sixteenth century and the affirmation they found in Schwenckfeld's reforming ideas. I also show that Agatha illustrates the problems historians face in researching even prominent women in the early modern period.

First, I want to reflect on what sparked my interest in Agatha Streicher. My interest in Agatha Streicher was preceded by an interest in Caspar Schwenckfeld (1489-1561) and the sixteenth century "Spiritualist" Reformation when I was a graduate student at the University of Waterloo. My dissertation, completed in 1986, focused on Schwenckfeld's humanist colleague, Valentin Crautwald (ca. 1465-1545). In 1526 Crautwald authored three of the earliest Reformation catechisms: the *Catechesis*, the *Canon Generalis*, and the *Institutiuncula de Signis*.[4] Crautwald advocated a program of popular instruction and renewal as the necessary precondition for institutional church reform. He and Schwenckfeld called for *Stillstand*, a cessation of all sacramental observance until the age of the Spirit arrived, with a church of 'new men' and properly administered sacraments. For Schwenckfelders, the fundamental act of piety was the direct inward partaking of Christ's deified body and blood; this partaking took place spiritually through faith, not through material sacraments.

Several things about Agatha Streicher and the city of Ulm caught my attention. First, she came from a prominent family in Ulm. The family had a large house and servants. Agatha's father, Hans, was a physician in Ulm and died in 1522, when she was just two years old. Her brother, Augustin, was also a physician. Second, Ulm was a centre for disciples of Caspar Schwenckfeld in southern Germany. This is not surprising, for Ulm was a free imperial city in Swabia, on the Danube, and a major centre of trade and textile production. It was located on one of the main European trade routes, extending from the Netherlands to Tirol and to northern Italy. Third, Agatha and her sister Katharina headed the network of Schwenkfelders in Ulm. They illustrate the prominent, unofficial role that women played in promoting reform in early modern Europe. Finally, Agatha gained fame and honour as a physician in Ulm, and cared for Schwenckfeld in his last days. In March 1561 she took the oath required of physicians to practice in the city of Ulm, making her an officially licensed physician, and the first woman to gain this recognition in early modern Germany. Agatha is still honoured for this distinction in Germany today. In Ulm a street is named for her, and a hospice bears her name – the Hospiz Agathe Streicher, a place that helps people die with dignity. Each year the German Association for Wound Care awards the Agathe-Streicher-Preis for outstanding work in this field. At a time when scholars are pursuing questions about gender dynamics in early modern church and society, Agatha Streicher is an obvious research choice.

Agatha Streicher as a Research Challenge for Historians and Novelists

Agatha's life and career raise some questions for modern historians. How did she gain her medical knowledge at a time when women could not yet attend university or practice medicine? How was she able to break gender stereotypes and pursue her medical practice, and gain fame and recognition for her medical learning? How competitive and/or cooperative was her relationship with her physician brother? How much did she owe to Paracelsus and his ideas? What exactly were her views on religious matters? How close was her relationship with Caspar Schwenckfeld?

Unfortunately, there is surprisingly little by way of historical source material to help us answer these questions. The nineteen-volume *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum*, the modern source edition of works by Schwenckfeld and his associates, includes only two sources by Agatha Streicher: her account of Schwenckfeld's last days and a hymn.[5] While there are many letters from Schwenckfeld to Agatha's mother Helena and her sister Katharina, there is only one surviving letter to Agatha. We have no samples of her handwriting and there is no portrait of Agatha Streicher.

Studies of Agatha Streicher's life and career are few and far between, with only a handful of journal articles devoted to her. Lore Sporhan-Krempel has produced three articles on Agatha Streicher, most recently in 1999 in *Baden-Württemberg Portraits*. Sporhan-Krempel reproduces the oath that Agatha took in Ulm on 15 March 1561 in order to practice medicine in the city: she promised that when attending to the illness of someone, whether a citizen or resident of Ulm, whether rich or poor, she would advise and help the sick faithfully and to the best of her knowledge. Sporhan-Krempel recounts the story of Agatha's most famous patient, the German Emperor Maximilian II. When the Emperor took ill at the Reichstag in Regensburg, in September 1576, the Landvogt von Schwaben recommended that he consult Agatha Streicher on account of her healing skills. A count likewise offered words of praise for Agatha, noting that she had cured him of the gout. The Emperor sent to Ulm, requesting that Agatha come to his sick bed in Regensburg. Agatha travelled by ship on the Danube to that city to attend to the Emperor. One of the Emperor's ministers reported concerning her visit: "The Emperor's pain was relieved thanks to the compresses and medicines prepared by a woman from Ulm, who was called to his bedside on account of her reputation for great medical knowledge."[6] The Emperor died on 12 October 1576, with Agatha Streicher in attendance. Sporhan-Krempel

concludes that Agatha Streicher was "without doubt one of the most astounding women of the 16th century." "Her success in healing so many was based not only on her practical knowledge, but also on the strength of her personality." Agatha's life and faith "shine through the few testimonies we have of her life."[7]

In a short article in March 2008, Frank Raberg described the main features of Agatha's life. He noted speculation that there may have been more than a religious bond between Agatha and Schwenckfeld: "It was rumoured that Schwenckfeld and Agatha were in love."[8]

This past winter I discovered a novel based on the life of Agatha Streicher, published in 2014: *Die Stadt-Ärztin* (*The Town Physician*) by Ursula Niehaus.[9] It is Niehaus's fourth historical novel, all dealing with women figures from German history. The author has done impressive historical research, consulting with scholars in the history of medicine, visiting the city archive in Ulm, and obtaining primary sources relating to Schwenckfeld, to the Streichers, and to current events, such as the desecration of the Ulm Cathedral in 1531. I agree with reviewers who observe: "Ursula Niehaus has done careful research, gathering facts and evidence concerning Agatha Streicher, the time of the Reformation, the preachers of the day, the knowledge of the day concerning medicine and illnesses, and the treatments offered by physicians."[10]

And again:

> Much in this story of Agathe Streicher could have been just as Ursula Niehaus describes it. Agathe Streicher was eleven years old when the Reformation iconoclasm took place in Ulm, destroying the artwork of the Ulm Cathedral. Her encounter with the reformer Caspar Schwenckfeld von Ossig, her comprehensive medical knowledge despite the prohibition of women studying medicine, and Agatha's efforts on behalf of renowned personalities of the day – all this is historically true.[11]

The novel does provide an accurate description of Agatha's experience in sixteenth-century Ulm. Niehaus offers insightful portrayals of prominent figures who passed through Ulm in Agatha's lifetime, including the radical reformers Sebastian Franck (1499-1542) and Caspar Schwenckfeld (1489-1561), and the controversial physician Paracelsus (1493-1541). She describes the conflicts between Ulm's Lutheran Cathedral preacher Martin Frecht (1494-1556) and Caspar Schwenckfeld.

By 1526, Schwenckfeld was disillusioned with the lack of moral improvement among the Lutherans. He challenged Lutheran views concerning the sacraments as means of grace and Christ's real presence at the Lord's Table.[12] For Schwenckeld, the outer word of Scripture had to be complemented by the inner Word of the Holy Spirit. True religion was a matter of the soul's direct dealing with God, and requires neither church, nor clergy, nor sacraments.[13] Niehaus shows the sympathy that Ulm's mayor Bernhard Besserer (1471-1542) had for Schwenckfeld. From 1514 to 1539 Besserer was the leading political figure in Ulm and a strong supporter of Schwenckfeld and Sebastian Franck.

Niehaus notes the innovations that Paracelsus brought to the study of medicine in the sixteenth century, earning him a reputation as *Lutherus medicorum*, the Luther of the physicians.[14] Niehaus accurately describes Paracelsus' success as a city physician in Basel, treating and saving the leg of the printer Johannes Froben when other physicians advised amputation. Paracelsus based his treatments on experience and observation rather than on the authoritative books of Hippocrates and Galen. Paracelsus found that applying mercury worked wonders in curing syphilis.[15]

Niehaus also portrays contemporary events in Ulm, such as the acts of iconoclasm in the Ulm Cathedral in June 1531.[16] In November 1530, Ulm's citizens voted by a large majority to join the Reformation. Martin Bucer (1491–1551) from Straßburg, Johannes Oekolampad (1482-1531) from Basel, and Ambrosius Blarer (1492-1564) from Konstanz arrived in Ulm in May 1531. The three Reformers assisted the Ulm city council in establishing new church ordinances. In June 1531 the Catholic Latin Mass was abolished and replaced with the Lutheran liturgy in the German language.[17] The city also removed the large church organ. On 19 June, the city witnessed a day of uncontrolled popular acts of iconoclasm, "Götzentag," as throngs poured into the Ulm Cathedral and smashed the images to pieces, and tore out sixty altars.[18] The event is powerfully described by Niehuas, who suggests that eleven-year-old Agatha felt a notable lack of sympathy with the iconoclasts. "The mob was plundering the cathedral, her beautiful cathedral, of which Ulm's citizens were so proud."[19]

One of the main threads in the novel is the way Agatha overcomes a series of obstacles to win entry to a highly gendered profession and to realize her dream of becoming a physician. She faced opposition from family, from male physicians, including her brother, and from city authorities. When Paracelsus visited Ulm, he challenged the city's physicians to set aside ancient medical authorities and to use observation

to determine proper cures and therapies. Agatha managed to attend Paracelsus's lecture by donning her brother's cloak and presenting herself as a man. Much of Agatha's own medical learning came from observation, and trial and error, rather than just books. She gained valuable experience by offering her services to the nuns who ran a clinic for Ulm's poor.

Ursula Niehaus's imaginative telling of Agatha Streicher's life story contains several unproven speculations, such as Agatha's supposed sympathy for Paracelsus' innovative approach to medicine. Evidence does not support the suspicion of Niehaus and others that Paracelsus influenced Agatha.[20] Also unproven is Niehaus's suggestion that a book by Agatha's brother Augustin was actually authored by her: *Ivdicivm Vrinarvm: Ein gueter bericht von erkandtniß der kranckheiten aus des menschen harn* (*Consideration of the Urine: A Good Report Concerning Our Knowledge of Illnesses Based on Human Urine*). The book's author is given as D. E. Augustinj Streichers Medicj. The treatise has three parts: general instructions on urine analysis; a list of nineteen different shades of urine, from white to black, and their significance in medical diagnosis; and a detailed discussion of the shades of urine. In the late middle ages, urine analysis was considered an important means of medical diagnosis and prognosis.[21] The principle at work here is the conviction that, "the physician should consider the condition of the liver, for on this basis many other illnesses can be diagnosed."[22]

Most controversial is Niehaus's portrayal of Agatha's love affair with Caspar Schwenckfeld, which leaves little to the imagination:

> They made love, not knowing if another opportunity would be granted them. They held each other, lingering, chatting and enjoying each other's company until the sun was high in the sky. Finally, they each had to go their own way, to heal the world of its sickness – he from spiritual illness, she from bodily.[23]

Adding to Niehaus's dramatic account is a scene in which Agatha's sister Katharina catches the two lovers in the act. Katharina is also in love with Schwenckfeld, so a deep rift develops between the sisters. Niehaus suggests that Agatha and Schwenckfeld were engaged to be married, but that Agatha broke it off when she realized it would mean giving up her medical practice. Agatha explained to Schwenckfeld: "I love you, but I cannot sit around a castle and do embroidery while sick people need my help. Just as you devote yourself to humanity's salvation, so it is my calling to care for the health of the poor. They have no one but me."[24]

Schwenckfeld said he understood. Of course, there is no evidence to back up any of this.

The Streicher Family and the Network of Schwenkfelders in Southern Germany

Between 1533 and 1536, Caspar Schwenckfeld traveled widely throughout southern Germany. He successfully built up circles of supporters in Protestant free imperial cities and small principalities. As a nobleman, his strategy was to win over the ruling elites. Schwenckfeld's practice was to engage in theological conversation with members of prominent families and their friends and neighbours over a meal in a home. His strategy was successful. Indeed, "the first generation of Schwenkfelders arose less from reception of Schwenckfeld's writings than from personal contact."[25] Schwenckfeld's theological ideas and writings also proved popular among the urban middle class, including merchants and craftsmen.

Leading civic and church officials often kept secret their Schwenkfeldian inclinations, demonstrating an outward conformity to Lutheranism while inwardly adhering to Schwenckfeld's notions of spiritual religion. Schwenckfeld never demanded that his disciples withdraw from their social and professional activities and obligations. In contrast to the Anabaptists, he offered no social agenda that demanded separation from the world. His supporters should be attentive to Christ's inner teaching and seek to be faithful to Christ in everyday life. The Schwenkfelders engaged in no program of missionizing; they were content to share Schwenckfeld's writings with close relations and friends.[26]

Disciples of Schwenckfeld often met in conventicles, or home gatherings. These scattered meetings had no firm structure, liturgy, or sacraments. They typically consisted of communal prayer and Bible reading, sharing letters and tracts they had received from Caspar Schwenckfeld, and group discussion. News and letters from other groups of Schwenkfelders were read and exchanged.[27]

While there was no hierarchy of authority among the Schwenkfelders, some members took on roles of leadership and coordination. In Ulm, between the 1530s and 1581, women members of the Streicher family assumed these roles. Helena Streicher (d. 1549) became an enthusiastic supporter of Caspar Schwenckfeld in the 1530s, corresponding with him and entertaining him in her home. After Helena's death in

1549, Katharina took on the leadership; when Katharina died in 1564, Agatha acted in this role until her own death in 1581. The Streicher home became the main meeting place for Schwenkfelder gatherings and discussions in the region. One scholar observes that "Agatha was recognized as the main force in the movement by Ulm authorities, so that sometimes they spoke *not* of the Schwenkfelders but rather of the Streicher Sect."[28] Because of Agatha's prominence as a physician, the city council chose not to persecute her or her friends for their religious leanings.

In 1545 Caspar Schwenkfeld referred to "a widow in Ulm named Helena Streicher, who along with her house faithfully serves me in the things of the Lord, and who with her five daughters calls upon and honours the Lord Jesus Christ along with us in a common faith, love, and hope."[29] The *Corpus Schwenckfeldianorum* contains a host of letters from Schwenckfeld addressed to Helena Streicher and her daughters.

Agatha Streicher's 1552 Hymn and her 1561 Account of Schwenckfeld's Last Days: What we Learn about Agatha as Schwenkfelder, Physician, and Woman[30]

In Agatha Streicher's hymn, "Of the Love of Christ" ("Von der Lieb Christi," ca. 1552), she writes,

> Awake my soul,
> With psalms, prayers, and hymns;
> Thou shalt love above all things
> The true and most high God,
> And Jesus his beloved Son,
> Reigning on the throne
> With equal power and glory,
> Who died on the cross for me.

In verse four, Agatha reflects a physician's perspective in praying for Christ's healing touch:

> There is neither rest nor peace for even an hour,
> *Until you make me healthy and whole,*
> *In conscience, heart, and soul*;
> In my suffering
> May I not depart from you,
> But follow after you

And endure with patience.[31]

In the nine-page account of Schwenckfeld's last days, Agatha describes how Schwenckfeld came to be in Ulm at the end of his life, and his condition when he arrived. Agatha describes his worsening health, his daily habits, and especially the last week of his life. Her report offers extensive quotations of Schwenckfeld's words during his final days and hours.

Schwenckfeld began to feel unwell during the summer of 1561. He became weak and had trouble eating and drinking. In September, after some improvement, he made his way from Memmingen to Ulm. But then he began to suffer from headaches and dizziness. The Streicher family pled with him to cut back on his speaking, writing, meditating, and praying, and to take care of himself, but to no avail. He lost his appetite for food and drink. Schwenckfeld prayed: "Help me to get better, so that by the grace of my Lord Jesus Christ I might continue to serve him. But I am content with whatever happens, and not afraid to die when my time comes."[32] In the fall of 1561, Schwenckfeld became weaker.

It was Schwenckfeld's custom each morning, after rising from bed, to pray, commending himself and the whole household to Jesus Christ, to thank him for the night's rest, and to ask that God might give him strength to serve Him that day. At night he committed himself to Christ's care, and prayed that Christ might protect him and the whole household from evil.

As one might expect of a physician, Agatha describes in detail Schwenckfeld's changing bodily condition. She describes his bowel movements and the colour of his urine. She noted that he continued to have a strong heart and a strong pulse. On 7 November, Schwenckfeld prayed: "Lord Jesus, if it is your will that I continue to serve you, then restore me to health, which you are able to do. If you no longer require my service, then take me to your rest . . . I know that my name is written in the book of life." He reflected, "There is no greater joy in the whole world than serving the Lord Christ."[33]

On 5 December, a friend visited Schwenckfeld. He thanked God that he had been able to serve Schwenckfeld to his glory for such a long time. Schwenckfeld confessed, "I can think of nothing that I have taught that was in error."[34] The next day some brethren visited him, much to his delight, but, by evening, he was weak and spoke very little.[35]

On the morning of Sunday, 7 December, Schwenckfeld asked Agatha to give a message to her brother. Schwenckfeld admonished

Augustin that he should remember to return good for evil. That evening, a large number of friends stood around Schwenckfeld's bed; he blessed them all, and then gave a special word of instruction to each one. On 8 December, all his friends gathered by his bedside, including some preachers. Schwenckfeld explained that he had come to Ulm because of Agatha. "She has traveled far and wide, for God has given her the gift of healing." "She has spared no effort to assist me, but because it is not God's will, she cannot help me."[36]

Among his last words, Schwenckfeld reflected, "If I have done harm to anyone, I ask him forgiveness." He confessed, "I have taught only on the foundation of my Lord Jesus Christ. It may be that I have sometimes thought wrongly, but very rarely."[37] The account concludes: "On December 10th, about 5am at break of day, he fell asleep and entered God's rest. May our Lord Jesus Christ grant us also eternal rest with him and all the elect."[38] So ends Agatha's sensitive, heartfelt description of the reformer's passing.

The account confirms the respect in which Agatha was held, especially by Schwenckfeld. Agatha's own devotion to Schwenckfeld is evident from her care in recording his last words. It is clear that Agatha's brother, Augustin, was *not* one of Schwenckfeld's adherents; he was not present with his sisters when Schwenckfeld died.[39]

Conclusion

Agatha's leadership role within the Ulm community of Schwenkfelders illustrates the empowerment that women experienced in Schwenkfelder conventicles in the sixteenth century and the affirmation they found in Schwenckfeld's reforming ideas. Agatha's account of Schwenckfeld's last days offers a glimpse of her sensitive nature, as well as her competence and devotion to detail as a physician. It is regrettable that, due to a lack of sources, we cannot learn more about this remarkable and talented sixteenth-century woman.

Endnotes

1. Hans-Jörg Künast, "Augsburg als Knotenpunkt des deutschen und europäischen Buchhandels (1480-1550)," in *Augsburg in der frühen Neuzeit. Beiträge zu einem Forschungsprogramm* (Berlin 1995), 247.

2. We have 155 letters from Schwenckfeld to Eiselin. Caroline Gritschke, *'Via Media.' Spiritualistische Lebenswelten und Konfessionalisierung. Das süddeutsche Schwenckfeldertum im 16. und 17. Jh* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006), 30 n. 36.

3. Gritschke, *'Via Media.' Spiritualistische Lebenswelten und Konfessionalisierung,* 40, 42.

4. CLM 718, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München. See Douglas H. Shantz, *Crautwald and Erasmus: A Study in Humanism and Radical Reform in Sixteenth Century Silesia* (Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner, 1992), 59-100.

5. For the account of Schwenckfeld's last days see *CS* XVII, 1019-1027; for her hymn see CS XVIII, 258.

6. Lore Sporhan-Krempel, "Agatha Streicher (um. 1520-1581)," in *Baden-Württembergische Portraits*, ed. Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1999), 21.

7. Sporhan-Krempel, "Agatha Streicher (um. 1520-1581)," 22.

8. Frank Raberg, "Agathe Streicher (um. 1520 bis 1581)," *Momente* 3 (2008): 25.

9. Ursula Niehaus, *Die Stadt-Ärztin* (Ulm: Knaur Verlag, 2014).

10. Heike Sobotta, "Geschichte einer Stadtärztin," *Allgemeine Zeitung*, 26 November 2014.

11. "Auf den Spuren der ersten Ulmer Ärztin," *Augsburger Allgemeine*, 19 November 2014.

12. Niehaus, 116.

13. Niehaus, 140, 152.

14. Douglas H. Shantz, *An Introduction to German Pietism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 2013), 22.

15. Niehaus, 186, 307.

16. Niehaus, 12-18.

17. Günther Sanwald, "Einführung der Reformation in Ulm," 26 January 2015.

18. Verena Schühly, "Reformation: Ulm und die Kirche," 17 July 2014, http://www.swp.de/ulm/lokales/ulm_neu_ulm/Reformation-Ulm-und-die-Kirche;art4329,2707243

19. Niehaus, 13.

20. "Eine Durchsicht einschlägiger Paracelsus-Traktate ergibt keine unmittelbaren Parallelen in der Fassung. Soweit beide auf älteren Quellen beruhen, sind Übereinstimmungen natürlich nicht aussagekräftig." See Hans J. Vermeer, "Ein *Iudicium Urinarum* des Dr. Augustin Streicher aus dem Cod. Wellc. 589," *Sudhoffs Archiv* 54, no. 1 (1970): 6 n. 42.

21. "Die hier zu besprechende Harnschau spielte in der mittelalterlichen Prognostik und Diagnostik eine große Rolle." See Vermeer, "Ein *Iudicium Urinarum* des Dr. Augustin Streicher," 1-19, especially 4.

22. Vermeer, "Ein *Iudicium Urinarum* des Dr. Augustin Streicher," 7.

23. Niehaus, 292.

24. Niehaus, 284-86.

25. Caroline Gritschke, *Via media: Spiritualist Lifeworlds and Confessionalization; South German Schwenkfelders in the 16th and 17th Centuries* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006), 62.

26. Gritschke, *Via media*, 162-65, 168.

27. Gritschke, *Via media*, 153-55, 157.

28. Gritschke, *Via media*, 42, 170. "Nach [Katharina's] Tod um 1564, übernahm ihre Schwester Agatha die Leitung der Ulmer Gemeinde. Sie wurde von der Obrigkeit so sehr als Hauptantriebskraft der Bewegung gesehen, daß manchmal gar nicht vom Schwenkfeldertum die Rede war, sondern nur von der Streicherin Sect. Ihr Haus war zumeist Veranstaltungsort schwenckfeldischer Versammlungen und Besprechungen . . ."

29. The editor identifies the daughters as Katharina, Helena, Anna, Maria, and Agatha. CS IX, 271 n. 3.

30. *Kurtze Lebens-Beschreibung Des hoch-von Gott begnadeten und gelehrten Mannes Caspar Schwenckfelds, Nebst Dessen Abschied, So den 10. Decembris des 1562sten Jahres Christlich und seelig abgeschieden,* CS XVII, 1019-27.

31. Agatha Streicher's hymn, "Von der Lieb Christi" (ca. 1552), CS XVIII, 258.

32. CS XVII, 1019, 1020.

33. CS XVII, 1022.

34. CS XVII, 1023.

35. CS XVII, 1012. His visitors were Jacob Held von Tieffenau, Johann Heid von Daun, Abel Werner, and Bernhard Unsinn.

36. CS XVII, 1024.

37. CS XVII, 1025, 1027. "In Soma mein gewisen stet also das ich ihn gar nichts gethon hab, sonder das ich alain auff den grund hab geweiset auff mein heren jesum christum Es mag wol sein das ich etwan ir gedacht aber gar selten."

38. CS XVII, 1027.

39. CS IX, 340-48. Schwenckfeld wrote a letter to Hans Augustin Streicher on Helena's behalf. The purpose of the letter was to respond to Augustin's concerns about Helena's Schwenkfeldian beliefs.

Scholarship on Women, Gender, and the Reformation: Developments in Recent Years

LAURA JURGENS
University of Calgary

In the late 1990s, the three main figures in gender approaches to the Reformation were Heide Wunder, Merry Wiesner-Hanks, and Lyndal Roper. This essay discusses how the gender study of the Reformation has progressed in recent years, while highlighting the contributions made by these key scholars.

Women's History Surfaces

Traditional historical studies, written and presented by conventional historians, capture the male experience and present this experience as universal.[1] It is for this reason that traditional historical studies have been called "Men's History."[2] Within these studies women are not typically mentioned unless they were related to an important male figure or "very occasionally and exceptionally, women who performed roles generally reserved for men."[3] In other words, women are not usually considered worth discussing in historical works that follow traditional historical methods. Conventional historians exclude women because they are solely considered in relation to marriage, family life, and the "house" and thus appear to have no history of their own.[4] Heide Wunder explains that "their economic, social, and cultural accomplishments were seen as 'close to nature,' or of minor importance, or the result merely of passive execution."[5] Conventional historians and traditional historical methods neglect social contexts and are oriented toward political or constitutional

history where, Wunder argues, "women were not part of the picture" and were, in fact, not represented.[6]

Traditional historical studies received much criticism growing "out of the [second wave] women's movement at its early, spontaneous and energetic phase, bringing together political commitment" and advocating that women should be represented in historical scholarship.[7] This assertion was first met with scepticism from conventional historians who thought that this was a quickly passing trend.[8] This scepticism, however, did not extinguish interest in women's history, but perhaps even accelerated it; as Merry Wiesner-Hanks notes, "many women who were active in radical or reformist political movements were angered by claims that their own history was trivial."[9] The effort to reconstruct the female past in the face of such enormous neglect from conventional historians and traditional historical works has been called "Women's History."[10]

Since the beginning of women's history, an important research area has been the study of women during the early modern period in Europe.[11] Conventional historians writing about this historical period might mention queens, martyrs, and reformers' wives, but most still focus on men.[12] These studies often consider women as passive partners or do not critically investigate them at all. This is not to say that women have been left out of history because of the "evil conspiracies of men in general or male historians," but because history has traditionally been considered and represented in male-centred terms.[13]

Early modern scholars acknowledged this neglect and began to approach the Reformation and women in two distinct ways. The first trend examines individual women and their lives.[14] Reformation scholars apply the social-historical method and research women or "women worthies" as topics that they argue are worth including in historical studies of the early modern period.[15] The works by Kirsi Stjerna and Roland Bainton provide good examples of this research trend because their works include biographical information on individual women in order to highlight women's leadership roles and their contributions to the Reformation.[16]

The second trend explores women's lives during the early modern period and seeks to explain how women were affected by the Reformation.[17] Research on the Reformation and women originally took a divisive approach, similar to Joan Kelly, to the question: Did women experience a Reformation?[18] Heide Wunder perhaps provides the most striking scholarship on this topic when she answers this question with a "no" rather than with a "yes."[19] In contrast to other scholarship, Wunder

does not base her answer on the notion that women's lives did not change, but rather rejects that the Reformation was the main cause of that change.[20] Wunder points to transformations in family life and ideas about marriage since they were considered the most significant effects of the Reformation on women. She argues that these transformations were a result of dramatic social and economic transitions and were not due to religious changes.[21] While attempting to contribute answers to this question, scholars like Wunder produced more questions than satisfactory answers.

Scholars no longer focus on whether women experienced a Reformation, but instead have started questioning how such transformations, religious or social, affected women and women's lives. In other words, was the Reformation beneficial or harmful to women?[22] In attempting to answer this question, scholars particularly turn their attention to female religious and life in the convent.[23] Lyndal Roper contributes to analyzing the effects experienced by women religious by pointing out that life in the convent theoretically provided women with an alternative to marriage.[24] This alternative meant that marriage was not the only role socially valued for women. However, the Reformation forced many convents to close their doors, which propelled many women from the religious life to family life.[25] This limited acceptable social roles for women by replacing spiritual virginity with marriage as the Christian ideal, which proved to have both beneficial and negative effects for women.[26]

In recent years, however, questioning the positive or negative effects of the Reformation on women is not as popular as it was previously. Instead, scholars are now considering more diversity: Which women? Where? When? Married or single?[27] Scholars like Roper and others adjusted how they approached this question and are now less interested in making general conclusions about the effects of the Reformation on women as a whole.[28] Rather, scholars such as Merry Wiesner-Hanks contribute by including discussions on women who were single, married, mothers, or widows in order to explore the enormous range of the female experience.[29] Wiesner-Hanks argues that despite this diversity there are two factors that remain constant. First, a woman's response to the Reformation was determined more by her gender than any other aspect of her life. Both Catholic and Protestant reformers agreed that the proper avenue for a woman's response to their ideas was either personal or domestic because "public responses, either those presented publicly or those which concerned dogma or the church as a public institution,

shocked and outraged authorities, even if they agreed with the ideas being expressed."[30] For women the proper avenues included prayer, teaching children the catechism, or entering and leaving the convent.[31] Second, Wiesner-Hanks argues that most women experienced the Reformation as individuals since they were not considered their own social class and that these experiences need to be examined further.[32] Noting the significance of diversity, Wiesner-Hanks and others critically investigate women's political, social and cultural, and economic roles and identities from a variety of angles in order to "light up areas of historical darkness" and focus more specifically on a *woman-centred* inquiry.[33]

Wiesner-Hanks argues that by focusing on *woman-centred* studies scholars started investigating women's lives in the past and fitting them into categories with which they were already comfortable, but then realized that "this approach, sarcastically labeled 'add women and stir,' was unsatisfying."[34] Due to this, scholars like Heide Wunder started to disrupt familiar and conventional categories while also rethinking the ways in which history was traditionally structured and organized.[35] For example, conventional historical studies focus on political or constitutional history, which describes the state and its institutions where women were usually not represented.[36] Women are excluded from traditional historical studies because scholars considered women to be embedded in marriage, the family, and the household. Conventional historians argue that these are not topics for general historical works because the relations between the sexes are a private matter.[37] Wunder notes that the "search for women in the society of the early modern period has yielded findings that fit only in part with conventional ideas . . . they challenge us to rethink our notion of the political during those centuries."[38] By rethinking traditional structures, Wunder argues that women were by no means excluded from political authority by pointing to female rulers, but, more importantly, also wives. She asserts that scholars "failed to realize just how normal the regency of noblewoman was, and that the running of a peasant household, an artisan's workshop, or merchant business was possible only on the basis of the shared responsibility of wife and husband."[39] Wunder disrupts conventional categories by arguing that marriage and the household combined in a unique social order where the "husband and wife, in their roles as housefather and housemother, were part of the 'political' public" and where the wife had authority and represented the household.[40] Wunder contributes to rethinking and complicating traditional structures by arguing that although scholars still acknowledge local community politics *as*

politics, they continue mistakenly to limit what occurs in the home and within a marriage as simply a "battle of the sexes."[41]

Rethinking and disrupting conventional categories not only helped to "light up areas of historical darkness," but also provided scholars with unique avenues to search for new sources that revealed women's historical experiences.[42] In addition, it provided scholars with different avenues to interpret traditional sources in new and creative ways.[43] For example, Lyndal Roper interprets traditional sources, such as historical case studies, in imaginative ways by examining the psychological aspects of popular culture using feminist theory and psychological analysis.[44] With this work, she examines witchcraft and witches.[45] Roper argues that a prominent theme in witch trials was motherhood and that these trials did not represent "male attempts to destroy a female science of birth nor were they concerned with wrestling control of reproduction from women."[46] On the contrary, she notes that it was mothers who typically accused other women. Roper argues that witch trials and accusations should be considered on their own terms through the themes in which they developed: "I think we may best interpret them as psychic documents which recount particular predicaments. Witchcraft cases seem to epitomize the bizarre and irrational, exemplifying the distance that separates us from the past."[47] While using psychological analysis, Roper contributes by collecting traditional sources and analyzing them in creative ways to help illuminate women's historical experiences that might have otherwise been neglected.[48]

These creative approaches and new interpretations have made available even more avenues for scholars critically to examine and, more importantly, re-examine how historical developments might have affected women and women's lives. For example, some scholars examine the effects of the expansion of capitalism on women's work and identity.[49] However, more recent scholars, such as Wiesner-Hanks, critically re-examine women's labour, economic activities, and experiences. She re-examines these topics in order to show how they differed according to a woman's social class, economic status, and geographical location.[50] As Wiesner-Hanks re-examines this topic, she contributes by providing new insights into women's other economic activities and whether capitalism expanded or limited women's work opportunities.[51] Wiesner-Hanks argues that there have been both positive and negative effects on women's work. This expansion provided women with employment that helped them to contribute income, but it also lessened the value of their domestic duties.[52]

These new insights add to scholarly discussions of the ways in which women's economic activities were usually restricted, poorly paid or unpaid, and perceived as marginal.

By rethinking such structures, creatively approaching traditional sources, and critically re-examining the ways in which history affected women, scholars such as Wunder, Roper, and Wiesner-Hanks contribute to this field by challenging traditional history with the assertion that women actually have a history that is worth further exploration and analysis.[53]

Evolution of Gender History

As this paper has shown, women's history affirmed that women are important topics that need to be included in historical studies, especially within the field of Reformation studies. Remarkable scholarship has emerged from including women as topics, such as those works by Wiesner, Wunder, and Roper. During the 1990s, however, many scholars became increasingly unsatisfied with the consideration given to both women *and* men.[54] Gerda Lerner argues that "there are women in history, and there are men in history, and one would hope that no historical account of a given period could be written that would not deal with the actions and ideas of both men and women."[55] Natalie Davis takes a similar approach, stating that by "treating women in isolation from men, it ordinarily said little about the significance of sex roles in social life and historical change."[56] It is for this reason that social historians began to discuss the ways in which sex differentiation affected both women and men and started to use the word "gender" to describe these systems and structures.[57] This terminology became widely noted, and scholars in many fields increasingly switched from "sex" to "gender" as the acceptable terminology for any scholarship addressing feminine and masculine characteristics.[58] In other words, the overall progression of this field has been to move towards "a gradual displacement of women's history by gender history."[59]

There have been two conflicting reactions to this gradual displacement. The first response to this shift is from feminist historians who lament this evolution.[60] Not only do some feminist historians reject this shift altogether, but some also consider "gender history" to be a passing trend within the field.[61] Some feminists argue that this shift ultimately means that the field will include the very topic that has been considered

the "proper" focus of conventional history, that is, men.[62] This may explain the reasons why recent studies with "gender" in the title still mainly focus on women and women's history.[63] Clare Lees and Andrea Pearson provide counter arguments to this by stating that "the focus on men . . . is . . . not a return to traditional subjects that implies a neglect of feminist issues," but an acknowledged contribution to them, which can be created as a dialectic.[64] Lees and Pearson argue that focusing on men and masculinity could actually help to contextual scholarship on women and femininity. However, there has not been much agreement on this shift within the field, which has caused much tension between women's history and gender history.

The second reaction to the shift from women's history to gender history is to celebrate the change. Many scholars, such as Roper, argue that this evolution could actually benefit historians, including both feminist and non-feminist.[65] For these scholars, "gender" is a category "through which it looked as if women's history might have the potential not only to enter history as a respectable historical field, but to reshape the historical narrative themselves."[66] Roper argues that reshaping the historical narrative will help to capture the male experience.[67] Bennett and others argue that by solely addressing the problem of "women," scholars have "been blinded to the way masculinity" also changed throughout history, especially during the early modern period.[68] In other words, viewing the male experience as universal not only hid women's history, but also prevented historians from analyzing the male experience.[69] Wiesner-Hanks argues that the very words we use to describe people, such as "artist" and "women artist," kept scholars from "thinking about how the experiences of Michelangelo or Picasso or Isaac Newton were shaped by the fact that they were male, while it forced us to think about how being female affected Georgia O'Keefe or Marie Curie."[70] This shift or evolution has provided historians with a new perspective. This perspective characterizes "gender" as an appropriate category of analysis when examining all historical developments and not simply those topics that involved women or the family, but also men and masculinity.[71] This has proven to be beneficial to more recent studies since it has moved the field overall "towards broader studies of how gender was understood."[72]

Recent studies, such as those by Roper, Wunder, and Wiesner-Hanks, contribute to this shift by critically exploring concepts of gender and concentrating on both femininity and masculinity.[73] More specifically, there are three ways in which Roper, Wunder, and Wiesner-Hanks

contribute to this evolution and to modern scholarship on this topic.

First, these scholars enrich current discussions of the ways in which both women and men *defined themselves* during the early modern period.[74] For example, Heide Wunder explores how men and women were defined during the Reformation. She notes that men and women were defined based on conceptions found in dominant Christian anthropology, including biblical creation stories.[75] In her work, Wunder explores these prevailing models for male and female through autobiographical accounts and observations from fathers, mothers, and siblings.[76] Along with exploring women, she goes further by examining how men defined themselves, how they defined their own gender membership, and how men developed their male identity throughout their lives.[77] Wunder spans the transformation of the male identity, beginning with a discussion of children. For example, she notes that when boys received their first pair of trousers it was an important moment in their lives because they were "putting aside girls' clothing," which marked a clear distinction between men and women.[78] Wunder argues that the final transformation of the male identity occurred when the man became married because he accepted the ultimate male role and social status.[79] Wunder highlights information on masculinity and the male identity during the early modern period. She provides insight into how men identified themselves as men and she presents a topic that has been little considered in previous scholarship.[80]

In addition to discussing the ways in which both men and women defined themselves, these scholars also contribute by exploring how men and women were *defined by others*.[81] For example, Lyndal Roper explores this very topic as she analyzes the female figure as a representation of evil womanhood and the masculine counterpart – Catholic and Protestant clerics. During the early modern period, the Catholic priest was accused of possessing excessive manhood through fighting, drinking, and lusting. The Catholic priest was seen as a "sexual competitor, stealing wives and naïve daughters who, however, are so deeply mired in the sin of Eve as to be eager to yield to his seductive arts."[82] Protestants considered the Catholic priest "as a particular kind of man because the doctrinal battle engaged two different kinds of manliness . . . as it set the pious married woman against the lusting nun."[83] Roper argues that the Catholic priest came to represent fears about manhood and anxieties that were felt by Protestant clerics who had to figure out their own sexual status. Protestant clerics had left an all-male monastic living environment and began entering a married state in which "manhood had to be proven in compan-

ionship with the opposite sex." Prior to the Reformation, the clergy experienced a distinctive sexual status because, in principle, "they were virgins, men who had not acquired manhood by mastering a woman through sexual intercourse, men who were in a sense castrated."[84] Roper argues that as the Protestant clergy became "men," or heads of households, they came to hate the Catholic priest figure as he began to symbolize "aspects they wished to obliterate from their own masculine identity."[85] Roper contributes to the discussions of how men were defined by others by identifying how Catholic and Protestant clerics defined other men in relation to their own manhood.

Finally, these scholars contribute to current discussions of how men and women were *defined by social institutions* by exploring how gender identities were closely tied to social and economic activities.[86] For example, scholars have previously examined notions of guild honour, but have not analyzed what it might say about masculinity or femininity.[87] Wiesner-Hanks refines this discussion by focusing on gender. She argues that these scholars have failed to notice the "most important component of [guild honour], this was an honour among *men*, an honour which linked men together with other men and excluded women."[88] These guilds essentially became excellent examples of "male bonding." Wiesner-Hanks argues that this concept rarely appears in historical studies, but that it can help illuminate some of the actions of craft guilds "which were difficult to explain in terms of more standard social, economic, and political factors."[89] These actions included strange guild restrictions, such as forcing a widow to leave her shop and essentially become bankrupt, even though these actions would be against the interests of their own guild members.[90] Wiesner-Hanks explores the concept of "male bonding" to analyze craft guilds and examines how male bonding affected women's access to economic power since skilled work was defined as "men's work."[91] Wiesner-Hanks contributes to current discussions by exploring male bonding and guild systems in order to highlight how men defined themselves, defined themselves against each other and against women, and how their masculinity related to social structures, status, and economic activities.

Conclusion

The first half of this paper discussed how Wunder, Wiesner-Hanks, and Roper challenge traditional history by asserting that women actually

have a history that is worth including in historical studies, especially works on the early modern period. By rethinking structures, approaching sources in creative ways, and re-examining how history affected women, these three scholars have contributed to the field by including women as important topics within their works and critically analyzing what it meant to be a woman during the Reformation period.

In addition, when this field shifted to include gender history, these three scholars seamlessly evolved with it. They explore feminine and masculine conceptions of gender identity through how men and women define themselves, how others have defined them, and how social institutions have shaped their senses of self. These contributions have helped the gender study of the Reformation, as a field, progress from a nearly invisible field to one that has, in a short time, become a very dynamic one.

However, much work still needs to be done in this field because it is clear that there are significant gaps in our knowledge and understanding about both women and men during the early modern period in Europe.[92] Future research may also benefit if scholars ease the tensions between adherents of women's history and gender history. Indeed, this tension is slowly starting to diminish. Many scholars are now describing the field as "women's and gender history," thereby illuminating the connection between them rather than highlighting their differences, which should prove to be useful for future research projects.

Despite the remarkable quantity and quality of previous scholarship, especially the contributions made by Wunder, Wiesner-Hanks, and Roper, this field has not yet experienced a paradigm shift that would lead to a thorough reassessment of the importance of both men and women to the early modern period.

Endnotes

1. See Gertrude Himmelfarb, *The New History and the Old* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987); for other examples of conventional historical works see David Childs, *Britain Since 1945: A Political History* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979); and G. R. Elton, *England Under the Tudors* (London: Methuen, 1955).

2. Gerda Lerner, *The Majority Finds Its Past: Placing Women in History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 133; Merry Wiesner-Hanks, *Gender in History: Global Perspectives* (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 1-2; and Georges Duby and Michelle Perrot, *A History of Women in the West*

(Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), x-xi.

3. Lerner, *The Majority Finds Its Past*, 133.
4. Heide Wunder, *He Is the Sun, She Is the Moon: Women in Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 202.
5. Wunder, *He Is the Sun, She Is the Moon*, 202-3.
6. Wunder, *He Is the Sun, She Is the Moon*, 202.
7. Marilyn Boxer, *When Women Ask the Questions: Creating Women's Studies in America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 10.
8. Colin Brooks, "Writing Women In: The Development of Feminist Approaches to Women's History," in *Historical Controversies and Historians*, ed. William Lamont (London: UCL Press, 1998), 185; Boxer, *When Women Ask the Questions*, 8-9; and Lerner, *The Majority Finds Its Past*, 133-34.
9. Merry Wiesner-Hanks, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 2.
10. Lerner, *The Majority Finds Its Past*, 133.
11. Wiesner-Hanks, *Women and Gender*, 10-11.
12. See Owen Chadwick, *The Reformation* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972); and Euan Cameron, *The European Reformation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).
13. Lerner, *The Majority Finds Its Past*, 140.
14. Ruth Gouldbourne, *The Flesh and the Feminine: Gender and Theology in the Writings of Caspar Schwenckfeld* (Bletchley: Paternoster, 2006), 35.
15. Lynn Abrams and Elizabeth Harvey, *Gender Relations in German History: Power, Agency, and Experience from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 1-5.
16. Kirsi Stjerna, *Women and the Reformation* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2009); Roland Bainton, *Women of the Reformation in Germany and Italy* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1971).
17. Gouldbourne, *The Flesh and the Feminine*, 35-40.
18. See Joan Kelly-Gadol, *Did Women Have a Renaissance?* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977).
19. Wunder, *He Is the Sun, She Is the Moon*, 58-87.

20. See Christine Peters, *Patterns of Piety: Women, Gender, and Religion in Late Medieval and Reformation England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 154-55.

21. Wunder, *He Is the Sun, She Is the Moon*, 58-87.

22. See Susan Karant-Nunn, "Continuity and Change: Some Effects of the Reformation on the Women of Zwickau," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 13, no. 2 (1982): 17-24; for England see also Peters, *Patterns of Piety*, 154-55.

23. See Merry Wiesner-Hanks, *Convents Confront the Reformation: Catholic and Protestant Nuns in Germany* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1996); see also Barbara Harris, "A New Look at the Reformation: Aristocratic Women and Nunneries, 1450-1540," *Journal of British Studies* 32, no. 2 (1993): 89-113.

24. Lyndal Roper, *The Holy Household: Women and Morals in Reformation Augsburg* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 206; see also S.M. Wyntjes, "Women in the Reformation Era," in *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*, ed. Renate Bridenthal (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977).

25. For the effects of closing convents and changing church practices see Katherine French, *The Good Women of the Parish: Gender and Religion After the Black Death* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008); for women and religion see Margaret King,and Albert Rabil, *Teaching Other Voices: Women and Religion in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007); for Catholic nuns see Amy Leonard, *Nails in the Wall: Catholic Nuns in Reformation Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005).

26. Roper, *Holy Household*, 233-37.

27. Merry Wiesner-Hanks, "Protestant Movements," in *Ashgate Research Companion to Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Jane Couchman, Katherine McIver, and Allyson Poska (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 130.

28. Merry Wiesner-Hanks, "Women and the Reformations: Reflections on Recent Research," *History Compass*, 2 (2004): 1-10.

29. Merry Wiesner-Hanks, "Nuns, Wives, Mothers: Women and the Reformation in Germany," in *Women in Reformation and Counter-Reformation Europe: Public and Private Worlds*, ed. Sherrin Marshall (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 8.

30. Wiesner-Hanks, *Nuns, Wives, Mothers*, 25.

31. Wiesner-Hanks, *Nuns, Wives, Mothers*, 25-27.

32. Wiesner-Hanks, *Nuns, Wives, Mothers*, 25-26.

33. Lerner, *The Majority Finds Its Past*, 140.

34. Wiesner-Hanks, *Gender in History*, 1.

35. Wiesner-Hanks, *Women and Gender*, 2.

36. Allan Megill, Steven Shepard, and Phillip Honenberger, *Historical Knowledge, Historical Error: A Contemporary Guide to Practice* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 1-3.

37. Wunder, *He is the Sun*, *She is the Moon,* 203.

38. Wunder, *He is the Sun*, *She is the Moon*, 203.

39. Wunder, *He is the Sun*, *She is the Moon*, 202-3.

40. Wunder, *He is the Sun*, *She is the Moon*, 203-4.

41. Wunder, *He is the Sun*, *She is the Moon*, 204.

42. Lerner, *The Majority Finds Its Past*, 140.

43. Abrams and Harvey, *Gender Relations*, 40; Wiesner-Hanks, *Women and Gender*, 1-2.

44. See also Lara Apps and Andrew Gow, *Male Witches in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003); and J.R. Brink, Allison Coudert, and Maryanne C. Horowitz, *The Politics of Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Kirksville: Sixteenth-Century Journal Publishers, 1989).

45. Lyndal Roper, *Oedipus and the Devil: Witchcraft, Sexuality, and Religion in Early Modern Europe* (London: Routledge, 1994), 201-2.

46. Roper, *Oedipus and the Devil*, 201-2.

47. Roper, *Oedipus and the Devil*, 201.

48. For more traditional views on witchcraft and explanations see Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English, *Witches, Midwives, and Nurses: A History of Women Healers* (Old Westbury: Feminist Press, 1973).

49. See Alice Clark, *Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Routledge, 1992); Susan Cahn, *Industry of Devotion: The Transformation of Women's Work in England, 1500-1660* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987); and Martha Howell, *Women, Production, and Patriarchy in Late Medieval Cities* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

50. Wiesner-Hanks, *Women and Gender*, 129.

51. See also Merry Wiesner-Hanks, "Spinsters and Seamstresses: Women in Cloth and Clothing Production," in *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Margaret Ferguson (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986); 191-205.

52. Wiesner-Hanks, *Women and Gender*, 129-30.

53. This challenge has proven to be beneficial to the study of the Reformation and women that has progressed remarkably in recent years. See Helena Cole, Jane Caplan, and Hanna Schissler, *The History of Women in Germany from Medieval Times to the Present: Bibliography of English-Language Publications* (Washington: German Historical Institute, 2009).

54. Brooks, *Writing Women*, 185.

55. Lerner, *The Majority Finds Its Past*, 133.

56. Natalie Davis, "Women's History in Transition: the European Case," *Feminist Studies* 3, no. 4 (1976): 83-103.

57. At this point, historians differentiated between "sex," by which they meant physical, morphological, and anatomical differences, and "gender," by which they meant a culturally constructed, historically changing, and often unstable system of characteristics. There has been some scrutiny surrounding even the basic theories that deal with gender. For example, the work of Judith Butler has led to a re-examination of "gender" as a term itself. Butler notes that there are instabilities within the term "gender" and "sex" and asserts that "rather than being fixed or 'essential' entities, in fact these terms are both constitutive of and constituted by the effects of hegemonic discourse." See Judith Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 1-16; see also Herbert McAvoy and Teresa Walters, *Consuming Narratives: Gender and Monstrous Appetite in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2002), 2; and Brooks, *Writing Women*, 185.

58. Marianna Muravyeva and Raisa Toivo, *Gender in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 1-2.

59. Abrams and Harvey, *Gender Relations*, 1-5; see also Teresa Meade and Merry Wiesner-Hanks, *A Companion to Gender History* (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004).

60. See Kathleen Canning, "Gender History/Women's History: is Feminist Scholarship Losing its Critical Edge?" *Journal of Women's History* 5 (1993): 102-14; and Gisela Bock, "Challenging Dichotomies: Perspectives on

Women's History," in *Writing Women's History: International Perspectives*, ed. Karen Offen (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), 1-23.

61. See Denise Riley, "Am I that Name? Feminism and the Category of 'Women' in History," *History Workshop* 29 (1990): 159-62.

62. See Wiesner-Hanks, *Gender in History*, 1-5.

63. See Sylvia Brown, *Women, Gender, and Radical Religion in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

64. Clare Lees, *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), xv; and Andrea Pearson, *Women and Portraits in Early Modern Europe: Gender, Agency, Identity* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).

65. Roper, *Oedipus and the Devil*, 13-14.

66. Roper, *Oedipus and the Devil*, 13.

67. For information on masculinity in Europe (mainly England and France) see Susan Broomhall and Gent Van, *Governing Masculinities in the Early Modern Period: Regulating Selves and Others* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2011).

68. Judith Bennett, "Feminism and History," *Gender and History*, 1 (1989): 251-72.

69. It is for this reason that scholars like Bennett have recently asserted that the historian's task is now to think about gender analysis and not simply women's history for historical studies: "We need . . . to develop historical narratives in short – and long-term transformation of gender relations; we need to think about the extent of the impact of shifts in the meanings of masculinity and femininity on the ongoing system of gender relations." See Bennett, *Feminism and History*, 251-72.

70. Wiesner-Hanks, *Gender in History*, 2.

71. See Joan Scott, "Gender: a Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (1986): 619; see also Joan Scott, "Gender: Still a Useful Category of Analysis?" *Diogenes* 57, no. 1 (2010): 7-14.

72. Penny Richards and Jessica Munns, *Gender, Power and Privilege in Early Modern Europe* (Harlow: Pearson & Longman, 2003), 2-3.

73. McAvoy and Walters, *Consuming Narratives*, 1-3.

74. Richards and Munns, *Gender, Power and Privilege,* 2-3.

75. For detailed explanations on how biblical creation stories influenced theological and social understandings of male and female relationships during the early modern period, see Margaret Sommerville*, Sex and Subjection: Attitudes to Women in Early-Modern Society* (London: E. Arnold, 1995).

76. See also Steven Ozment, *Three Behaim Boys: Growing Up in Early Modern Germany* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

77. Heide Wunder, "What Made a Man a Man? Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-century Findings," in *Gender in Early Modern German History*, ed. Ulinka Rublack (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 24.

78. Wunder, *What Made a Man a Man*, 24-25.

79. Wunder, *What Made a Man a Man*, 34.

80. Wunder, *What Made a Man a Man*, 25.

81. Richards and Munns, *Gender, Power and Privilege*, 2-3.

82. Roper, *Oedipus and the Devil*, 43.

83. Roper, *Oedipus and the Devil*, 43.

84. Roper, *Oedipus and the Devil*, 43.

85. Roper, *Oedipus and the Devil*, 43.

86. Richards and Munns, *Gender, Power and Privilege,* 2-3.

87. See Mack Walker, *German Home Towns: Community, State, and General Estate 1648-1871* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1971).

88. Merry Wiesner-Hanks, *Gender, Church, and State in Early Modern Germany: Essays* (London: Longman, 1998), 163-64.

89. Wiesner-Hanks, *Gender, Church and State*, 164.

90. Wiesner-Hanks, *Gender, Church and State*, 174-75.

91. Wiesner-Hanks, *Gender, Church and State*, 173.

92. Lynn Botelho notes that scholars are not yet familiar with women's life stages or ageing, especially how they affect different kinds of women, while others, like Allyson Poska, emphasize the need to use class as a perspective to discern women's experiences. See Poska, Couchman, and McIver, *Ashgate Research Companion*, 7-8.

John Webster Grant – John Moir
Graduate Student Essay Prize Winner 2016

Spouses of Christ or Marys and Marthas: Competing Images of Female Spirituality in the Ursuline Convent of Quebec

KIMBERLY MAIN
University of Toronto

Various unique features marked the foundation of the Ursulines' convent in Quebec City. Led by the enterprising Marie de l'Incarnation in 1639, and precipitated by both her religious visions calling her to New France and her persistence in pursuing this calling, the convent was established by a woman who at the age forty had gone through many changes in her life: young mother, widow, business woman, nun, mystic, and now foundress and hopeful missionary. This latter aspect was also unique: the nuns' active role in converting Aboriginal peoples was to be a complementary role to the Jesuits. Work has been done on Marie and her attributes; the community itself has had a lesser examination. A community, in relation to both its spirit and its canonical legal status, is not as such a true community until it has a rule and constitution. This is where the Quebec Ursulines played an atypical role. In what was essentially a political move, nuns from the two dominant "styles" of Ursulines in France came together to form this community.[1] What resulted was the need for a constitution that reflected this new unity: it was a unique development on its own, since Ursuline convents had been urged to adopt either the constitution of Paris or Bordeaux.[2] The document itself gives a snapshot into the nuns'

values in the seventeenth century.

Historians have focused on this new constitution of Quebec in only a few ways: the changes in the religious habits and the requirement of all choir nuns to pronounce a fourth vow to teach, in particular, being attentive to the education of Aboriginals; or the changes that Bishop Laval made in regards to governance, liturgy (particularly interfering with the desire of the nuns to chant), and the power struggle which ensued between him and Marie. But what these analyses have missed is the actual formulation of *what* an Ursuline nun *is,* and *how* she is supposed to shape her life rather than solely what she does, wears, or with whom she has a political argument. This essay discusses how a competing view of female spirituality emerged in these constitutions, which were co-written by Fr. Jerome Lalemant, at this time the superior of the Jesuits in Canada, and Marie (and possibly some of her advisors).[3] Further, comparing it to contemporary Paris and Bordeaux constitutions gives insight that these constitutions were not simply a "cut-and-paste" exercise; the Quebec *Constitution* was a unique entity in which every word mattered.[4]

The Ursuline order itself was founded in Italy in the sixteenth century by Angela Merici. Its primary work of laywomen helping others, particularly through education, was an attractive feature, and the community quickly grew. With the Tridentine reforms, the desire of the bishops to enclose the Ursulines often prevailed over the women's desire to be uncloistered. Within France, there were numerous Ursuline communities all following their own constitutions. By the 1630s, only two sets of constitutions were dominant: those of Paris, the largest congregation, and those of Bordeaux. The Paris constitution focussed on having a fourth vow, that of instructing girls for free in a school capacity, whereas Bordeaux did not include this vow and understood their role in education more broadly to encompass other women.[5]

The desire to merge these two constitutional groups may have seemed like a straightforward task, but it proved to be a difficult enterprise for the Quebec Ursulines. Guided by the equally strong hands of Lalemant and Marie, they had to merge not only different external looks, but also their own schedules, the schedules for teaching girls, the order of precedence in terms of governance, how those governing positions were defined, and even their approach to liturgy. This last point reflects the oft-cited disagreement between Marie and Laval in regards to chant in the liturgy. Not only was it a power-struggle, one in which Marie sought to use her vows and position as foundress to thwart Laval; it was also an

argument over how nuns were supposed to be, pray, and whether they were first of all nuns or teachers and missionaries.[6] The Quebec constitution, so much more than those of Paris and Bordeaux, illustrate the personal interventions of Lalemant, the nuns, and, finally, Laval, into this interpretation of nuns' daily lives. This can also be seen, in particular, with the competing imagery of the nuns as brides of Christ or as Marys and Marthas. Lalemant pushed the former whereas the contributions of the nuns to the constitutions introduced the latter.

In some ways, the creation of the Quebec *Constitution* comes as a sort of last evolution of the various Ursuline communities. As previously mentioned, the Ursulines evolved from semi-autonomous communities of laywomen. With the imposition of cloister and various bishops' desire to restrain the role of the sisters, the formalization of the Paris and Bordeaux constitutions only reached their finalized forms less than three decades before the Quebec community was founded.[7]

The overall decision to combine the constitutions of Paris and Bordeaux in the Quebec monastery was born of necessity, but it was also highly contentious. Various miscommunications led numerous nuns involved into believing that their originating community would be the constitution that would prevail in New France.[8] Marie herself favoured the keeping of the Tours' habit, but with the adoption of the fourth vow of Paris.[9] This is entirely fitting with her feeling that she was called to teaching and being a missionary to the Aboriginal peoples while fulfilling her first desire to be a cloistered nun.

The Quebec *Constitution* actually consist of the constitution and the "règlemens" in one document, a mix of voices including that of Marie herself. The first part, or the constitution, relates to the spirit, charism, and vows of the nuns. The second part, or "règlemens," discusses the more practical aspects of their life, including the daily schedule and the role of each of the offices, for example, the superior, portress, or procuratrice. This second part, if not written directly by the nuns, shows a great amount of their input. The second part reflects in many ways the continuation of both Paris' minute details on carrying out every function of their lives, as well as Bordeaux's straightforward, no-nonsense tone and detailed description of the various offices. It also appears to show the personal interventions of Marie: the description of the role of superior is fifty-one paragraphs long.[10] This is almost three times the length of the description in the Paris constitution.[11] It also is lengthier than the forty-eight short paragraphs of the Bordeaux constitution.[12] While the Bordeaux constitu-

tion focuses on what the superior is supposed to handle, the Quebec constitution spells out in greater detail the interior (and sometimes exterior) disposition that the superior is supposed to have towards these responsibilities. For example, the superior is instructed that, "she will consider our Lord and his holy Mother as the true superiors of the community who deign to govern it through her intervention as their instrument and their organ."[13] Further, "in all times and in all cases, her eyes, her face, and her word have the duty to feel kindness and gentleness, except in regards to impious persons, contumacious and detrimental to others or malcontents."[14] The Quebec *Constitution* clearly sets out a vision of the ideal superior that goes far beyond her ability to administrate.

What truly sets these constitutions apart is the extent to which they emphasize the nuns as brides of Christ. Within the Paris constitution, there is hardly any usage of the "bride of Christ" trope. In all, the term "Epouses de Jesus-Christ" is used a total of four times. The first is in a section documenting the perfection of sanctity the nuns need so that they may be good examples to the girls whom they teach.[15] In this instance, the phrase is a bit of a throwaway or parenthetical addition to the sentence: "See therefore, Spouses of Jesus Christ, how you are obliged to work in order to acquire great perfection and sanctity."[16] The second and third mentions are in short reflections on the vows of poverty ("the nun, who in order to conform herself to her Spouse our Lord Jesus Christ, renounces all the goods of the earth") and twice in that of chastity: "that we see [in their dress] the becoming modesty of the Spouses of Jesus Christ, who in order to conform to their Spouse despises the world and embraces the Cross."[17] It should be noted that in this section on chastity the definition of modesty is less concerned with sexual purity and more with humble dress and removal of extravagances – it thus is closely linked with poverty. Within these Paris constitution, the bridal imagery is not, therefore, the dominant metaphor that is used. Other images used are those such as "daughters" of God, sister, and "servant of God."[18]

The Bordeaux constitution, for the most part, follows this pattern. Again, they too have a mention of Christ as their spouse in the section on the vow of chastity. This time, the mention is to maintain the "modesty suitable to their religious profession, seeing in each of their sisters the image of Our Lord Jesus Christ, their spouse."[19] The spousal image occurs a couple of times within the description of how they are to teach their students, and, like Paris, it is the nuns' foremost goal to perfect themselves in order to teach the girls. They are particularly to be "imitators" of "their

spouse" in practising the virtues of humility, patience, charity, and gentleness.[20] Unlike in Paris, several of the descriptions of the offices compare the office holder in terms of how they serve the "spouses of Christ," as well as being a reflection of Christ himself. For example, the Dispensary sister "governs the patrimony of Jesus Christ" and the habit-keeper "carefully keeps all the habits which belong to the poor of Jesus-Christ."[21] She is also to "feel in herself an interior joy of having the charge of clothing the spouses of Our Lord."[22] She is to "ask God to adorn her in the nuptial robe in order to go to Heaven."[23] The laundress also is reminded to recall that her sisters are brides of Christ. This heavy emphasis on the bridal imagery may have been a way to help whichever sister was assigned to these undesirable positions so that, even if it was lowly in this life, it had a weighty spiritual importance. The Bordeaux Constitution thus has slightly more uses of the bridal images than the Paris one.

The Quebec *Constitution*, however, uses bridal and marital imagery on a totally different scale. Within the first half, the part written by Lalemant, there are fifty-four mentions, and twenty-seven in the second part, influenced by the nuns, for a total of eighty-one. Clearly, the inclusion of all the bridal imagery indicates in its sheer numbers a willingness to alter the originating texts. Lalemant's writing in the first part is unique in itself. Unlike both of the French communities, Lalemant starts the constitution with what would best be considered a spiritual treatise. The editor, Gabrielle Lapointe, notes that many of these initial entries, such as on the Mass, real and spiritual communion, and of prudence and discretion are completely of Lalemant's own initiative.[24] Considering, as the editor does, that the *Constitution* are thus a reflection of Lalemant's personal spirituality, they become a specific example of male perceptions of female spirituality at this time.[25]

For example, chapter four discusses the vows of poverty and chastity. One passage combines these two themes:

> The vow of religious poverty, or the privation of all external goods left voluntarily in the hands of God or his divine providence, is like the dowry the nun brings to her marriage with Jesus Christ; the vow of perpetual chastity is that which frees the body and all its pleasures into the hands of this lovable and adorable Spouse, with the happy inability to ever be able to have another husband but him.[26]

This reflection on the vows does not end with such a description or hold

to the broader understanding of the vow of chastity and poverty in terms of worldly extravagance and modesty in comportment such as is the case in the other constitutions. Rather, Lalemant takes this reflection into the realm of fears regarding sexual purity. He writes, "this holy and sacred Spouse, as a result of this vow, takes a very particular possession of religious persons, that the sins against the sixth commandment of God, which in other people are only simple sins, become in them sacrilege."[27] No such language is found in either French constitution. Whether or not this is unique in regards to spiritual reflections at this time needs more investigation. Regardless, it is unique because it is a view that becomes enshrined in the document itself. What exactly Lalemant's motivations were for writing this bluntly is also unclear: perhaps the fact that these women were on the edge of empire, as well as their desire to counsel and teach indigenous people, heightened his alarm that they were threatened by the possibility of falling into the "savageness" that was New France.

Lalemant continues throughout the rest of the first part with a similar style of referencing Christ as spouse. In the very lengthy section on the vow of obedience, he reminds the nuns to "obey everything and everywhere with a lot of simplicity and humility . . . leaving a free and whole disposition of themselves in the hands of the officers of their divine Spouse."[28] This is a subtle change from how the Paris and Bordeaux constitutions speak of the role of the officers. These often compare the officers to servants, mothers, or sisters of the "lord" and sometimes God as "master." The more heavy emphasis of the Quebec *Constitution* on the spousal makes the spiritual relationship among the sisters themselves, as well as with God, far more intimate. It retains the notions of filial subservience while adding on to the spousal closeness and possibility of deep betrayal or glory depending on how faithfully the nuns fulfilled their vows.

The nuns themselves did use this nuptial spirituality in the more legalistic and grave prose of the second part. In the reception of novices, they "offer to Our Lord his future bride in order to receive his blessing" and the novice has the principal occupation to "die to herself and live for Jesus Christ as her future spouse."[29] But the novices' agency in carrying out this transformation is also described in far more energetic and violent terms: "Here is to be remarked that in this combat or massacre of the old man one can proceed in two ways: the one cowardly and tepid, the other generous and heroic."[30] When the nuns do use Lalement's wording, it is during their set prayer for the chapter of faults.[31] They have sinned against

their spouse and resolve to do better. This rote prayer helped to draw a heightened drama to the chapter of faults. The nuns' other usage of spouse is left without interpretation so that the individual nun may decide precisely how she relates to the image or as one option amongst many.

There is one other image in particular which warrants examination – that of "Mary and Martha." Within the French constitutions, only Bordeaux uses this image and it is only once, in the description of the office of Superior who in her role as both spiritual and corporate head of the convent fills "both offices of Mary and Martha."[32] Rather, in the Quebec *Constitution* it is the procuratrice (responsible for the accounting, debts, and outside workers) who must join these offices "and make them inseparable."[33] Within Quebec's convent, this Mary is considered to be Mary Magdalene, and the sacristan is also treated with this imagery: that her office is that of "St Magdalene, and St Martha, the dear hostesses of Our Lord."[34] Her job is to prepare the "lodgings" of the Lord, just as these women did in the Gospel, providing food, lodging, and also companionship.[35] Implying that she fills the role of Martha, the cellarer is to "remind herself of the words of Our Lord" to Martha about not worrying and adds a unique interpretation that "one dish was sufficient."[36] While the converse sisters receive much comparison with St. Joseph, a comparison made five times in the small section on the converse sisters, they are reminded that their role in the convent is "principally the office of Martha not forgetting that of Mary Magdalene for often remaining at the sacred feet of the good Lord and kissing them."[37] In combining the two offices, it is also a reminder to the converse nuns that they are subservient. This section goes on to talk of being like Martha, but of frequently raising their thoughts to the Lord. These mentions of Mary and Martha are thus much fewer than the bridal images, but they are more frequent than the ones found in the French texts. Also, since these comparisons only occur in the second half, which was more directly influenced by the nuns, it is highly likely that this interpretation came from the nuns themselves.

Jo Ann McNamara points out that the Mary/Martha duality had been a trope existing for centuries. Its meaning had shifted over the years and, during the sixteenth century, it gained popularity, particularly among married women.[38] The Catholic response to the Protestant Reformation resulted in a greater fear about women's presence in the public sphere; using the Martha imagery in conjunction with acts of charity in hospitals or other institutions was a way for the women to survive marriages that they may have been pressured into while moving towards the religious life

they would have chosen for themselves. Marie de l'Incarnation had her own personal experience with an unwanted marriage, but the vagaries of her life allowed for the eventual pursuit of her chosen vocation. By this time, however, rather than justifying work external to the home, the trope of Mary and Martha appears to have shifted to spiritualizing the servants' roles in the convent. At least within the Quebec monastery, the repeated use of the Martha imagery served both to reinforce the role of the serving nuns and the attendant hierarchical difference between converse sisters and choir nuns. It also served to spiritualize those roles, held by both choir and converse nuns, which dealt with some aspects of labour, business affairs, or with the outside world. The imagery also denotes the value the early constitution put on these converse nuns, both for their domestic work as well as illustrating that their lesser status in the convent did not preclude them from being valuable praying members who could be close to the Lord. The evolution of the Mary/Martha duality is a continuous step in how women religious understood themselves and justified their role within the religious sphere, whether in public or in the convent.

So, why is this competing imagery important? Lalemant puts forward his own interpretation of female spirituality in this *Constitution*. It marks a significant shift in the ways of envisioning Ursuline nuns *vis-à-vis* their constitution while reflecting the greater changes in regards to female spirituality in general at this time. He may also have been hoping to elevate the nuns' status in closeness to Christ, by casting them in spousal terms, as a way to keep them safe on the "frontlines" of the missionary world or to help assuage the bending of the gendered missionary lines.

The Ursulines themselves added to the Mary/Martha spirituality. The additions of the Mary/Martha imagery in the second half of the *Constitution* illustrate their ability to propose their own vision of their spiritual life. The Quebec *Constitution*, as stated above, does make direct use of the biblical passage regarding Mary and Martha, unlike the Bordeaux constitution. At the very least, it indicates knowledge of the biblical passage, but it also shows the direct link between Martha and Jesus as a personal one and not solely a working one. The imagery of Mary, of course, is directly linked with prayer, as Mary was willing to spend time with Jesus, rather than be solely occupied with the material functioning of the household. Further, Claire Walker has examined Ursulines in English cloisters during the seventeenth century and found that they used similar imagery to help justify their commercial work, as

well as to spiritualize the menial labours they performed.[39]

Beside the numerous bridal images in the *Constitution*, there are also numerous images and comparisons that use the language of trade: words such as "craft," "trade" and "commerce" are also found with frequency, particularly in the part written by Lalemant.[40] These terms are used in a spiritual context, that is, to encourage the nuns to be industrious in their prayer lives. Overall, this sort of imagery also reflects the greater precariousness found within the *Constitution*.[41] If the nuns were not energetic in their primary role of prayer, the "enterprise" of the monastic house might fail. Although in a different context than the English Ursulines, both these sets of Ursulines were separated from their traditional networks and used these historical tropes in ways which both set them in line with the thought of their spiritual superiors, but also permitted them a level of freedom in order to pursue their own religious goals. Throughout the Quebec *Constitution*, the precarious nature of the nuns' situation in the colony was written into their foundational document. The continuing possibility of their return to France, their continual poverty and thus their reliance on crafts, which persisted through the eighteenth century, and the fear of enemy attacks, all factored into the provisions and considerations of the *Constitution*. Even the very lengthy section on the necessary qualities of a superior may reflect the internalized fear of the community that, without a strong and holy leader, their initial efforts to evangelize on the periphery could easily fail. Every nun in the entire community was called both to holiness and hard work, each in her own measure and according to her status in the monastery. The Ursulines did not reject wholesale the notion of being brides of Christ, but their constitutions helped support their belief that in being Christ's spouses they could also be Marthas labouring for him.

Endnotes

1. Jérôme Lalemant, *Constitutions et Règlements Des Premières Ursulines de Québec, 1647 Par Le Père Jérôme Lalemant*, ed. Gabrielle Lapointe (Québec: [s.n.], 1974). Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own. I have kept the original sixteenth-century French spelling and grammar of each source.

2. Elizabeth Rapley, *A Social History of the Cloister: Daily Life in the Teaching Monasteries of the Old Regime* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001), 135. Rapley notes that at this time these constitutions were the "principal" rule for Ursulines in France. Guy Marie Oury, *Les Ursulines de Québec, 1639-1953* (Sillery: Septentrion, 1999), 47. Opposition

surrounding this third Ursuline institute came from the superior of the Tours monastery.

3. Léon Pouliot, "Lalemant, Jérôme," *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* (University of Toronto/Université Laval), accessed September 23, 2016, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/lalemant_jerome_1E.html

4. I have used these sources primarily due to ease of access. It should be noted, however, that the 1635 Bordeaux and the 1640 Paris constitutions (Ursulines of Bordeaux, *Les Constitutions de l'institut et compagnie des Religieuses de Sainte Ursule*, (Paris: George Josse, 1635), 1/E,1,1,1,5,1, Archives de Monastère des Ursulines de Québec (AMUQ); Ursulines of Paris, *Les Constitutions des religieuses de Sainte-Ursule de la Congrégation de Paris divisées en trois parties* (Paris : Gilles Blaizot, 1640), 1/E,1,1,1,5,4, AMUQ) also contain the spousal imagery in the same manner and in about the same number as these later versions. In regards to the later Paris constitution, the Quebec Ursulines would have used it after Bishop Laval overturned their unique constitution in 1681. Lalemant, *Constitutions et Règlements*; Ursulines de Paris, *Les Constitutions des Religieuses Ursulines de la Congrégation de Paris: divisées en trois parties* (Paris: chez Louis Josse, 1705); and Ursulines de Bordeaux, *Règles de Saint-Augustin à l'usage des Religieuses de Sainte-Ursule de la Congrégation de Bordeaux* (Vannes: De Lamarrelle, 1839).

5. Jo Ann McNamara, *Sisters in Arms: Catholic Nuns through Two Millennia* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 469-70, discusses the creation of the first Ursuline constitutions and the implementation of cloister. Oury, *Les Ursulines de Québec*, 33.

6. Numerous authors have written about this argument between Laval and Marie, each with their own focus on what the primary cause of the disagreement was and to what extent Marie ceded control to Laval. See, for example, Oury, *Les Ursulines de Québec*; Claire Gourdeau, *Les Délices de Nos Coeurs : Marie de l'Incarnation et Ses Pensionnaires Amérindiennes, 1639-1672* (Sillery: Septentrion, 1994); Marie-Florine Bruneau, *Women Mystics Confront the Modern World: Marie de l'Incarnation (1599-1672) and Madame Guyon (1648-1717)* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998); and Jean-Pierre Pinson, "Quel Plain-Chant Pour La Nouvelle-France? L'exemple Des Ursulines," *Canadian University Music Review* 11, no. 2 (1991): 7-32.

7. Oury, *Les Ursulines de Québec,* 31-33. The Tours congregation was relatively new, founded out of Bordeaux in 1622. Both of these constitutional groups had followed simple vows until 1612 for Paris and 1618 for Bordeaux. In fact, the Bordeaux constitution still alluded to these simple vows in their description of the taking of vows. When solemn vows were taken, the nuns were constrained to a stricter form of cloister than what they had previously

followed.

8. Oury, *Les Ursulines de Québec,* 46. Anne le Bugle and Marguerite de Flecelles came from Paris and believed that they would continue as they had done in Paris.

9. Oury, *Les Ursulines de Québec,* 46.

10. *Constitutions et règlemens*, 183-200.

11. Ursulines de Paris, *Constitutions de Paris,* 3: 22-34.

12. Ursulines de Bordeaux, *Constitutions de Bordeaux*, 98-113.

13. *Constitutions et règlemens*, 184. «Elle considèrera Nostre-Seigneur et sa sainte Mère comme les vrais Supérieurs et Supérieure de la Communauté qui daignent la gouverner par son entremise, comme par leur instrument et par leur organe.»

14. *Constitutions et règlemens*, 186. «En tout temps et en tous cas, ses yeux, son visage et sa parole se doivent ressentir de la douceur et bénignité, excepté au regard des personnes impies, contumaces et nuisibles aux autres ou inquiètes.»

15. *Constitutions de Paris*, 1:17.

16. *Constitutions de Paris*, 1:17. «Voyez donc, Epouses de Jesus-Christ, combine vous êtes obligées de travailler à acquérir une grande perfection & saintété.»

17. *Constitutions de Paris*, 2: 39, 45. «La Religieuse, qui pour se conformer à son Epoux notre Seigneur Jesus Christ, à renoncé à tous les biens de la terre,» and «que l'on voye en la modestie convenable aux Epouses de Jesus-Christ, qui pour se conformer à leur Epoux ont méprisé le monde & embrassé la Croix.»

18. *Constitution de Paris*, 2:101.

19. *Constitutions de Bordeaux*, 28. «Que leur maintien ressente la modestie convenable à leur profession religieuse, regardant en chacune de leurs sœurs l'image de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ, leur époux.»

20. *Constitutions de Bordeaux*, 86-87.

21. *Constitutions de Bordeaux*, 182, 185.

22. *Constitutions de Bordeaux*, 186.

23. *Constitutions de Bordeaux*, 186. «Elle demande à Dieu qu'il la revête de la robe nuptiale pour aller au ciel.»

24. *Constitutions et règlemens*, xiii.

25. *Constitutions et règlemens*, xiv.

26. *Constitutions et règlemens*, 8. «Le vœu de pauvreté religieuse ou le despouillement de tous les bien extérieurs laissez volontairement entre les main de Dieu ou de sa divine providance estant comme le dot que la religieuse aporte pour son mariage avec Jésus-Christ, le voue de chasteté perpétuelle est celuy qui livre le corps et tous ce plaisirs entre les mains de cet aymable et adorable Espoux, avec une heureuse incapacité de pouvoir jamais avoir autre espoux que luy.»

27. *Constitutions et règlemens*, 8. «Ce saint et sacré Espoux en suite de ce vœu prend une si particulière possession des personnes religieuses, que les péchez contre le sixiesme commendement de Dieu qui, en d'autres personnes ne seroient que simples péchez, deviendroient en elles des sacrilèges.»

28. *Constitutions et règlemens,* 19.

29. *Constitutions et règlemens*, 111, 114.

30. *Constitutions et règlemens*, 117.

31. *Constitutions et règlemens*, 152.

32. *Constitutions de Bordeaux,* 109.

33. *Constitutions et règlemens*, 209.

34. *Constitutions et règlemens*, 230. «Sainte Madeleine, et sainte Marthe, les chères hôtesses de Nostre-Seigneur.»

35. *Constitutions et règlemens*, 231.

36. *Constitutions et règlemens*, 236. See Luke 10: 40-42 (Douay-Rheims). "And the Lord answering, said to her: Martha, Martha, thou art careful, and art troubled about many things: But one thing is necessary. Mary hath chosen the best part, which shall not be taken away from her."

37. *Constitutions et règlemens*, 250.

38. McNamara, *Sisters in Arms*, 457.

39. Claire Walker, "Combining Mary and Martha: Gender and Work in Seventeenth-Century English Cloisters," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 30, no. 2 (Summer 1999): 397-418.

40. Lalemant, *Constitutions et Règlements,* 41-43.

41. In Lalemant's section on the nuns' fourth vow, he also discusses what happens if the convent is not successful. «Que si quelque revolution d'affaires ou nécessité particulière obligeoit les sœurs de ce monastère ou congrégation de se retirer en France, les sœurs d'iceluy demeureont libres de toutes les obligations particulières de ce monastère ou congrégation, pour entrer dans celles des monastères de France où elles seroient receues, le tout néanmoins conformément aux articles du contract de la fondations autant qu'il se poura.» *Constitutions et règlemens*, 84.

"The World of Politics is the World of Possibilities": Bill C-43 and Canadian Evangelical Political Engagement

AARON A. MIX-ROSS
Wycliffe College, University of Toronto

In 1969, Pierre Elliot Trudeau's Liberal government redefined abortion within the context of the *Criminal Code of Canada*. In so doing, the federal government lifted legal limitations on abortion without rendering it universally accessible. Prior to this, abortions could only be performed in hospital, and only if a committee of professionals determined that continuation of the pregnancy would endanger the expectant mother's health.[1] On 17 April 1982, the British Parliament's *Canada Act* patriated the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (better known as the *Charter*). The *Charter's* purpose was, and remains, to limit the encroachment of the Canadian government upon the rights of citizens.[2] In January 1988, the Supreme Court of Canada (Supreme Court) handed down the well-know abortion decision involving pro-choice physician Dr. Henry Morgentaler. The Supreme Court interpreted Section 251 of the *Criminal Code of Canada (Criminal Code)* – the section that pertained to abortion – through Section 7 of the Charter. Section 7 of the *Charter* declares the Canadian citizen's rights to "life, liberty and security of person"; the Supreme Court considered access to abortion to fall within these rights. Chief Justice Brian Dickson wrote:

> Forcing a woman, by threat of criminal sanction, to carry a fetus to term unless she meets certain criteria unrelated to her own priorities and aspirations, is a profound interference with a woman's body and thus a violation of her security of the person.[3]

The Supreme Court's decision rendered Canada as one of only a few countries lacking any regulation on abortion.[4]

In response to this vacuum, on 3 November 1989, Brian Mulroney's Progressive Conservative government introduced Bill C-43 to reassert the regulation of abortion by reintroducing it into the *Criminal Code*. Canadian conservative Christian ethicists and lobby groups prominently discussed and debated Bill C-43. In particular, the Evangelical Fellowship of Canada (the EFC) encouraged Parliament to reintroduce legislation in order to regulate abortion.[5]

The EFC named Brian Stiller its full-time Executive Director in 1983. In this role, Stiller involved the organization more directly and consistently in Canadian public life.[6] During Stiller's tenure as Executive Director, the EFC maintained an estimated 2.5 million constituents, representing over 100 organizations, and twenty-eight denominations.[7] Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the EFC submitted ethical and moral position papers to federal and provincial governments. "Abortion . . . [was] predictably at the top of the list of concerns."[8] Still, consensus among conservative Christians on these issues proved difficult to attain. Some wished for a gradual limitation on abortion, others for the legal prevention of abortion, and still others for the criminalization of abortion. In spite of these internal differences of opinion, most were outwardly outspoken regarding Bill C-43. After the House of Commons passed Bill C-43, the Senate rendered a tie vote, striking down the Bill, and leaving Canada without any laws to regulate abortion.[9]

This article examines two conservative Christian groups: the EFC and one of its prominent member denominations, the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada (the PAOC),[10] comparing and contrasting the responses to abortion of both groups. Established in Ontario in 1919, the PAOC grew to a nationwide denomination, claiming 222,000 adherents in 1991.[11] In 1976, the PAOC General Executive perceived a "'critical point' of moral deterioration in the nation" and responded by establishing the Office of Social Concerns. The PAOC General Executive appointed a Toronto pastor, Hudson Hilsden, as Coordinator from 1982 to 1991.[12] Hilsden allocated a significant amount of time and resources to responding to the abortion issue. It is helpful to compare and contrast the EFC and the PAOC. These organizations, at times, disagreed on their positions and strategies surrounding abortion, and this tension played out when they approached Parliament independently of one another. This fact alone poses

some degree of irony, because, as was mentioned, the PAOC was a member organization of the EFC. As such, the PAOC's positions should have been reflected in the EFC's Parliamentary submissions, without requiring the PAOC to make submissions independently. By examining the newsletters and publications of the PAOC and the EFC (collectively "the evangelicals"), this article outlines their positions and submissions, and argues that they failed to convey a cohesive position on Bill C-43.

The 1988 Supreme Court of Canada Decision

The Supreme Court's decision on abortion proved controversial, provoking an unprecedented volume of pro-life protest. *Faith Today*, the EFC's main publication, commented on the scale of protests.[13] It recognized the unrest as "one of the first instances when criminal convictions have resulted" from pro-life protest. *Faith Today* quoted a protestor: "give me a law that I can obey – a law that extends justice, mercy and the rule of love and care to our unborn children as well as to others – and I assure you that I will obey it with all my heart."[14] Stiller pleaded with protestors to curb their assertiveness, claiming that, "though I stand behind their right to practise civil disobedience, I plead with them to be tolerant of the long-term strategy."[15] Stiller cited Gallup poll findings showing 13 percent of Canadians opposing abortion altogether, and an additional 27 percent opposing abortion on demand. Stiller's "long-term strategy" was to persuade a portion of the remaining 60 percent to support a law that resembled a pro-life position.[16] More than wishing to quell protests, Stiller's comments indicated his desire to act.

The Supreme Court's decision did not provoke only the pro-life groups; many within the general public were concerned by the removal of abortion from the Criminal Code. Only days after the Supreme Court decision, a *London Free Press* editorial urged Parliament to legislate new restrictions on abortion.[17] Further, Robert Nadeau, legal consultant to the EFC, stated in a *Faith Today* article that he believed the Progressive Conservative government wished to introduce legislation to regulate abortion.[18]

The Evangelicals' Response to the Supreme Court's 1988 Decision

As it was a relatively young movement, neo-evangelicalism in Canada had not addressed social issues in the public setting *en masse*

before this time, unlike the broader spectrum of churches.[19] Catholics, for example, were outspoken, arguing for the legal protection of the unborn.[20] Pollster Kurt Bowen noted that, "the . . . (PAOC), paid little or no attention to social involvement and public affairs until at least the middle of the 1970s."[21] Church historian John Stackhouse credited Trudeau with motivating Canadian neo-evangelicals, as his government

> accepted a variety of moral behaviours that evangelicals wished they would not accept. The Evangelical Fellowship of Canada . . . since the mid-1980s . . . made clear that evangelicals have been unhappy with many aspects of Canadian life, . . . [not least of which the] increasing rates of abortion.[22]

The socio-political events that came to the fore during the 1980s moved the evangelicals to social action. In doing so, they came to share common ground with the Catholic Church, and, in their social and political engagement, drew closer to the Catholics of that era than they did to mainline Protestantism.[23] Generally, the evangelicals drew their positions from the interpretation of Scripture. Hudson Hilsden cited Psalm 139 as a core passage prompting his pro-life position.[24] The evangelicals occasionally argued a pro-life position on the bases of ethics, constitutionality, and, in rare instances, science. Yet, in referencing Scripture, the evangelicals, for the most part, did not communicate in the vocabulary of present day political parlance.[25] Given the impact of the Supreme Court and the *Charter* on these issues, the evangelicals were remiss in not addressing more thoroughly the constitutional definitions of the rights of both mother and child, choosing instead to emphasize primarily Scriptural arguments. Although an argument derived solely from Scriptural interpretation is appropriate in ecclesial settings, it is likely to be less persuasive elsewhere. A successful position before decision makers during such a constitutional debate must be cogently argued in language that is universal and relevant. The evangelical side also lacked – or was silent – regarding the hard scientific data necessary to argue for constitutional and legal protection of the unborn.[26]

Nevertheless, Stiller, more than Hilsden, attempted to articulate a position that could be understood by the general public. On behalf of the EFC, Stiller pleaded that the Canadian public would "consider the possibility of life existing in the fetus."[27] The EFC believed that all human life must be protected, including the life of the unborn. However, the EFC did not go so far as to argue that the unborn possesses personhood. With

respect to its dealings with government, the EFC was willing to negotiate the constitutional status of the unborn for the express purpose of influencing legislation that would offer some degree of regulation on abortion.[28] To this extent, the EFC was prepared to accept a compromise position. The PAOC, on the other hand, argued for the personhood of the unborn, and it was on this issue that the two organizations differed most significantly. Although the EFC did not argue for the personhood of the unborn, it is still considered a pro-life organization, as it supports constitutional protection for the unborn.

The evangelicals wished to uphold the rights of the unborn without detracting from women's rights. Yet if an expectant mother exercises choice, her decision necessarily holds implications for the rights of the unborn and sets up a conflict between the rights of the mother and the unborn. The evangelicals did not offer a convincing solution to this conflict; instead, the groups maintained that the unborn's right to life superseded the expectant mother's right to choose. Expounding the rights of the unborn without detracting from a woman's right of person proved to be a difficult task.[29] The EFC was concerned that the Supreme Court had decided in favour of a woman's right, "without giving consideration to the question of life itself." The EFC sought restrictions on abortion "that attempt[ed] to balance the rights of the mother and fetus by protecting the fetus unless great[er] damage would be done to the mother."[30]

Some within the EFC offered a moderate response to the *Morgentaler* decision. Denyse O'Leary, a prominent evangelical pro-life writer, believed that reintroducing abortion into the *Criminal Code* would be ineffective. Preceding *Morgentaler*, abortions were prevalent;[31] in fact, in 1982, nearly 70,000 abortions were performed, or almost eighteen abortions for every 100 live births.[32] Comparing these to 2005 figures, 96,815 or 14.1 abortions were performed for every 1,000 women aged 15 to 44.[33] While the increase in the number of abortions between 1982 and 2005 is noteworthy, the increase is not extraordinary. O'Leary concluded that the abortion rate was high already in 1982, and, as such, she and other evangelicals predicted that regulation alone was not sufficient to reduce the number of abortions.[34] O'Leary was optimistic that Parliament would enact sufficient *modern* legislation in order to replace the out-dated, and now unconstitutional, section 251 of the *Criminal Code*.[35] O'Leary frequently contributed to the EFC's flagship periodical, *Faith Today*, as well as other EFC publications. Her contributions and opinions provided a female voice to the EFC's arguments and positions. The female voice

was all but absent from the PAOC's arguments. Perhaps it was the EFC's inclusion of opinions such as those of Denyse O'Leary that contributed to more balanced and moderate arguments than those of the PAOC.

In April 1989, the EFC held its annual General Council and moved to appoint official and designated spokespeople to promote new abortion laws and lobby for public policies reflecting the "EFC's position on the sanctity of human life . . . [and taking] significant steps toward legally protecting the human right to life of the unborn and meeting the socioeconomic needs of the parents."[36] In stating this, the EFC displayed a willingness to be flexible in its approach to supporting legislation regulating abortion, including supporting proposals as steps. The PAOC was particularly inflexible in its opposition to Parliamentary proposals.

Like the EFC, the PAOC advocated the sanctity of the unborn, and maintained that the unborn comprises human life; however, the PAOC was more stringent than the EFC, viewing the unborn as possessing personhood from the moment of conception. Also, like the EFC, the PAOC was unwilling to compromise its respective moral position. Yet, unlike the EFC, the PAOC did not position itself to negotiate a practical outcome with government; rather, it insisted upon Parliament's recognition of the unborn as a person. Hilsden believed that if government defined the unborn as a person, then logically the *Charter* would be required to protect the right to life of the unborn. The PAOC desired absolute restriction on abortion, resisting any proposal that was not purely pro-life in its orientation.[37]

The PAOC's initial response was to decry the *Morgentaler* decision, criticizing it for neither protecting nor defining personhood for the unborn. The court focussed its decision on determining when the unborn is viable, and therefore entitled to protection under the *Charter*. Immediately following the decision, the PAOC appealed to its constituency to pressure Parliament to implement legislation that would protect the unborn, respect the expectant mother, and not offend the *Charter*.[38] In its May 1988 *News Release*, the PAOC warned its constituency that, "once legislation is tabled in the House of Commons, we must count on you . . . either to support the legislation if it is good or oppose it if it is bad."[39]

On this point, the EFC, too, was optimistic that legislation would be enacted that would not offend the *Charter*. The EFC relied on Madam Justice Wilson's wording in *Morgentaler*, underscoring the validity of a state interest in the unborn and resolving that

> the state's compelling interest in the protection of the foetus . . . I leave to the informed judgement of the legislature which is in a position to receive guidance on the subject from all relevant disciplines. It seems to me, however, that it might fall somewhere in the second trimester.[40]

Stiller commented: "this decision . . . has affirmed that the responsibility for defining life belongs to Parliament and not the courts."[41] The EFC could only speculate on whether or not the *Charter* would allow proposed legislation regulating abortion, but was ready and willing to lobby for such legislation.

The Introduction of Bill C-43

The Progressive Conservative government – and even more so the pro-life groups – believed the Supreme Court decision allowed Parliament to respond with new legislation. Notwithstanding the Supreme Court's interpretation of Section 7 of the *Charter*, pro-life groups believed new and "more pro-life" legislation was possible.[42] Paul Marshall, chair of the EFC's Social Action Commission, summarized the decision, stating that "the Court did not say that restrictions on abortion are unconstitutional; it said that Section 251's way of restricting them is unconstitutional."

The Government tabled Bill C-43 on 3 November 1989, intending to reintroduce abortion regulations to the Criminal Code. The Bill permitted an abortion when a physician deemed it necessary. Specifically, the Bill stated:

> [e]very woman is prohibited from having an abortion unless a doctor consents to the abortion by deciding that a woman's life or health is threatened without it. With the added power to define health according to their professional standards, doctors will remain one of the gatekeepers of women's autonomy.[43]

Effectively, Bill C-43 would make abortion punishable by up to two years in prison unless a doctor determined continuing a pregnancy threatened a woman's physical, mental or psychological health.[44]

It is noteworthy that the early language of Bill C-43 proposed twenty-two weeks as an appropriate cut-off point, after which time restrictions on abortion would become much more stringent.[45] Accordingly, Bill C-43, in its initial stage, advocated what is called "the

gestational approach." The gestational approach places higher priority and value on the unborn's status the further along in gestation. Again, reflecting on the wording of Madam Justice Wilson's decision, the government believed regulation based upon the gestational approach would be less likely to conflict with *Morgentaler*. The PAOC particularly opposed the gestational approach, likely fueled by the denomination's position on the personhood of the unborn.[46] The PAOC, in its monthly *News Release*, criticized the effectiveness of the gestational approach, stating that over 90 percent of abortions were performed within the first week of gestation. The EFC was willing to concede the gestational approach stating that, "it was a compromise on *position*, but not on *principle*," and believing that some regulation was better than none.[47] Interestingly, the government responded and made changes to some of the Bill's wording, following which dialogue about the Bill shifted from the unborn's developmental status to the health of the expectant mother. The new wording implied that an expectant mother seeking to exercise choice needed only to find a sympathetic physician. The physician could then diagnose the expectant mother's health to be at risk on the basis of any number of criteria.[48] As a result, the evangelicals feared the Bill would effectively allow abortion on demand.

The Progressive Conservative government proved very reluctant to permit any further rewording, believing it would jeopardize the Bill's ability to pass. The government wished very strongly to legislate on abortion without offending the *Charter*, but, in order to do so, the government needed to articulate the proposed legislation in very broad terms.[49] Ultimately, Justice Minister Kim Campbell announced that the government would not entertain further amendments.[50] The Speaker of the House of Commons refused fourteen proposed amendments from the pro-life side,[51] while those few amendments made by Parliament were insufficient to garner the evangelicals' consensus.

The constitutional rights and freedoms of individuals may compete with each other and are therefore subject to balancing. This is reflected in section 1 of the *Charter* that considers the basic principle that individual rights and freedoms cannot be absolute and that, in some circumstances, they must be limited by the state in order to protect competing rights. The evangelicals argued that while indeed the expectant mother is entitled to certain rights, in the instances where she wishes to exercise choice, her rights conflict with what the evangelicals believed to be the unborn's right to life. Essentially, the evangelicals wished to sway the balance in favour

of the unborn, thereby encouraging constitutional protection for the unborn. The PAOC maintained that, as a person, the unborn is entitled to complete rights and protections, and would not surrender any ground to this ideal. The EFC, on the other hand, was more flexible on this point, and willing to negotiate with the government, provided the outcome included some form of protection for the unborn. The evangelicals' different philosophies, and lack of cohesion, contributed to the ineffectiveness of their respective arguments.

The Evangelicals' Inconsistency Regarding Bill C-43

By late 1989, the EFC had joined "a ground-breaking interfaith coalition" that lobbied the government with respect to Bill C-43.[52] In an action indicative of the pro-life groups' inability to achieve consensus, certain individual member organizations independently drafted separate submissions to Parliament. The organizations vehemently stressed their respective opinions through these separate submissions.[53] Of course, the PAOC was one of those organizations to act independently from the EFC. One can only imagine that the groups' competing methods did not rest well with the Parliamentary process. Still, Hilsden attempted to offer moral support to the EFC. In the April 1990 *News Release*, Hilsden stated that, "Brian Stiller, Executive Director of *The Evangelical Fellowship of Canada*, has appeared at the hearings and has represented well the concerns of EFC and its member groups, including the PAOC."[54]

As already noted, the EFC did not entirely agree with Bill C-43, but it was willing to negotiate with the government. The EFC extended moral support for Bill C-43 by way of subtle arguments put forward through *Faith Today* articles. One writer argued that, "the pro-life faction . . . recognized that the longer we went without a law, the harder it would be to enact one."[55] The EFC understood that although Bill C-43 was not perfect in wording, it was better than the absence of any law and was the best solution given the circumstances. Jake Epp, then Minister of Health, and a self-professing evangelical, described his own government's Bill C-43 as a "compromise" because it did not encompass the sanctions for the unborn he believed necessary. Still, it was a compromise Epp was willing to make.[56] Conversely, the PAOC's approach was much more unilateral, lobbying the government to change its position or abandon Bill C-43 altogether.

As early as January 1990, only two months after the government

introduced Bill C-43, the PAOC made clear to its constituents its desire to oppose the Bill. The PAOC declared that "Bill C-43 is a prescription for abortion on demand" and that it needed to be "scrapped." The PAOC further stated, "we therefore urge each and every MP to vote against Bill C-43 when it comes up for third and final reading."[57] In a later *News Release*, the PAOC drafted a

> strongly-worded brief to the legislative committee…on the government's proposed . . . Bill C-43 . . . point[ing] out that the bill would not reduce the number of abortions in Canada and provides no protection whatsoever for the unborn child. . . . It would give official approval to the indiscriminate, unrestricted and unlimited killing of innocent, unborn children.[58]

The PAOC believed that if Bill C-43 was overturned, another, more pro-life, bill would follow.

When it came time to vote, the House of Commons passed Bill C-43 by a wide margin. The Bill progressed to the Senate in January 1991 where it was subjected to committee hearings and debates, and a final vote conducted on 31 January. The Progressive Conservative government tried to persuade Tory Senators to support the Bill. Liberal Senator Stanley Haidasz told reporters that the Prime Minister's Office placed "unbearable" pressure upon the Senators, adding that he suspected more Tory Senators would have voted against the Bill had it not been for such tactics. Of the Liberal Senators, only two supported the Bill with seven voting against. Liberal Senators reported no pressure from their party either to oppose or support the Bill.[59] The result of the Senate vote was a 43-43 tie, which meant the Bill's defeat.[60]

It is difficult to assess how the evangelicals responded to Bill C-43's defeat. In fact, *Faith Today* offered only one column in response to Bill C-43's demise.[61] Perhaps the evangelicals' silence reflects the sombre insight of retrospection. The PAOC issued statements hinting at remorse for opposing the Bill.[62] While Hilsden believed Bill C-43 was only a "small step toward protecting innocent preborn children,"[63] he also felt that "it was better than no Bill and, if amendments were not allowed, should be passed, with the hope of making amendments later. The Bill would have returned abortion to the Criminal Code."[64]

This conclusion was a moot point given that it came after the Bill's defeat. However, this statement indicated a completely different position than that which Hilsden and the PAOC had articulated all along. Only after

the Bill's failure did Hilsden suggest that evangelicals should have supported the Bill. These retrospective remarks were likely prompted by the government's announcements that it would not table another abortion bill. Additionally, for his part, Stiller personally endorsed Bill C-43, considering it the best possible compromise given the circumstances.[65]

It is somewhat sobering to examine the history of Bill C-43 and its failure to achieve passage. Both pro-life and pro-choice groups opposed the Bill, yet the House of Commons passed it. Bill C-43 weathered this storm only to have the Senate strike it down, and by a tie-vote at that. The historian is left to wonder whether or not the attempted legislation would have withstood subsequent examination by the Supreme Court and the *Charter.* Even in the face of opposition from evangelical pro-lifers, the government remained adamant in its desire to pass Bill C-43. As Hilsden noted, "many pro-life MPs are . . . prepared to vote in favor [sic] of the legislation because they believe this bill is better than no bill at all."[66]

Perhaps Stiller, Hilsden, and each of their respective organizations were correct in their suspicions that Bill C-43 would have done little to limit the number of abortions in Canada. Still, a December 1990 *News Release* provided compelling indicators to the contrary. As a result of the proposed bill, fifty doctors reported stopping abortion procedures. Another 275 doctors claimed they would stop doing abortions altogether should Parliament enact legislation.[67] Perhaps future legislation regulating abortion could produce results to this effect.

Conclusion: The Future of the Evangelical Pro-Life Movement

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the evangelicals were ineffective in articulating a cohesive and persuasive pro-life position. The PAOC, in particular, believed accepting Bill C-43 to be tantamount to supporting abortion on demand. As has been indicated throughout this article, this degree of conviction was admirable. Yet, it was also ineffective.[68] "The world of politics is the world of possibilities."[69] Were the evangelicals – the PAOC in particular – to have more robustly, and more uniformly, supported Bill C-43, the regulation of abortion, albeit a loose regulation, may have resulted. Denyse O'Leary advocated a kind of evangelical response to ethical and moral issues which was willing to strike a compromise: "We think of positions on political issues as statements of faith, with the result that discussion turns into warfare . . . for certain Canada . . . [has] had heavy losses because of this problem."[70] The

evangelicals fell victim to the kind of thinking O'Leary described.

To have stayed open to Bill C-43's possibilities would have contributed to a forum where dialogue on the subject of the status and rights of the unborn might have continued. Instead, twenty-seven years later, a vacuum remains. The public does not seem opposed to reopening discussions on this topic. Yet, in order to be heard, proponents of abortion reform must craft their arguments tactfully, but they have thus far had little, if any, success.

It is impossible to say whether Bill C-43 would have succeeded had the evangelicals more fully cooperated with one another and remained open to the Bill's potential. Yet it may be possible to say that future legislation is more likely to be influenced, if these groups cooperate and encourage common engagement on Parliamentary proposals. Following the *Morgentaler* decision, Stiller stated, "what does concern me is not the Court ruling so much as the seeming lack of moral leadership within the church community."[71] Stiller went on to decry the silence and fragmentation of the conservative Protestant voice on ethical and moral issues. If faith-based groups are ever to influence Parliament toward abortion reform, the groups must increase their effectiveness by voicing a common position. Stiller indicated the desire to cooperate, "We need a willingness to work together on areas of agreement while recognizing that the existence of disagreements between people who work together does not mean that we have compromised."[72] During initial readings of Bill C-43, the Anglican Church of Canada tactfully informed the EFC that, "governments usually listen to churches which are acting together more than to those that are acting apart, on their own behalf."[73]

Perhaps faith groups today will achieve greater consensus and cooperation. Consider the position of the United Church of Canada (UCC) during initial readings of Bill C-43. The UCC urged Parliament not to recriminalize abortion while not allowing abortion on demand.[74] The UCC considered abortion to be "acceptable only in certain medical, social and economic situations."[75] Finally, the UCC urged Parliament to enact measures allowing for counselling for expectant mothers considering the right to choose.[76] The UCC's position did not correspond to the evangelicals' ideals. Yet Parliament – and particularly the Senate – likely would have been more accommodating of a moderate, uniform position rather a fragmented one.

Any legislation regulating abortion is better than the absence of legislation altogether. Should future legislation be implemented which

allows for a certain amount of regulation, even if minimal, it would lessen the number of abortions being performed at present. Moreover, as legislation is implemented, and as it cooperates with the *Charter,* it may move toward a more pure pro-life position over time. Faith-based groups wishing to achieve abortion reform must be content to work within the system that now exists. Parliament did not pass Bill C-43; nevertheless, having learned from past experience, there is no reason to abandon hope for future opportunities.

Endnotes

1. CBC News, "Abortion rights: significant moments in Canadian history," CBC News, http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/story/2009/01/13/f-abortion-timeline.html (accessed February 26, 2012).

2. Mark A. Noll, *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992), 453.

3. CBC News.

4. CBC News.

5. British historian of Christianity David Bebbington classifies evangelicalism by the following characteristics: prioritization of a conversion experience (conversionism); activism within an ecclesial setting; belief in the authority of Scripture (biblicentricism); and the soteriological implications of Christ's crucifixion (crucicentricism). David Bebbington, "Evangelicalism in Its Settings: The British and American Movements since 1940," in *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700-1990*, ed. Mark A. Noll, David W. Bebbington, and George A. Rawlyk (New York: Oxford, 1994), 365. The EFC exists as a *neo-evangelical* organization. The EFC is the Canadian equivalent of the United-States-based National Association of Evangelicals (NAE). Similar founding principles guided both organizations. Further, figures such as the American Carl Henry and Canadian Oswald J. Smith among others, contributed to the fledgling organizations. Garth M. Rosell, *The Surprising Work of God: Harold John Ockenga, Billy Graham, and the Rebirth of Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 29. In order to understand the neo-evangelical tenets that characterize the EFC, it is useful to examine a timeline of the NAE. A selection of conservative Protestants in the United States moved away from fundamentalism and contributed to the founding of the NAE in 1942. William Inboden, *Religion and American Foreign Policy, 1945-1960: The Soul of Containment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 56-57 and Bebbington, 365. Harold John Ockenga

and evangelists Charles Fuller and Billy Graham all served to advance the NAE's agenda. Rosell, 73. As the NAE's founding president, Ockenga undertook nationwide tours, networking, and raising support for the grassroots organization. Beyond his national commitments, Ockenga also endeavoured to forge ties internationally. In 1946 Ockenga visited London and preached in Martyn Lloyd-Jones' Westminster Chapel. While in London, Ockenga also undertook negotiations toward developing international evangelical cooperation. Bebbington, 368. In this sense, Ockenga served as an international ambassador of neo-evangelicalism. Undoubtedly Ockenga's diplomatic efforts influenced Canadian Protestants. The EFC does not exist as a directly affiliated chapter of the NAE. While the two organizations are similar, they exist as separate entities. Unlike the NAE, the EFC does not require constituents to disassociate from mainstream Protestant ecumenical groups. Some EFC constituents also maintained membership in the Canadian Council of Churches. By the 1990s, the EFC had an annual income of two million dollars. John G. Stackhouse, *Canadian Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century: An Introduction to Its Character* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1999), 171-2.

Evangelical Fellowship of Canada Beginnings. During the early 1960s, a Toronto pastor, J. Harry Faught, established a network of conservative Protestant pastors that grew and ultimately culminated in the founding of the EFC in 1964. Ronald A.N. Kydd, "Canadian Pentecostalism and the Evangelical Impulse," in *Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience*, ed. George A. Rawlyk, (Montréal: McGill Queens University Press, 1997), 297-99. Harry Faught earned a ThD from Dallas Theological Seminary. In Dallas, Faught worshipped at an Assemblies of God (AG USA) congregation. In Toronto, Faught pastored the PAOC's Danforth Gospel Temple. Faught enjoyed interdenominational, evangelical dialogue in Dallas, and sought to implement something similar through his pastoral network in Toronto. This loose network grew into the Evangelical Fellowship of Canada. The EFC was characterized by neo-evangelical tenets and initially existed only as a loosely organized network of denominations and member congregations. Noll, *A History of Christianity in the United States and Canada*, 448. Noll describes the founding of the EFC as having been motivated by denominations such as the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada and the Christian Missionary Alliance wishing to collaborate so as to project a public voice equivalent to those of the Catholics and mainstream Protestants.

6. Stackhouse, *Canadian Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century*, 165.

7. Don Page, "From a Private to a Public Religion: The History of the Public Service Christian Fellowship," in *Religion and Public Life in Canada: Historical and Comparative Perspectives*, ed. Marguerite Van Die, (Toronto:

University of Toronto Press, 2001), 305. In addition to his role as Executive Director of the EFC, Stiller hosted a weekly television programme known as the *Stiller Report*. Further, Stiller was a presenter on a television segment entitled *Understand Our Time*s. Page, "From a Private to a Public Religion," 305. Stiller communicated the EFC's stance on abortion on both of his television segments. In 1997, Stiller was named President of Tyndale University College and Seminary. Stackhouse, *Canadian Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century,* 170.

8. Kurt Bowen, *Christians in a Secular World: The Canadian Experience*, (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004), 189. Although the EFC is the Canadian counterpart to the NAE, the EFC should not be suspected of falling prey to undue American influence. Brian Stiller responded to criticism that associated Canadian evangelical political involvement with the American religious right. Stiller argued that anyone suspecting Canadian evangelicals of operating under an American religious right agenda need not worry as Canadian "Conservative Protestants are such a small minority." Further, the Canadian Protestant vote historically has been spread across the spectrum of Canadian political parties. Bowen, *Christians in a Secular World,* 201. John Stackhouse describes the EFC's 1980s social momentum as having been of paramount significance. Stackhouse believes these burgeoning forces were indicative of "the growing consolidation of evangelicals across denominational lines." John Stackhouse, "The Protestant Experience in Canada Since 1945," in *The Canadian Protestant Experience 1760-1990*, ed. George Rawlyk (Burlington, ON: Welch Publishing: 1990), 232.

9. CBC News.

10. Whenever referring to Pentecostals it is necessary to define exactly what is meant. Generally, classical Pentecostalism traces its roots to Charles Parham's holiness Bible College experience of speaking in tongues in Topeka, Kansas, in 1900, and thereafter the Azusa Street Revival as coordinated by William Seymour in Los Angeles in 1906. Pentecostals in Canada trace their origins to the revival at the Hebden East End Mission in Toronto, also occurring in 1906. Classical Pentecostalism is evangelical Protestant in its theology, but with a unique position on the "Baptism in the Holy Spirit." Classical Pentecostals interpret the Acts of the Apostles to imply that the Baptism in the Holy Spirit occurs subsequent to salvation; it is experiential; it is evidenced by speaking in tongues; and it is for the purpose of empowering the disciple so as to witness boldly. Depending on the source one consults, there are between thirteen and fifteen different classical Pentecostal denominations in Canada. Of these, the PAOC is the largest. Among others, AG USA itinerant ministers contributed to the formation of the nascent PAOC. Michael

Wilkinson, *The Spirit Said Go: Pentecostal Immigrants in Canada* (New York: Peter Lang, 2006), 17. Pentecostals and broader evangelicals in Canada have often experienced tension. This tension is partially a result of theological differences. However, sociological differences also differentiate Canadian Pentecostals from other evangelicals. At the founding of the EFC in 1964, Pentecostals were on the fringe of Canadian evangelicalism. Pentecostals qualified as evangelicals, yet Pentecostals stood distinct from wider evangelicalism. John Stackhouse describes the upstart EFC as "includ[ing] groups previously isolated in their respective enclave, especially Pentecostals." Stackhouse, *Canadian Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century*, 165. Canadian historian of Christianity Ronald Kydd describes the two groups' differences as an aspect of their "mutual exclusion." Kydd theorizes that the PAOC and EFC held each other at arms' length and often pursued different courses because of an all but muted distrust for one another. Kydd, "Canadian Pentecostalism and the Evangelical Impulse," 299. The PAOC has been a prominent member denomination of the EFC and has even contributed key personnel to positions of EFC leadership. In fact, the 1980s were an era marked by an increase of Pentecostals in evangelical public life. Stackhouse, "The Protestant Experience in Canada," 226-27. Although the EFC drew from the PAOC's pool of leadership, the Fellowship viewed this as the exception rather than the rule. Many within the ranks of the EFC suspected the PAOC of maintaining certain distinctions inconsistent with wider evangelicalism. While the EFC relies and even depends upon the PAOC, the Fellowship has also remained wary of Pentecostals, believing "the cultured few do not necessarily represent the many." Stiller observed that during this period, in general, few Pentecostals served on boards or staffs of evangelical organizations. Kydd, "Canadian Pentecostals and the Evangelical Impulse," 299. Kydd's theory of the PAOC's and EFC's "mutual exclusion" certainly applies to the different positions articulated by these two organizations pertaining to abortion, as well as the perception of the need for separate organizations to lobby Parliament.

11. Thomas William Miller, *Canadian Pentecostals: A History of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada* (Mississauga, ON: Full Gospel Publishing House, 1994), 58-59. Wilkinson, 17. Additionally, the PAOC frequently refers to itself as Canada's largest evangelical denomination.

12. Miller, *Canadian Pentecostals,* 319.

13. Don Page describes *Faith Today* as "the largest subscriber-driven religious magazine." Page, "From a Private to a Public Religion," 305. John Stackhouse describes *Faith Today* as having "clearly sought to play the role in Canadian evangelicalism that *Christianity Today* played in the United States. The journal offered timely comment on contemporary issues" (Stackhouse, "The

Protestant Experience in Canada," 232). Eighteen thousand people subscribed to *Faith Today* by the mid-1980s (Stackhouse, *Canadian Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century*, 169).

14. The Supreme Court found Section 251 of the CCC to be unconstitutional, but suggested that Parliament could introduce legislation that would be constitutional. Evangelical Fellowship of Canada, "Canada Update Social Issues: Pro-life advocates go to jail for beliefs," *Faith Today*, May/June 1989, 56. In 1988, over 14,000 people across North America participated in a major protest organization called Operation Rescue. Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, October 1989, 2.

15. Brian C. Stiller, "Understanding Our Times: Civil disobedience," *Faith Today*, May/June, 1989, 78.

16. Stiller, "Understanding our Times," 78. It was around this time that the PAOC increased pressure upon the government to implement limitations on abortion. The PAOC employed the *News Release* of the Office of Social Concerns and Public Relations to rally the support of the PAOC's constituents. Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, July 1989, 1.

17. Berend Hovius, "Abortion: The fight goes on," *Faith Today*, May/June 1988, 18-20. Berend Hovius was a professor of law at the University of Western Ontario. Hovius contributed a similar article to London's daily newspaper, *The London Free Press*.

18. Robert Nadeau, "Guest Column: Fetal rights undecided," *Faith Today*, May/June 1989, 19. Robert Nadeau was a regular guest columnist for *Faith Today*. Nadeau's legal practice was based in Ottawa. Further, Nadeau, at the time, directed the Christian Legal Fellowship (a network of Christian legal professionals across Canada) on a part-time basis. Finally, Nadeau maintained ties with Hudson Hilsden of the PAOC's Office of Social Concerns.

19. See endnote 5.

20. Hovius, "Abortion," 18. While the Catholic Church was actively involved in this issue, lobbying Parliament about Bill C-43, this article focuses instead on the actions of the EFC and the PAOC.

21. Bowen, *Christians in a Secular World,* 189.

22. John G. Stackhouse, "'Who Whom?': Evangelicalism and Canadian Society," in *Aspects of the Canadian Evangelical Experience*, 59.

23. Bowen, *Christians in a Secular World,* 189.

24. "For you created my inmost being; you knit me together in my mother's womb. I praise you because I am fearfully and wonderfully made; your works are wonderful, I know that full well. My frame was not hidden from you when I was made in the secret place. When I was woven together in the depths of the earth, your eyes saw my unformed body. All the days ordained for me were written in your book before one of them came to be." Psalm 139:13-16, *The Holy Bible: New International Version* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1984).

25. Hudson Hilsden, "Society's Central Issue: When Human Life Begins," in *The Issue is Life: A Christian Response to Abortion*, ed. Denyse O'Leary (Burlington, ON; Welch Publishing, 1988), 68.

26. The EFC did not argue from scientific data, at least in those volumes consulted for the purposes of this article. The EFC may have argued on the basis of a scientific position before Parliament. That said, if the EFC did argue from this position, it was not evident in either of its publications: *Faith Today* and *National Alert*. Neither did the PAOC argue on the basis of scientific data. This article consults primarily the internal publications of the EFC and the PAOC. As "in house" publications, these documents presumably did not assign priority to convincing readers of the pro-life position. Instead, these documents sought to rally supporters to make appeals to Ottawa. To this extent, these documents were "preaching to the choir." The one notable exception is Hilsden's inclusion of a medical opinion in a section entitled "Scientific View" in his chapter "Society's Central Issue." Hilsden cites a 1948 World Health Organization declaration and Dr. Heather Morris of Women's College Hospital, Toronto. Hilsden, "Society's Central Issue," 68-69. Not to have argued more thoroughly from a scientific perspective – aside from anecdotal accounts – was an oversight on the part of the evangelicals.

27. Brian Stiller, "This Is Our Father's World," in *The Issue is Life*, 150-51. Although the EFC never spoke of the unborn as possessing personhood, Paul Marshall, chair of the EFC's Social Action Committee, appealed to the SCC "to determine if and when the fetus is a person." Marshall believed that, "if the Court did something like this, limits on abortion could have a much firmer status: they would themselves be constitutional and hence we could have a constitutional prohibition of abortion on demand." Marshall, "Some Political Implications of the Abortion Decision," in *The Issue is Life*, 20.

28. Stiller, "This Is Our Father's World," 146-48.

29. Suzanne Scosone, director of the Office of Family Life of the Archdiocese of Toronto, contributed a chapter to Denyse O'Leary's *The Issue is Life*. Scosone sought to articulate a pro-life position interested in balancing the rights of the expectant mother with those of the unborn. Scosone stated that, "both [pro-

choice and pro-life] sides believe deeply in the freedom of the individual. The problem is, *which* individual, a mother or her child? Who is to be free, and at what cost to the other? . . . Thoughtful people on both sides will, for the same reason, acknowledge the difficulties seen by the other side. Pro-life people see clearly the dilemma of the woman and the need for real support for her so that abortion will not seem like a 'solution.' . . . Pro-choicers now often talk about the importance of the 'potential human life' and its value, but at the same time they insist on the 'overriding value' of the 'choice' and the 'well-being' of the mother. Both are defending freedom and seeing its complexity; ultimately, however, nobody can have it both ways. Where the freedoms of two people conflict, one must be given precedence. . . . If we believe that all human beings are equal in value, the choice is not of the more valuable over the less valuable, but the choice of the smaller loss of freedom. There seems no question which is the smaller loss of freedom, and therefore which loss is to be chosen . . . the quick fix to which our advertising-trained minds have been accustomed. . . .We support also the freedom of the woman . . . when she chooses . . . not [to] deny the freedom and rights of another person, the child." Suzanne Scorsone, "Freedom: Choice or Life?" in *The Issue is Life*, 44-9. Scorsone suggests adoption in place of abortion. An important step in attempting to articulate a pro-life position that is also pro-woman, is to familiarize oneself with the opposing argument. In this chapter, Scorsone wishes to engage the pro-choice side in meaningful dialogue. Scorsone's ultimate goal is to arrive at a compromise that is as agreeable to both sides as is possible.

30. Paul Marshall, "Some Political Implications of the Abortion Decision," 20. Pro-choice groups might consider this position effectively to deny women's rights. Based on all of the sources consulted for this article, there is no evidence that the evangelicals actively sought to deny women's rights. It might have been beneficial for the evangelicals together to have discussed the legitimacy of 'rights' language in the first place and coming to a position of consensus, instead of setting the rights of the unborn against the rights of the expecting mother.

31. Denyse O'Leary, "Where pro-life went wrong," *Faith Today*, May/June 1988, 21.

32. Hovius, "Abortion," 20.

33. Statistics Canada, "Induced Abortion Statistics, 2004," Statistics Canada, http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/82-223-x/2008000/5202129-eng.htm (accessed 30 March 2013).

34. Paul Marshall echoed O'Leary's sentiment. Marshall believed that even with Section 251 of the Criminal Code in place "abortion committees . . . took such a wide view of protecting the health of the mother that they, in effect, provided something close to abortion on demand before the decision. . . . Section 251['s] . . . elimination . . . won't make too much difference to the number of abortions done over the next few months." Marshall, "Some Political Implications of the Abortion Decision," 17.

35. Again, Marshall shared O'Leary's optimism, believing the SCC decision "not calamitous. It acknowledges the state's interest in protecting the fetus. . . . It explicitly leaves room for, and even indicates a desire for, legal protection of the unborn." Marshall, "Some Political Implications of the Abortion Decision," 16.

36. Evangelical Fellowship of Canada, "EFC Update," *Faith Today*, July/August 1989, 50. Carl Henry was present at the 1989 EFC General Council meetings. Addressing the main assembly, Henry commented on the responsibility of Evangelicalism to challenge "'radical secular humanism' prevalent today." Henry continued, "the church can least afford to ignore evangelism . . . but if you ignore social justice you may lose the opportunity for evangelism."

37. Hudson Hilsden, "Society's Central Issue," 67-8; Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, May 1988, 1. Hilsden found his Scriptural bases in Exodus 21, Job 10, Psalm 139, Jeremiah 1, and Luke 1.

38. Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, March 1988, 2-3.

39. Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, May 1988, 1.

40. Sheila M. Noonan, "What the Court Giveth: Abortion and Bill C-43," *Queen's Law Journal* 16 (1991): 334. Stiller, "This Is Our Father's World," 147.

41. Stiller, "This Is Our Father's World," 147. Paul Marshall believed that the SCC wished to protect the unborn to some degree. Marshall wrote that, "the Court itself suggested that the development of the fetus was important." Marshall, "Some Political Implications of the Abortion Decision," 23.

42. Stiller, "This Is Our Father's World," 147.

43. Noonan, "What the Court Giveth," citing Bill C-43, 325.

44. David Vienneau, "Amending abortion bill won't be easy, MP says," *Toronto Star*, 30 November 1989. The PAOC supported a proposed amendment to Bill C-43 put forward by Liberal Member of Parliament Don Boudria. Boudria's amendment "would allow abortions to be performed only by a doctor and only when a woman's life was threatened. It would also increase the penalty for performing an illegal abortion to a maximum of 20 years." Hudson Hilsden,

News Release, April 1990, 2. Shortly following the announcement of Bill C-43, the NDP Premiere of Ontario, Bob Rae, vowed to oppose the Bill, labeling it "a bad law . . . which will create more problems for access. It's already raising questions in the minds of many doctors about whether they're going to be prepared to perform abortions and abortion services." Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, December 1990, 2. Hilsden quoting Rae.

45. David Vienneau, "New bill would allow access to abortions with doctor's okay," *Toronto Star*, 2 November 1989.

46. Hilsden, "Society's Central Issue," 70.

47. Paul Racine and Al Hiebert, "Bill C-43: Compromise or capitulation?" *Faith Today,* July/August 1990, 34. Emphasis original.

48. Racine and Hiebert, "Bill C-43," 35.

49. Marianne Meed, "EFC Update," *Faith Today*, May/June 1990, 54.

50. Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, March 1991, 1.

51. Hudson Hilsden, *News Release,* July 1990, 1. One of the amendments that the government refused proposed prohibition on abortions intended to prevent the birth of disabled unborn. Another refused amendment argued for a conscience clause for medical professionals unwilling to perform abortions.

52. Marianne Meed, "EFC Update," *Faith Today*, January/February 1990, 52. While it was the EFC that reported this interfaith coalition, the contributors comprised the breadth of the Canadian Christian spectrum. It is uncertain, however, if any non-Christian members were present within this supposed interfaith coalition. *FT* describes the group as having comprised "the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops, the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Anglican Church of Canada, the Salvation Army, as well as the EFC, which includes 27 member denominations." In a *News Release* dated May 1988, the PAOC stated it too was involved in this interfaith coalition. Presumably the PAOC became involved as an individual organization before the EFC became involved. Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, (Toronto, ON), May 1988, 1. To be sure, the complication of having an EFC member organization also participate independently must have contributed to confusing communications to Parliament. Reference to the coalition appears in the minutes of the Legislative Committee on Bill-C43. Progressive Conservative MP Gabrielle Bertrand described the Alliance for Life's president – Marilyn Bergeron – as "une certaine célébrité." CANADA. *BRIEF SUBMITTED TO THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON BILL C-43 [ABORTION]*. 1990, 18:5. The Parliamentary Committee entertained arguments from the representative groups of this coalition.

53. Marianne Meed, "EFC Update," *Faith Today*, January/February 1990, 52; EFC, *National Alert,* August 1989, 1.

54. Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, April 1990, 2. Emphasis original.

55. Racine and Hiebert, "Bill C-43," 34.

56. Racine and Hiebert, "Bill C-43," 37. The PAOC announced that Jake Epp had received "over 15,000 letters, 90 percent of them pro-life." Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, June 1988, 2.

57. Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, January 1990, 2.

58. Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, March 1990, 1.

59. Geoffrey York, "Senators kill abortion bill with tied vote," *Globe and Mail*, 1 February 1991.

60. Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, March 1991, 1. In the case of the 31 January 1991 vote, the Senate Speaker, Senator Rhéal Belisle, was ineligible to vote after the results had been announced. Even before the House voted, Senator Belisle abstained. York, "Senators kill abortion bill with tied vote."

61. Faith Today Staff, "Social Issues," *Faith Today*, May/June 1991, 63.

62. Hudson Hilsden retired from his position as Coordinator of the PAOC's Office of Social Concerns and Public Relations only months after the Senate's action on Bill C-43. *Faith Today* Staff, "Churches: PAOC Shifts Approach to Social Issues," *Faith Today*, July/August 1991, 46.

63. Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, December 1989, 1.

64. Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, March 1991, 1.

65. Jonathan Malloy, "Bush/Harper? Canadian and American Evangelical Politics Compared," *American Review of Canadian Studies* 39, no. 4 (2009): 356.

66. Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, June 1990, 2.

67. Hudson Hilsden, *News Release*, December, 1990, 2.

68. John Stackhouse cites pollsters Reginald Bibby and the Angus Reid Group as having shown "that evangelicalism is a vital movement . . . But it is still the faith of a relatively small minority and has made very little impact on the religion of most Canadians." Stackhouse, "'Who Whom?'" 61.

69. O'Leary, "Where pro-life went wrong," 22.

70. O'Leary, "Where pro-life went wrong," 22.

71. Stiller, "This Is Our Father's World," 148.

72. Stiller, "This Is Our Father's World," 151. Stiller remained true to his word to cooperate with other groups. Until Stiller withdrew from EFC leadership in 1997 to become President of Tyndale University College and Seminary, he continued to contribute to interdenominational committees discussing the status of the unborn. These committees not only informed the EFC's publications, but they also contributed to the increasingly prominent work of the EFC. Stackhouse, *Canadian Evangelicalism*, 169.

73. Marianne Meed, "EFC Update," *Faith Today*, January/February 1990, 52.

74. United Church of Canada, "Brief to the Parliamentary Committee on Bill C-43, An Act respecting Abortion," in CANADA. *BRIEF SUBMITTED TO THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON BILL C-43 [ABORTION]*, 1990, 11A: 42.

75. United Church of Canada, "Brief to the Parliamentary Committee on Bill C-43, An Act respecting Abortion," 11A: 44.

76. United Church of Canada, "Brief to the Parliamentary Committee on Bill C-43, An Act respecting Abortion," 11A: 45.

Confronting Sexual Abuse in the Anglican Church of Canada: Social Gospel Feminists

MARY LOUISE MEADOW
Centre for Studies in Religion, University of Victoria

This is the first in a series of stories about how women in Anglican Canada initiated responses to sexual abuse within their church. Here one meets Marjorie Watson Powles and Jeanne Rowles, whose personal and professional stories were born of the Social Gospel movement and nurtured by the overseas missionary service that marked Canadian church life from the close of the Great War to the politically turbulent 1960s and the rise of feminism. Along with Donna Hunter, Mary Wells, Marsha Hewitt, and Kate Merriman, Marjorie and Jeanne worked collaboratively and consistently in the final decades of the twentieth century to transform the Anglican Church on behalf of women and children, confronting sexual abuse in the ministry and holding church leaders accountable for sexual misconduct in ministry relationships.

In 2002, when Wendy Fletcher-Marsh published her research on the status of women in the Anglican Church of Canada two decades after the ordination of women (1976-96), she found that in the 1980s there was a spike in reports of sexual harassment among women preparing for ministry. In this study of women clergy, *Like Water on a Rock,* Fletcher-Marsh found that women born between 1940 and 1959 were the most likely to report the experiences of sexual harassment; 76 percent of all women clergy reporting sexual harassment were ordained in the 1980s.[1] Women who entered ministry in this decade faced professors, mentors, and supervisors who used professional privilege and social leverage in a close knit Anglican community to harass and abuse female students, trainees,

and candidates for ordination. When unforeseen incidents of sexual harassment threatened the ability of female ministry candidates to fulfill preparation requirements and endorsement for ordination, they turned to women in their Trinity Divinity community for counsel and support.

Marjorie Powles at Trinity

In the 1980s, Marjorie Powles was invariably found in the Trinity Divinity Common Room on Friday mornings, following the Eucharist. A circle of women formed around her on these mornings reflecting on language, the scriptures, or happenings in the academic community, from a feminist perspective. She modeled collaborative leadership and brought a feminist analysis of power to church hierarchal structures dominated by men, many with social entitlements that enhanced their power and authority, keeping women and their voices marginal to church leadership. These Friday morning groups offered a critical feminist perspective on the church, theology, and the sociocultural systems embedded in Canadian Anglicanism. Marjorie Powles functioned as an agent of change for women and the church. No longer employed in either faith or education programs, she worked and networked within Canada's Anglican community, using her freedom as a retired colleague and clergy spouse to move fluidly through power structures of church and academy with experience, conviction, and skill. Trinity's women trusted Marjorie Powles. Indeed, in 1992, the University of Trinity College conferred on her the degree of Doctor of Sacred Letters *honoris causa* for her lifelong ministry in support of women within the church and outside of it.

Marjorie Agnes Watson

To a Strange Land, her autobiography published in 1993, gives us a picture of Marjorie Powles' early life in Winnipeg and her introduction to the Student Christian Movement (SCM), a formative experience that shaped her life and ministry.[2] As she was writing this book, however, the later life and work of Marjorie Powles was just beginning. Much of what she accomplished in these Toronto years, from the late 1980s to the early-twenty-first century, I learned about in an interview with Marjorie in 2007 in the Cavell Gardens apartment she and her husband Cyril called home in Vancouver.[3]

Marjorie Agnes Watson was born in Saskatoon in 1914, where her

parents, Agnes McKnight and Mark Watson, had moved in 1910 from North Dakota. A year later, the Watson family moved to Winnipeg, where Mark managed a lumber business. The McKnights were from Ontario, Presbyterians and political Liberals. Mark Watson was a Methodist, and, according to Marjorie, a small "l" liberal. They belonged to the Home Street Presbyterian Church, which, in 1925, voted for church union and became a United Church. Marjorie recalled the Winnipeg of her youth as a small and snobbish city, where social status depended on money rather than inherited family prestige.[4] European immigrants lived in the northeast of the city, meaning north of Portage Avenue, but the Watsons lived south of Portage. Her awareness of social divisions increased when she entered the University of Manitoba in 1930 at age sixteen, to find large numbers of Jewish students, excluded from social clubs, and not a single Jewish professor in the university.[5] Her most significant and enduring experience in university was the Student Christian Movement. She wrote of this as "a liberating experience, both intellectually and socially." "Through it I experienced the joys of group activities and the development of friendships with both men and women based on similar concerns: personal, social, intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic."[6] The SCM contributed significantly to her convictions about justice and feminism; SCM colleagues across Canada became her social network for the next seven decades. In an interview in 2007, when asked about the collaboration of former SCM colleagues in the religious and political life of the Canada, Marjorie observed that in the 1930s Canada's population was about ten million; finding and maintaining colleagues and collaborators was not as challenging as in a country of thirty five million in the first decade of the twenty-first century.[7] She received her BA in 1934, in the midst of the Depression, and, for the next eight years, assisted her father with his business. She also volunteered, through SCM, at All People's Mission, founded by J.S.Woodsworth in Winnipeg's north end.[8] The Woodsworths, then retired from All People's, hosted SCM gatherings in their home, now the Centre for Christian Studies. In 1936 Marjorie joined the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), Canada's first socialist political party. In 2007 she claimed still to have her CCF membership card signed by Stanley Knowles, a former classmate, fellow SCM member, and United Church minister.[9]

In 1942 Marjorie Watson left Winnipeg to study at the United Church Training College in Toronto (UCTS), affiliated with Emmanuel College and the University of Victoria at the University of Toronto.

Marjorie attributes her conviction that "women are equal to men and must be treated as equals" to the women at UTCS and to the SCM.[10] She was on the National Executive of the SCM, and began her ecumenical involvement with the World Student Christian Federation (WCSF). In September 1943 Marjorie Watson was appointed SCM General Secretary at McGill University. Her advocacy for women began in Montreal, along with a colleague, Harriet Christie, who later became a United Church minister and principal of Covenant College, now the Centre for Christian Studies. One of the programs they shaped was called a Feminar.[11] It was through SCM in Montreal that Marjorie Watson met Cyril Powles, his parents, and siblings. The Powles were an Anglican missionary family from Japan, home in Montreal during World War Two. In post-war North America, Marjorie Watson's story might have ended in 1946 when she married Cyril Powles, or perhaps in 1949, when, after language training at Harvard, they left for Japan with infant son John. They remained in Japan for the next twenty years, adding son Peter to their family, returning occasionally to Canada for study leave or to care for aging parents.

The post-war growth of Canada's suburbia in the twenty years during which the Powles were in Japan took women out of the flow of mainstream social, political, and church life, kept at home in new suburban communities not readily accessible to one another except by automobile. For a look into the Anglican Church during the absence of the Powles, one need only read Pierre Berton's *The Comfortable Pew*.[12] Women's issues emerged in the 1960s and were addressed in the Royal Commission on the Status of Women report in 1970 with 167 recommendations. The following year the National Action Committee (NAC) on the Status of Women was formed as a pressure group to lobby for the implementation of this report. The NAC grew into the largest feminist organization in Canada with over 700 women's groups claiming affiliation by 1997, and throughout the 1980s it received 90 percent of its funding from the federal government.[13]

The Powles' return to Canada in 1970 rekindled former ties for Marjorie and Cyril, augmented by new colleagues and friendships, some formed through shared work in Japan. The extended Powles family contributed to this vast network of relationships in Canada and the United Kingdom, all concerned with making the world a better place for all people. They worked and worshiped ecumenically and engaged in theological reflection and discussion with one another about the course of their lives and ministries. Many former SCM colleagues were now

academics, as well as civic and church leaders.

Women in Groups and Groups of Women

Marjorie Powles met Jeanne Rowles in Toronto through the Movement for Christian Feminism (MCF) to which both women belonged in the 1970s. This ecumenical "consciousness raising" movement was led by Shelley Finson of the United Church, then Director of Field Education at the Centre for Christian Studies.[14] No doubt MCF involvement contributed to the critical perspective Marjorie brought to discussions at Trinity College a decade later. From Trinity she also advocated for women across all the divinity schools at the Toronto School of Theology (TST), organizing Women in Theology, a lecture series by feminist theologians from TST member faculties.

In the late 1980s Marjorie Powles, together with Jeanne Rowles, gathered a small group of Anglican women to reflect on women transforming the church. Through the Women's Unit at Church House, a video, *Christian and Feminist,* was created and released in 1989, incorporating interviews with Anglican women across Canada, as well as a panel discussion on feminism and the church.[15] In 1992 this small group hosted a forum with the Sisters of St. John the Divine, for the women candidates on Toronto's ballot for election as Canada's first female bishop. This group, early in the twenty-first century, established an award at the Toronto School of Theology for women studying theology from a feminist perspective, in the name of Marjorie Watson Powles.[16] When Marjorie and Cyril moved to Vancouver, the church women continued to meet, calling themselves "The Marjorie Group."

The Bishop's Committee on the Sexual Harassment of Women Clergy

In 1991, about the time of Anita Hill's testimony about sexual harassment from Clarence Thomas in the United States, Marjorie Powles was appointed Chair of the Bishop's Committee on the Sexual Harassment of Women Clergy. This committee was formed by then Bishop of Toronto, Terence Finlay. Marjorie's appointment came in part from her relationship with Donna Hunter, the first woman to serve on the Toronto Diocesan executive. Marjorie had consulted Hunter when advocating for Trinity women about harassment experiences in ministry training and service. Hunter had been charged with creating and overseeing a task force leading

to policy and procedures on diocesan responses to allegations and complaints of sexual misconduct. As John Doyle pointed out in a review of *Confirmation,* a 2016 film about that historic event*,* none of the powerful politicians knew how to deal with the issue of sexual harassment: "They were dismissive or clueless or both."[17] The issue for Anita Hill, as for most women bringing forward complaints of sexual harassment, shifted from her testimony to protecting the dignity of Clarence Thomas, the alleged offender. Without policies and protocols to address the needs of victims/complainants, the interests of the accused and his community invariably take precedence in the eyes of adjudicating bodies. This dynamic was at work in the 2016 trial of CBC's Jian Ghomeshi; the "dismissal" of women speaking out about harassment has not changed in twenty-five years.[18]

With Marjorie Powles as chair, the Bishop's Committee organized a gathering of women clergy and ordination candidates from Toronto and neighboring dioceses in September 1991. This session gave the committee and participants a sense of the scope of harassment, as experiences were shared, with confidentiality, among the participants. In November, the committee sent letters to the bishops of dioceses represented in the September gathering, citing examples of harassment reported by the women in September: Inappropriate touching of women's bodies (i.e. unwelcome hugging and feeling of women's bodies during the Peace, patting women's buttocks, unwanted hand holding as gestures of greeting), sexual comments in the guise of a joke, overt and subtle invitations, sexual references in the guise of compliments (pertaining to dress and appearance in liturgical garb, and possessive descriptions of women – i.e. "don't touch her, she's my curate"). The letter further reminded the bishops that sexual harassment is an abuse of power, and thus is violence against women. "In that light we call on the Church to examine its own power structures and its understanding and practice of authority."[19]

In February 1992 the committee met with the Toronto College of Bishops to request that the bishops contact deans of Ontario's theological colleges to consider offering courses in feminist theology, and giving such courses visible support. The Toronto bishops told the committee to take their issues to the Ontario Provincial Council on Theological Education (OPCOTE).[20] Two years later a presentation was finally made to OPCOTE. Marsha Hewitt spoke on behalf of the committee describing the fundamental issues underlying the problems of female clergy. Some were identified, including unchallenged theological assumptions and world

views that privileged maleness as a taken-for-granted attribute of Divinity that attached to the male priest, and that there was an intrinsic, often unconscious connection between these assumptions that operated a powerful force that structured relations within the church that privileged maleness as the decisive element of normative humanity. The crux of the matter was that women were vulnerable to sexual harassment because they were not taken seriously as priests, a problem which was reflective of a larger socio-cultural problem where women were not taken seriously as human beings. The presentation concluded that sexual harassment arose from distorted attitudes towards women embedded in some basic theological beliefs; changing these beliefs involved re-examining the image of God, of humanity and the Divine, of human relations, as well as theological symbols, God language, Christological assumptions, our church structures, and relations of power.[21]

Jeanne Rowles at Church House

Jeanne Rowles met me for an interview in her Toronto home in September 2007, and began with a description of growing up on a farm during the dust bowl years in Saskatchewan:

> It was a time of great poverty and desperation for everyone. I didn't belong to anything. We did go to church faithfully by horse and buggy in the summer and sleigh in the winter and, you know, Saskatchewan was a pretty radical place! My mother was a feminist. She had worked in the Stella Mission (All Peoples) in the north end of Winnipeg before she married. My mother told how she had been assigned to find the biggest Bible she could for J.S. Woodsworth to take with him to court – to read from in his defense. I don't think I ever asked what he was accused of but I knew it was from in his defense. I don't think I ever asked what he was accused of but I knew it was important justice work. My father had three cousins who were formidable women. The one with whom I had the most contact worked for the university extension service travelling around the province working with groups of women. She later became the director of women (I don't remember what it was called) at the university. So in the family we were socially conscious. I knew about the founding and growth of the CCF (Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, 1932) and never even thought of voting for any party but the CCF-NDP. I remember the family listening to the radio when

Tommy Douglas was elected.[22]

Jeanne attended the University of Saskatchewan, receiving her BA in 1947. She worked for the YWCA upon graduation, first serving with the Farm Service Corps in Niagara, Ontario. There she contracted polio. As she recovered she continued with the YWCA in Kingston, Ontario, and was supported in earning an MSW from the University of Toronto in 1952. "Once I started to work for the YWCA I was into both social justice and feminism big time. We always had to fight against the take-over by the YMCA, which was neither feminist nor actively into social justice – we often came into those unions in the best financial situation and ended up serving tea!"[23] With the YWCA, she went overseas to Karachi, Pakistan, where she served for three years, training a Pakistani to take her role. Jeanne then moved to Tanzania, where the YWCA partnered with the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), and again she was responsible for preparing local staff to take YWCA leadership. After four years in Tanzania, Jeanne returned to Canada in 1970 and worked for Central Neighbourhood House in Toronto for the next seven years. In Toronto, Jeanne belonged to the Movement for Christian Feminism."We lived and breathed it. We read Phyllis Trible, Schussler Fiorenza, and all the others."[24]

Putting a Spotlight on Women

When Jeanne Rowles came to Church House, as the Office of the General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada is now known, Edward "Ted" Scott was Primate of the Anglican Church in Canada. Scott, a former member of SCM, was known for his social justice positions, and Jeanne wanted to work within that ethos, building ecumenical coalitions for social justice, many of which remain today. In our 2007 interview, thirty years after coming to Church House, Jeanne remarked that the Women's Unit was "a thorn in the side of the church."[25] The unit was charged not only to administer women's organizations like the Anglican Church Women, which traced its origins to Roberta Tilton in 1885, but also to foster and further the interests of women in the church.[26] Jeanne astutely perceived the challenges women brought to the church and the challenges the church presented to women.

Almost immediately upon coming to Church House, Jeanne was asked for advice by a newly ordained woman on responding to violence

against women. This priest told Jeanne that women were coming to clergy with experiences of domestic violence and abuse, and male clergy were sending them back into abusive homes and relationships. Jeanne formed a task force with the Women's Unit on violence against women. This group held workshops across the country. According to Jeanne, at that time, 1979, there was general agreement that about 10 percent of all women were in battered or abusive situations. Jeanne noted, from debriefing the workshops held on the subject, that at least 10 percent of women attending the workshops had been battered; thus the real numbers of women in abusive relationships must have been higher than that estimate.[27] The task force brought its report to General Synod in 1986, the year Ted Scott retired as primate, only to have Scott himself dress "us down as alarmists, making too big a thing of it."[28]

Published in 1987, this report remains a matter of record for the Anglican Church in combating abuse, and naming the church as well as the state as complicit in violence against women. The Anglican Church of Canada was called to acknowledge its participation in violence against women through theologies that supported notions of male superiority, its use of exclusive language, and an historic tendency to support a pattern of dominance and submission.[29]

In God's Image

"When I first came to the job I was told repeatedly by women that there are 'other women' I want you to meet." This was a reminder that the Anglican Church Women (ACW) and the Women's Unit did not represent all Anglican women. To make room for women not involved in traditional groups, the unit held a joint conference with the ACW and these "other women," called *In God's Image*, held in May 1982, at the University of Winnipeg. Marjorie Powles was among the women attending from across Canada, as well as guests from Sri Lanka, India, Lesotho, Tanzania, Zimbabwe, and Sr. Marie Assad of the World Council of Churches. The program offered sociological as well as theological presentations in its plenary sessions and small group work. The Rev. Suzanne Hiatt, professor of pastoral theology at Episcopal Divinity School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, was the keynote speaker, and she set the context in which women have lived their Christian faith, beginning with the two accounts of creation in Genesis. Hiatt attributed the secondary position of women in Christianity to the influence of culture upon the structure and tradition of

the church. The set tasks of women were: 1) recovering the record of women's achievement in the church and passing it on to their daughters; 2) insisting that the Gospel belongs to women as equals of men and not to women through men; 3) recognizing that the majority of victims in the world are women, and the church must not use culture as an excuse to condone forms of male supremacy that excuse wife beating, polygamy, and other practices that suggest women are to be controlled by men; 4) the ordination of women is important in part because it signifies women in the public sphere and that women have a lot to say about issues, but "we haven't been socialized to make pronouncements or to think of ourselves as public persons;" and 5) "as women join the public sphere, we need to make clear – we want to change the structures."

Kathleen Storrie of the faculty of sociology of the University of Saskatchewan reminded participants that, ever since Aristotle defined a female as "a misbegotten male," the view of women as "other" has persisted. A male perspective unconsciously influences what is taken to be "normal" or "neutral" or scientific. Being "othered," meaning experiences such as wife battering and the reality that 60 percent of homicide victims are women killed by a man in "the family context," illustrates the ways in which women's experience is downplayed by society.[30]

General Synod and Sexual Misconduct

Jeanne Rowles retired from Church House in 1989, three years before the General Synod disbanded the Women's Unit. Her contributions would no doubt have influenced the sexual misconduct policy that the General Synod began to develop for its staff and volunteers in 1992.[31] Because of the relative independence and authority of each bishop and diocese in Canada, this policy was intended only for national office functions and its ministries. Unlike churches elsewhere in the Anglican Communion, the thirty dioceses of the Canadian church each have responsibility for their own policies, and there is no accountability to a single national standard, code of ethics, or authority. An individual who has experienced sexual harm in one diocese must use the policy and procedures of that diocese to make a complaint of misconduct. This means a ministry leader allegedly responsible for that harm can be relocated to another diocese, confusing the process of accountability and complaint. It further means that the church cannot hold an ordained Anglican priest accountable for abuse of children or any person unless that priest is serving

in a ministry of the diocese in which the allegations have taken place and can be held responsible by the legal understanding of "duty of care." This was determined by a decision of the Ontario Supreme Court in a case against Grenville Christian College and the Diocese of Ontario.[32] Ordination as a priest in the Anglican Church of Canada does not require that priests subscribe to a code of ethics regarding professional conduct. This lack of structure places an undue burden on the victim in seeking justice and healing, protecting the alleged offender and the church. Church House, functioning in an advisory capacity to the thirty dioceses in Canada, does not establish binding policies, practices, and protocols regarding sexual abuse and misconduct. For example, in 1988, the Children's Unit produced *A Citizen's Guide to Sexual Abuse Issues.*[33] This booklet was to provide sound basic information on sexual abuse in the hope that the reader would be led to further study and, more importantly, to action. Researched and written by a former Children's Unit staff member, the booklet details facts and myths about child sexual abuse, emphasizing significant information such as: 1) one in four girls and one in six boys will have received some unwanted sexual attention before age eighteen; 2) sexual abuse is one of the most underreported crimes in society; and 3) families and friends tend to desert victims when they disclose abuse.[34] What this booklet does not reference is sexual abuse as an issue within the church itself; nor does it set out model policies and protocols for reporting and preventing abuse in the church. Keeping the focus on children, in 1992 the General Synod referred a resolution on the "Sexual Molestation and Abuse of Children" to the National Executive Committee with a request that the Program Committee "produce a comprehensive protocol for responding to reports of sexual molestation and abuse of young persons by some personnel, and that this protocol be circulated to all dioceses."[35]

The church was no doubt influenced by Canada's ratification of the United Nations Conventions on the Rights of the Child in 1991, as well as the Badgley *Report on Child Sexual Abuse in Canada* of 1984[36] and the Winter Commission Report on the sexual abuse of boys in Newfoundland by parish priests, released in 1990.[37] More pressing for Anglicans was the disclosure in 1990 of the sexual offences against children by John Gallienne, choirmaster of Kingston's St. George's Cathedral.[38] As Jeanne Rowles remarked in 2007, with respect to John Gallienne and other ministry leaders alleged to be in abusive ministry relationships "Is there no way to keep track of these guys? " Jeanne then summarized her insights,

born of experience, stating that sexual misconduct is a women's issue, and the concerns of women are invisible to the church.[39]

Ecumenical Decade of the Churches in Solidarity with Women

In 1988, as Jeanne Rowles was winding down her service with the Anglicans of Canada, the World Council of Churches (WCC) launched the Ecumenical Decade of the Churches in Solidarity with Women to provide a framework within which WCC member churches could look at their structures, teaching, and practices with a commitment to the full participation of women. It was also seen as an opportunity for churches to reflect on women's lives in society and to stand in "courageous solidarity" with women. Midway into the decade, the WCC began to gather responses to the decade's initiatives through team visits to churches, national councils, and some 650 women's groups. The reported findings described "The Stones" of violence and racism against women, economic injustice, barriers to participation, the role of family, oppressive theology and interpretations of the Bible, attitudes to sexuality, and both solidarity and divisions between women. In particular, the teams noted that, "to deal with the violence women experience even within the church is to approach two areas: sexuality and abuse of power which have always been taboo for the churches." "Most discouraging was clear evidence that women are marginalized by their own church structures . . . All the teams noted women's lack of or limited access to decision-making processes – and thus power in their churches . . . This situation both reflects and promotes a similar imbalance of power in society." When the decade closed, WCC saw its agenda as unfinished, and called for "sometimes radical reordering of aspects of the life of the church rooted in a reinterpretation and reconstruction of those practices and teachings that discriminate against women." This report is replete with evidence of the challenges women face within their churches.[40]

In Closing

Just before Jeanne left Church House, Marc Lepine shot and killed fourteen women students at L'Ecole Polytechnique in Montreal on 6 December 1989. This event galvanized all of Canada, and twenty-six years later is still solemnly marked with services on campuses and in churches across the country. The Primate's office asked Rowles what to say. "He

wanted me to say it was violence that could happen to anyone. He did not understand it happened because they were women. Good guys did not think this had anything to do with women."[41]

Jeanne Rowles concluded her 2007 interview with an acute feminist critique: "When we want what men have got, it is not good news." The church is not behaving differently because of the ordination of women, although some individuals within it are changing. "Some women in the pews have different visions of what could be." She reflected that lay-women could, and can, make changes ordained women cannot make if they are to stay employed. There were no ordained women in the Women's Unit. "No one could pull strings or control us." "When it comes to making changes, it is people on the outside that make a difference."[42]

Endnotes

1. Wendy Fletcher-Marsh, *Like Water on a Rock* (Guelph, ON: Artemis Enterprises, 2002), 116-19.
2. Marjorie Agnes Powles, *To a Strange Land: The Autobiography of Marjorie Agnes Powles* (Dundas, ON: Artemis Enterprises, 1993), 12.
3. Marjorie Powles, Interview with Author, Vancouver, BC, 15 September 2007.
4. Powles, *To a Strange Land,* 20.
5. Powles, *To a Strange Land,* 22.
6. Powles, *To a Strange Land,* 28.
7. Powles, Interview, 15 September 2007.
8. Powles, *To a Strange Land*, 32-33.
9. Powles, Interview, 15 September 2007.
10. Powles, *To a Strange Land,* 39.
11. Powles, *To a Strange Land,* 45.
12. Pierre Berton, *The Comfortable Pew: A Critical Look at Christianity and the Religious Establishment in the New Age* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1965).
13. Cheryl Collier, "Not Quite the Death of Organized Feminism in Canada: Understanding the Demise of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women," *Canadian Political Science Review* 8, no. 2 (2014): 24.

14. Powles, *To a Strange Land,* 123.
15. *Christian and Feminist* (Toronto: Anglican Church of Canada, 1989), vc.
16. Marjorie Watson Powles Award (established 2002), Scholarships and Awards, 2016, Toronto School of Theology Board.
17. John Doyle, "HBO's Confirmation: a '90s cautionary tale still resonates," *Globe and Mail*, 16 April 2016, R8.
18. Catherine Porter, "Why Jian Ghomeshi Accuser Wants You To Know Her Name," *Toronto Star*, 18 April 2016.
19. Letter to the Diocesan Bishops of Toronto, Niagara, Huron, Ontario and Ottawa, 4 November 1991, Anglican Diocese of Toronto Archives.
20. Minutes, Meeting between Bishops and Committee on Sexual Harassment of Women Clergy, 19 February 1992, Anglican Diocese of Toronto Archives.
21. Report on Meeting of Bishop's Committee on Sexual Harassment of Female Clergy and OPCOTE, 10 February 1994, Anglican Diocese of Toronto Archives.
22. Jeanne Rowles, Interview with Author, Toronto, ON, 21 September 2007.
23. Rowles, Interview, 21 September 2007.
24. Rowles, Interview, 21 September 2007.
25. Rowles, Interview, 21 September 2007.
26. *For All the Saints: Prayers and Readings for the Saints' Days, According to the Calendar of the Book of Alternative Services of the Anglican Church of Canada* (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1994), 178.
27. Rowles, Interview, 21 September 2007.
28. *Violence Against Women: Abuse in Society and Church and Proposals for Change, The Taskforce Report to the General Synod 1986 of the Anglican Church of Canada* (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1987), Anglican Church of Canada Archives.
29. Tracy J. Trothen, *Shattering the Illusion: Child Sexual Abuse and Canadian Religious Institutions* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2012), 80.
30. Jeanne Rowles, *Conference Report: In God's Image,* 1982, typescript copied to author.

31. *General Synod Journal of Proceedings,* 33rd Session, 1992, Anglican Church of Canada Archives.

32. *Cavanaugh v. Grenville Christian College*, 2012, Ontario Supreme Court of Justice, 23 May 2012 [113], 24.

33. *A Citizen's Guide to Sexual Abuse Issues,* Anglican Church of Canada Archives, 1989.

34. *General Synod Journal of Proceedings,* 33rd Session, 1992.

35. R. Badgley, *Report of the Committee on Sexual Offences against Children and Youths* (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1984).

36. Gordon A Winter, *The Report of the Archdiocesan Commission of Enquiry into the Sexual Abuse of Children by Members of the Clergy* (St. John's, NFL: Archdiocese of St. John's, 1990).

37. Judy Steed, *Our Little Secret: Confronting Child Sexual Abuse in Canada* (Toronto: Random House Canada, Ltd., 1994), 1-49.

38. Rowles, Interview, 21 September 2007.

39. World Council of Churches, Eighth Assembly, *Women's Challenges: Into the 21st Century* (www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/assembly/chall).

40. Rowles, Interview, 21 September 2007.

41. Rowles, Interview, 21 September 2007.

42. Rowles, Interview, 21 September 2007.

CSCH President's Address 2016

"May I print any of your books?" John Wesley and the Rise of Methodist Publishing in America

SCOTT MCLAREN
York University

"I was awakened about four o'clock A.M. by a ringing at my door, and a voice which apprised me that the Book Room was on fire! I sprung from my bed . . . and repaired with all possible speed to the scene of the conflagration . . . The smoke was already issuing from the windows of my office, and the flames from other parts of the house! . . . The hydrants were frozen, and the waters were thrown but feebly, though all exerted themselves to their utmost. We saw that all was gone."[1] So observed Nathan Bangs of a cold February night in 1836 after watching helplessly as the Methodist Book Concern was reduced to ashes. The loss of buildings and stock was more than heartbreaking: the financial consequences were so enormous that New York's insurance industry was driven to its knees. Astonishingly, and despite the financial panic of 1837 that gripped America into the middle years of the 1840s, the Concern's losses were quickly – even miraculously – recovered. Indeed, by the 1850s, the Concern had grown in size to eclipse every other publishing competitor – commercial, denominational, and interdenominational – to become, in the words of Nathan Hatch, "the largest publishing house in the world."[2] With over a dozen power presses, an in-house bindery, stereotyping equipment, four successful periodicals, virtually no debt, and a distribution system that extended up to and even beyond the limits of white settlement in North

America, its dominance must have seemed almost (but not quite) predestined.

The extraordinary growth of the Methodist Book Concern reflected and reinforced the wider and equally astonishing success of the Methodist Episcopal Church itself. Methodist historians writing in the nineteenth century had little difficulty accounting for their denomination's remarkable ascendency. It was a matter of universal agreement that God's special blessing rested on both the United States and Methodism. Thus it merely stood to reason that Methodists within the United States were doubly blessed. "History, when rightly written," noted Hollis Read in 1849, "is but a record of providence; and he who would read history rightly, must read it with his eye constantly fixed on the hand of God . . . There is no doubt at the present time, a growing tendency so to write and so to understand history."[3] And that is precisely the understanding that American Methodists brought to the contemplation of their nation as well as their own church. "No history in the world presents so many interesting combinations of piety, wisdom, patriotism, and daring enterprise, as that of these United States, and none exhibits more striking instances of a Divine Providence in the government and direction of the affairs of men," enthused Methodist abolitionist La Roy Sunderland in his *History of the United States of America* published by the Methodist Book Concern in 1834.[4] Nor was such patriotic bluster limited to the relatively few national histories written by American Methodists. When the Concern published an American edition of the Religious Tract Society's *The Dawn of Modern Civilization* under Daniel Kidder's name in 1847, American triumphalism was simply substituted for English. In the Concern's edition it was America, not England, whose "destiny shall be a new thing in the earth . . . filled with the illustrations of a merciful Providence."[5] For American Methodists reading these and other such texts the message was clear and emphatic: God's unique blessings rested on the United States in a way that was without peer. In a word, America was, as John Winthrop proclaimed in its colonial days, "a city upon a hill."[6] The triumph of the Methodist Episcopal Church by mid-century was understood in terms equally providential. Indeed, no less a figure than Nathan Bangs, our eyewitness to the Concern's destruction in 1836 and Methodism's first official historian in America, underscored as much in an 1850 address to a group of young Canadian preachers: "All you have to do it to smite the rock. It is God's work to split it. All you have to do is to preach the word, and attend to the other duties of your office. It is God's work to bless the labor

of your hearts and hands, and to give effect to your well-meaning efforts."[7]

As historians in the twentieth century progressively distanced themselves from denominational polemic and turned away from providential narratives, the work of accounting for evangelicalism's rapid expansion following the Revolutionary War became much more difficult. A bewildering array of social, cultural, political, and even aesthetic forces had to be accounted for in order to explain why so many Americans found themselves irresistibly drawn to the more radical forms of evangelicalism perhaps best exemplified by Methodism. Undoubtedly the most influential historian to grapple with this problem in the last several decades is Nathan Hatch. Hatch's groundbreaking book *The Democratization of American Christianity* proposed an interpretive framework that linked the expansion of evangelicalism in the new United States to the spirit of democratization that was sweeping the country in the wake of the Revolutionary War. Unlike historians before him, who argued that the rapid growth of evangelicalism was a reaction against the expansion of nascent capitalist markets in America, Hatch proposed that evangelicalism was a liberating force that operated in harmony with America's ascendant political egalitarianism.[8] Hatch's book was also remarkable for the fact that it was one of the first major studies of religion in America to attend to the role that reading, writing, publishing, and bookselling played in that evangelical expansion. At the heart of American evangelicalism, he argued, was a powerful "democratic urge to multiply authors and readers" that transformed the pulpit and the press into mutually reinforcing means for driving the evangelical project.[9] Methodists set themselves at the forefront of what Hatch called an emergent "democratic religious press" when they aggressively deployed preachers as commissioned booksellers across Methodism's far-flung preaching circuits.[10]

Over the past decade, a growing number of historians have begun to question Hatch's sweeping arguments, and the sweeping nature of those arguments, about the relationship between democracy and religion in the early republic. Some have done so by placing emphasis on the contested place race and gender occupied in this matrix, while others have foregrounded the degree to which evangelicals attempted to subvert democratic influences by erecting authoritative and exclusionary moral establishments to exert power over others.[11] Perhaps most notably, Amanda Porterfield has stressed the role political and religious doubt played in nineteenth-century America by investigating the ways in which evangelical leaders exploited doubt to bolster denominational agendas and

draw people into their churches.[12] Hatch's argument about religious print culture has also attracted criticism, most conspicuously in the work of David Paul Nord. Arguing that Hatch's "linking of publishing and religion to the market revolutions . . . does not tell the whole story about either," Nord proposes that many evangelicals were inclined to view the market as a "wily and dangerous foe" and for that reason sought ways to subvert it by giving books away "regardless of ability or even desire to pay."[13]

However, Hatch and his critics, including Nord, are largely in tacit agreement on one key point: their narratives often take for granted John Winthrop's view, shared alike by nineteenth-century denominational historians, that America was something special, something like, if not quite, a city upon a hill. "Only after independence," Nord argues, "was the American evangelical spirit fully awakened and wedded to systematic organization." For both Hatch and Nord, America's political independence from Britain and its concomitant burgeoning democratic spirit prepared the ground for a "democratic religious press" that would have been all but unimaginable in any other geopolitical context.[14]

The subtle cadences of American exceptionalism that permeate these narratives – particularly those penned by Hatch and Nord about religious print culture – have contributed to forestalling any serious consideration among scholars of religious print culture that lingering transnational forces may have continued to exert consequential cultural influences on the western side of the Atlantic after the Revolutionary War. Interestingly, those working outside the bounds of religious history have been more open to this approach. Meredith McGill, for example, has advanced a remarkably compelling argument that such transatlantic influences were operative well into the nineteenth century.[15] In this essay I show that the religious press in America, and particularly the Methodist Book Concern, the first and largest denominational publisher in the United States, did not flourish simply because Methodists evinced a uniquely American "democratic urge to multiply authors and readers" as Hatch suggests, and certainly not because Methodists had designs on subverting the market by giving away their wares at no cost as Nord proposes, but in large measure because Methodists found themselves reacting against powerful transatlantic forces exerted on them and their publishing activities by John Wesley before and following the Revolutionary War. Just as Hatch notes that there was a critical, but accidental agreement between Methodism's Arminian theology and America's political egalitarianism, so too I argue that there was a powerful, but equally unintended congruence between the kinds of

publishing and remunerative structures the Methodist Book Concern developed in response to Wesley's criticism of American Methodist publishing activities, and the early republic's rapidly expanding free market for religious books and periodicals.

* * *

The decades preceding the Revolutionary War witnessed not only the arrival of the first Methodists in America, but also important changes in the way books were produced and distributed in the colonies. The first printers to ply their trade in America were mostly immigrants who imported their presses, types, and even paper from overseas. The Massachusetts printer Stephen Day produced the first book in British North America, the Bay Psalm Book, in 1640. But when Parliament passed the Licensing Act in 1662, the London Stationers' Company became the patent owner of bibles, psalters, and the majority of most other titles. As a result, printers in America constrained their output and survived by producing mostly handbills, government documents, local almanacs, and, on rare occasion, schoolbooks. The vast majority of books sold in America – sermons, hymnals, poetry, histories, and manuals – were imported from London by general merchants.[16] Beginning around 1740, however, the number of printers operating in the colonies increased dramatically – an increase closely connected with the rise of the colonial newspaper. These printers forged relationships with their London counterparts and soon displaced the general merchants as America's largest importers of British books. When a large market for cheap reprints emerged in Scotland and Ireland around the middle of the eighteenth century, colonial booksellers, eager to increase their margins, made a point of importing these cheaper books for their American customers.[17] And, by the 1760s, when it became clear that the American market for books was increasingly lucrative, a number of printers operating in Scotland and Ireland pulled up stakes and emigrated to the colonies in the hope of establishing bookselling businesses of their own. They were highly successful. That success did not escape the notice of the first Methodist preacher to plant his feet on American soil that same decade.

In 1768, a small but growing body of Methodists in New York wrote to ask John Wesley to send help. They needed preachers. Wesley raised the matter at the Leeds Conference in August 1769. "Who is willing to go?" he asked. No one responded. Wesley had to ask twice more before

Richard Boardman and Joseph Pilmore reluctantly raised their hands. A collection of £50 was taken up to speed them on their way and to serve, in Wesley's words, as "a token of our brotherly love."[18] And yet, despite the difficulty Wesley had procuring volunteers, there was a third preacher who seemed more eager than all the rest but who did not offer himself in conference. Without any financial support or public endorsement, Robert Williams, a Welshman who cut his teeth as a Methodist preacher in Ireland, quietly set about making preparations to embark for America. The young preacher had at least one very good reason for not bothering to raise his hand when Wesley called for volunteers. Wesley did not much like him. Although admitting Williams possessed a rare pulpit oratory to hold thousands "quiet and attentive," Wesley found the younger man's cheeky attitude toward the Church of England all but intolerable.[19] But, no doubt reminding himself of his own pledge that Methodism was open to all regardless of religious inclination, Wesley permitted himself to be practical rather than principled on the matter.

Shortly after Williams learned that he would have the unenthusiastic company of Boardman and Pilmore in America, he made an abrupt and chaotic departure. "He hurried down to the town near to which the ship lay," wrote the first historian of American Methodism, "sold his horse to pay his debts, and taking his saddle-bags on his arm, set off for the ship, with a loaf of bread and a bottle of milk, and no money to pay his passage."[20] Williams's haste delivered him to the American shore sometime in August 1769 – some two months before the slightly more dignified Boardman and Pilmore eventually arrived.

Wesley's concerns about how Williams might conduct himself overseas were borne out almost immediately. One of the first things Williams did when he landed was to settle on a way to make Wesley – or at least Wesley's hymnbook – pay his way. Although preachers in Britain were forbidden from publishing anything without Wesley's approval, Williams seems to have thought the same restriction ought not to apply in America.[21] He can hardly be blamed for that. After all, as soon as he set foot on American soil, he found himself all but surrounded by British books and advertisements for British books printed not in Britain, but by Scottish and Irish immigrants on American presses. The financial success that these printers and publishers achieved in America's burgeoning reprint market rested on their common conviction that the colonies were, like Scotland and Ireland, beyond the jurisdiction of the London Stationers' Company. It was an infectious idea. As Williams reached into his

pocket and pulled out one of his only remaining possessions – a battered copy of the bestselling Methodist hymnbook – the circumstances must have seemed almost providential.

Using Williams's hymnbook for copy, John Dunlap in Philadelphia soon placed three hundred inexpensive duodecimo copies of Wesley's *Hymns for the Nativity of our Lord* in Williams's hands. Stuffing his saddlebags with as much as he could carry, Williams sold them wherever he went. When his inventory became depleted, he printed a cheap edition of Wesley's sermons in New York with the help of Philip Embury. The next time he was passing through Philadelphia, Williams ordered more hymnbooks from Dunlap. Wesley's sanctioned preachers, meanwhile, Boardman and Pilmore, did not lift a finger to stop him. They did not even report him to Wesley. It was not until a young Francis Asbury finally arrived in America in October 1771 that Wesley had any chance to find out what Williams was doing. At first, Williams's ministry impressed Asbury. "Brother Williams," he enthused in his journal, "gives a flaming account of the work. Many people seem to be ripe for the Gospel and ready to receive us."[22]

But Asbury's enthusiasm was dampened when he learned that Williams was doing more than just preaching. Asbury immediately wrote to Wesley about it. Then, in the autumn of 1772, Asbury received a letter from Wesley appointing him general assistant in place of Richard Boardman and charging him to ensure that, "Mr. Williams might not print any more books without my consent."[23] This sudden promotion was almost certainly a reward for, among other demonstrations of loyalty, tattling on Williams.[24] And yet, though the benefits to Asbury were not to be doubted, his censure of Williams seems to have been sincere. When Williams died in September 1775, Asbury remarked darkly that, "perhaps brother Williams was in danger of being entangled in worldly business, and might thereby have injured the cause of God. So he was taken away from the evil to come."[25] Those familiar with Williams's ministry would have had no difficulty interpreting the phrase "worldly business" as a veiled reference to Williams's unsanctioned publishing endeavors.

Despite Asbury's loyalty, Wesley was not quite ready to leave everything in the hands of a man quite so young and untested. In the spring of 1773, veteran preacher and Church of England clergyman Thomas Rankin was dispatched to restore order and make certain that others would not follow Williams's bad example. Rankin was a hard man with a reputation for dealing quickly with problems. In less time than it

would have taken him to cross the Atlantic, he had called all the preachers in America back to Philadelphia where they met together in June of that year. Acting on orders from Wesley, Rankin affirmed the subordination of Methodist preachers to Church of England clergymen, forbade those preachers from administering the sacraments, and made it perfectly clear that Wesley's rule against publishing applied every bit as much in America as it did in Britain. "No preacher," the minutes read, "shall be permitted to reprint our books, without the approbation of Mr. Wesley, and the consent of the brethren." As for Williams, the practical Wesley allowed that he would be permitted to "sell what he has, but reprint no more."[26]

David Hempton notes that, "one of the most striking features of Methodism is the extent to which Wesley tried to secure control over the discourse of the movement by remorselessly selecting, editing, publishing and disseminating print."[27] Wesley was deeply committed to maintaining that control on both sides of the Atlantic. Indeed, his preachers were specifically enjoined in the minutes of conferences to "sing no hymns of your own composing," to publish no tracts without first obtaining approval, to print nothing until Wesley had first revised it, and, in general, to avoid what Wesley called "that evil disease the *scribendi cacoethes"* or "itch for writing" that threatened to infect some of his assistants and helpers.[28] Yet Rankin puzzlingly cited none of Wesley's editorial concerns when he set out to explain why Methodists must not follow the example set by Williams and other Scottish and Irish immigrant printers in America. Instead, Rankin said, the rule was merely in place to ensure fairness, "so that the profits arising therefrom, might be divided among the preachers, or applied to some charitable purpose."[29] And although Wesley's preachers in America proved themselves to be remarkably tractable on this point in the short term – no further unauthorized editions of Wesley's works were printed on American presses at the behest of Methodist preachers until the darkest days of the Revolutionary War – Rankin's carefully crafted language eventually provided Methodists with just the opening they needed to begin assuming control over their own printing and publishing activities.

By the end of the 1770s, Methodism in America was in a state of serious disarray. Since the outbreak of hostilities, Methodist preachers had come under heavy persecution as suspected loyalists. As a result, all of the preachers Wesley had dispatched overseas, with the single exception of Francis Asbury, fled the continent. The appearance of Wesley's startling anti-revolutionary tract entitled *A Calm Address to Our American Colonies*

hardly helped. Although controversial on both sides of the Atlantic, in America it was nothing short of dangerous and no doubt contributed to the frustration of his followers in America.[30] Indeed, despite Asbury's continued presence in America and his intense loyalty to Methodism's founder, Wesley's authority overseas was soon hanging by a thread.

In 1779, Asbury narrowly prevented a body of southern Methodist preachers from arrogating to themselves the sacramental powers of ordained clergymen – a move that would certainly have invited Wesley's profoundest censure.[31] The following year, John Dickins, a rising star in the Methodist fold who went on to become a key figure in American Methodism, called for the formal separation of Methodism from the Church of England in the full knowledge that Wesley would oppose such a move. With so many ready to set aside Wesley's authority in relatively weighty matters, it is not surprising that Asbury came to the conclusion that printing a few Methodist books amounted to no great trespass under the circumstances. "May I print any of your books? We are in great want," Asbury pleaded in the waning weeks of the summer of 1780, adding by way of explanation that the last shipment received from London "was huddled and improper."[32] Without waiting for a reply, Asbury noted in his journal a month later that, "we have come to the conclusion to print the four volumes of Mr. Wesley's Sermons."[33]

The extraordinary circumstances under which these books were printed might have been taken by some to mean that no binding precedent about printing Methodist books in America had been set. At least that seems to have been Wesley's view. When regular lines of communication were restored after the war, it became clear that Wesley had every expectation that his followers on the far side of the Atlantic would resume their unwavering patronage of his London Book Room. But a different sentiment now prevailed in America. After the cessation of hostilities, everyone knew that the London Stationers' Company could no longer even pretend to hold sway over publishing in the new republic. American Methodists slowly evolved a similar view about Wesley's Book Room. When Wesley dispatched Rankin to put a stop to Williams's publishing activities more than a decade earlier, Rankin had argued that such restrictions were necessary in order to ensure that "the profits arising therefrom, might be divided among the preachers, or applied to some charitable purpose."[34] With that language at the forefront of their minds, American Methodists passed a new resolution requiring that profits arising from the sale of all books – presumably those printed locally as well as

those imported from London – be used to make up deficiencies in the salaries of the preachers.[35] The result was that Wesley and his lieutenants could no longer complain about an unfair distribution of profits. This also set books published by the London Book Room and those published on American presses on an equal footing for the first time. Wesley, who remained as committed as ever to controlling the discourse of the movement, was not appeased.

Over the next several years it became increasingly clear that Wesley's endorsement of a truly independent Methodism in the United States was not quite as unqualified as many had hoped. Although he had reluctantly sanctioned the establishment of the Methodist Episcopal Church under the joint superintendence of Francis Asbury and Thomas Coke in 1784, he seems to have been surprised when Americans made attempts to accommodate Methodism to the realities of their new environment. Around this time John Dickins, who had attempted to push back against Wesley's authority during the war, began to play an increasingly important role in Methodist affairs. Born and educated in London, Dickins traveled to America as a tutor before joining the Methodists on the eve of the Revolutionary War in 1774. In spite of his British birth, Dickins's sympathies were wholly with the disgruntled colonists. Dickins's remarkable talent for rhetoric became apparent when the time came to bestow a new name on the movement that had once been known by Wesley simply as "circuit number 50" in his transatlantic renewal movement within England's established church. Dickins suggested the Methodist Episcopal Church – a shrewd formulation that signaled both Methodism's independence from the Church of England and arrogated in three simple words the same sacramental prerogatives that he and his southern coreligionists had been demanding for years.[36]

Tensions between Wesley and his American followers finally came to a head in 1787. That year, in an effort to reassert his authority, Wesley attempted to blunt Asbury's influence by installing Richard Whatcoat in his place – a candidate who promised to be more deferential. The Americans, who had already come to regard Asbury as a kind of evangelical hero, flatly refused. Wesley, they argued, was simply too far removed from the situation on the ground to know what was best. Some even went so far as to suggest Wesley could reasonably expect no duty of obedience from those who had joined the ranks of the preachers after the establishment an independent Methodist Episcopal Church in 1784.[37]

With Wesley's influence thus diminished, and no doubt recalling the

good that had resulted from Williams's unauthorized reprinting activities a decade or so earlier, Dickins, at the urging of the preachers, began the work of reviving Methodist printing in America. In the spring he issued a thoroughly revised edition of Wesley's familiar *Minutes of Several Conversations* under the distinctly American title *Form of Discipline.* It was a landmark document that further diminished Wesley's authority by excluding his name from the list of preachers, styling Asbury a bishop against Wesley's thunderous but futile opposition, and unambiguously placing the right to decide what would be printed in the hands of American preachers. Importantly, it anticipated any criticism Wesley might make on the grounds of financial fairness by codifying the principle that "the profits of the books, after all the necessary expences [*sic*] are defrayed, shall be applied, according to the discretion of the conference, towards the college, the preachers' fund, the deficiencies of the preachers, the distant missions, or the debts of our churches."[38] Although that did not put an end to the importation of books and periodicals from Wesley's London Book Room, Americans now placed their oversea orders by choice rather than by compulsion. "From that time," Jesse Lee observed, "we began to print more of our own books in the United States than we had ever done before."[39]

In May 1789, Methodist preachers meeting together in New York made Dickins's role official by appointing him the first Book Steward of the newly established Methodist Book Concern – the first denominational publishing house in America. With the full weight of the preachers' authority now behind him, and even Wesley's own reluctant agreement, Dickins turned his full attention toward ensuring the Concern's survival. It would not be easy. Three serious threats to its welfare emerged almost immediately. First, America's booming postwar market for print meant that Methodists had no need to patronize the Concern to fill their shelves with the right books. Rival editions of Methodist hymnbooks, works by John Wesley, and other staples of Methodist spirituality were pouring forth from the presses of rival publishers in Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New York. Second, in 1790 Congress passed a Federal Copyright Act that effectively threw the whole of the Methodist canon, with the exception of a tiny proportion of literature actually authored by American Methodists, into the public domain. Third, financial pressure on the Concern to succeed was increased that same year when Asbury's controversial Bishops Council invested the Preachers' Fund in the book business in exchange for the right to draw dividends arising from the sale of the

Concern's books.[40] With fewer than a dozen books in print at that time, however, there was no guarantee that the Concern would even survive much less turn a profit.

Competition in the market, internal financial demands, and the lack of a distribution infrastructure, all drove the book business into an early debt. Under these pressures, Dickins began to evolve a marketing strategy that was clearly based on Wesley's earlier demand that Williams stop printing Methodist books in America because such activities prevented the equitable distribution of profits. In the face of the Concern's mounting debt, Dickins seems to have realized that there was an important difference between directing profits back into the wider Methodist Episcopal Church and loudly proclaiming that one was doing so. In 1793, Dickins issued the Concern's first catalogue as an appendix to his edition of John Fletcher's *Posthumous Pieces.* It contained something far more important to the Concern's long-term survival than the twenty-three titles actually listed for sale. Almost half of the allotted two-page space that the catalogue occupied was allotted to a kind of advertisement in which Dickins attempted to explain why his books were more desirable than those of rival publishers:

> The Following BOOKS are published by John Dickins, No. 118, North Fourth-Street, near Race-Street, Philadelphia; for the use of the Methodist Societies in the United States of America; and the profits thereof applied for the general benefit of the said Societies. Sold by the publishers, and the Ministers and Preachers in the several Circuits . . . As the Profits of these Books are for the general Benefit of the Methodist Societies, it is humbly recommended to the Members of the said Societies, that they will purchase no Books which we publish, of any other person than the aforesaid *John Dickins,* or the Methodist Ministers and Preachers in the several Circuits, or such Persons as sell them by their Consent.[41]

By connecting the sale of his books to the welfare of the Methodist Episcopal Church in a document read not only by preachers, but also by all his potential customers, Dickins took a critically important step in equating patronage of the denominational publisher with loyalty to the church itself. No other publisher could make a similar claim. And every book the Concern published, whether authored by a Methodist or a non-Methodist, a living or a dead author, an American citizen or a British subject, conferred in equal measure the same denominational distinction

on the purchaser. This set apart not only the Concern's Methodist hymnbook from the rival hymnbooks that were beginning to flood the market, but also spiritual classics popular among Methodist readers but over which they had no special claim of ownership, such as Richard Baxter's *Call to the Unconverted* – a book that the Roman Catholic publisher Matthew Carey soon issued in Philadelphia in the hope of selling it across denominational lines. Tellingly, Dickins made no effort to describe his texts as more accurate, less expensive, or of a superior manufactured quality. The only reason Methodists ought to prefer his books to those published by others was that his books conferred financial benefit on the wider Methodist Episcopal Church. To open an edition of Baxter's *Call* and see Dickins's name on the imprint conveyed to anyone who had read Dickins's catalogue a message about the denominational identity and loyalty of the owner of that book.[42]

For decades to come, Dickins's language, or language inspired by it, appeared at the head of all the catalogues and in many of the prefaces to the books the Concern published. Meeting in Baltimore in 1800, the General Conference took this principle about the proper use of profits derived from Wesley one step further by instituting a commission on the sale of all books to Methodist preachers who were also now required to offer the Concern's wares wherever they went. The amount of the payable commission varied but typically fell somewhere between 15% and 25%. A portion of this was also reserved for presiding elders – senior preachers who bore responsibility for overseeing a group of preaching circuits.[43] The result was an unintended ironic twist on Dickins's rhetoric and Rankin and Wesley's original language inasmuch as the wider church now assumed responsibility for the Concern's debts, and preachers became commissioned salesmen rather than straightforward beneficiaries of the Concern's bounty.

Strangely enough, the arrangement was not much different from the one Robert Williams pioneered decades earlier: the more books a preacher sold, the more money he could put in his pocket. And, not surprisingly, individual preachers became so intent on selling the Concern's books that the money earned from commissions in some cases equaled or even exceeded their entire annual salaries.[44] But what mattered to success in the market just as much as a motivated sales force was an effective advertising campaign. Methodists continued to believe, despite the competitive nature of the system, that the profits earned from the sale of books supported their preachers as well as widows, orphans, and missionaries. Taken together,

Methodists in America were left with a powerful recipe for placing books in the hands of readers and visibly strengthening the role those books played in the Methodist economy as denominational status objects.

Between 1800 and 1805 – a time when other printers and publishers all along the American seaboard were spiraling down into bankruptcy – the Concern's financial standing improved rapidly.[45] During these same years the church's membership rolls almost doubled from 64,894 to 119,945.[46] As the number of Methodists in the United States grew, the rhetorical relationship between patronage of the denominational publisher with the religious identity of readers promised to become ever more expedient. And as the Concern earned greater and greater profits, American Methodist historians set about recuperating Williams's reputation. "The sermons which he [Robert Williams] printed in small pamphlets," Jesse Lee later reflected, "and circulated among the people, had a very good effect, and gave the people great light and understanding in the nature of the new birth, and in the plan of salvation: and withal, they opened the way in many places for our preachers to be invited to preach where they had never been before."[47] Nathan Bangs and Abel Stevens, each of whom authored an official history of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the nineteenth century, were similarly laudatory in their accounts of Williams and his publishing activities.[48]

In the end, then, these American Methodists not only judged Williams to be in the right, but also quickly forgot that he had ever found himself in conflict with Wesley. Though later Methodists, particularly those who relied on the accounts penned by Bangs and Stevens for their information, may have been only vaguely aware of it, the rhetorical strategies on which the Concern's market dominance was built were pioneered by John Dickins not merely in response to an American "democratic urge to multiply authors and readers," but also, and even primarily, with an eye to the transatlantic pressures Wesley exerted on his American followers to resume importing all their reading material from his London Book Room after the Revolutionary War. Thus it may be that Wesley's distant but insistent objections to the printing of Methodist books in America had as much to do with the Methodist Book Concern's success as American democracy or market capitalism. This matters not only for the study of American religious print culture, but American evangelical expansion more broadly. After all, the Methodist Book Concern was a publishing house so deeply intertwined with the fortunes of the Methodist Episcopal Church that the success of the one drove and depended on the

progress of the other.

Endnotes

1. Abel Stevens, *Life and Times of Nathan Bangs* (New York: Carlton & Porter, 1863), 301.

2. Nathan Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 204.

3. Hollis Read, *The Hand of God in History: Or, Divine Providence Historically Illustrated in the Extension and Establishment of Christianity* (Hartford: H. E. Robins and Co., 1849), iv.

4. La Roy Sunderland, *History of the United States of America, from the Discovery of the Continent in 1492, to the Fiftieth Anniversary of Their Independence* (New York: B. Waugh and T. Mason, 1834), 6.

5. Daniel Kidder, *The Dawn of Modern Civilization: Or, Sketches of the Social Condition of Europe, From the Twelfth to the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Lane & Tippett for the Sunday-School Union of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1847), 175. See also *The Dawn of Modern Civilization: Or, Sketches of the Social Condition of Europe, From the Twelfth to the Sixteenth Century* (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1847), 152.

6. Francis Bremer, *John Winthrop: America's Forgotten Founding Father* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 180.

7. Nathan Bangs, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York: T. Mason and G. Lang, 1838-41), 4:359.

8. See, for example, Paul Johnson, *A Shopkeeper's Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815-1837* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978); see also Roy Rogers, "After Democratization?" *The Junto: A Group Blog on Early American History,* March 2013, https://earlyamericanists.com/2013/03/14/after-democratization/

9. Hatch, *Democratization,* 142.

10. Hatch, *Democratization*, 127, 142.

11. See, for example, Catherine Brekus, *Strangers & Pilgrims: Female Preaching in America, 1740-1845* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998); and Monica Najar, *Evangelizing the South: A Social History of Church and State in Early America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

12. Amanda Porterfield, *Conceived in Doubt: Religion and Politics in the New American Nation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

13. David Paul Nord, *Faith in Reading: Religious Publishing and the Bird of Mass Media in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 6-7.

14. Nord, *Faith*, 221-223; Hatch, *Democratization,* 127.

15. *Meredith McGill, American Literature and the Culture of Reprinting, 1834-1853* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003).

16. Scott E. Casper and Joan Shelley Rubin, "The History of the Book in America," in *The Oxford Companion to the Book,* ed. Michael Suarez and H. R. Woudhuysen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 1:425-26.

17. James Green, "English Books and Printing in the Age of Franklin," in *The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World,* eds. Hugh Amory and David D. Hall (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 270-83.

18. Henry Rack, ed., *The Methodist Societies: The Minutes of Conference,* vol. 10 of *The Works of John Wesley* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2011), 374; and W. Reginald Ward and Richard P. Heitzenrater, eds., *Journals and Diaries,* vol. 22 of *The Works of John Wesley,* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993), 197.

19. Ward and Heitzenrater *Journals*, 5:47, 2:322 n. 85; Dee Andrews, *The Methodists and Revolutionary America, 1760-1800* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 40.

20. Jesse Lee, *A Short History of the Methodists, in The United States of America; Beginning in 1766, and Continued till 1809* (Baltimore: Magill and Clime, 1810), 27.

21. Rack, *Minutes*, 190, 207, 235, 291. See also T. B. Shepherd, *Methodism and the Literature of the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Haskell House, 1966), 71, 253.

22. Francis Asbury, *Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1958), 1:28; and John Wigger, *Taking Heaven by Storm: Methodism and the Rise of Popular Christianity in America* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 78.

23. Asbury, *Journal,* 1:46; Andrews, *Revolutionary America,* 44.

24. Despite the wording of Wesley's letter, John Wigger draws no connection between Asbury's promotion and Wesley's desire to see a stop put to Williams's publishing activities in his recent biography of Francis Asbury. See John Wigger, *American Saint: Francis Asbury and the Methodists* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 56.

25. Asbury, *Journal,* 1:164. Wigger is similarly silent on this letter in his biography (*American Saint,* 85).

26. Asbury, *Journal*, 1:85; Lee, *Short History,* 46-47.

27. David Hempton, *Methodism: Empire of the Spirit* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 58. See also Henry Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast: John Wesley and the Rise of Methodism* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993), 247; Andrews, *Revolutionary America*, 22, 25, 28, 230; Wigger, *Taking Heaven,* 179-80; and Wigger, *American Saint*, 271-75, 402.

28. Rack, *Minutes*, 190, 207, 235, 291. See also Shepherd, *Methodism and the Literature of the Eighteenth Century*, 71, 253.

29. Lee, *History*, 49.

30. James Penn Pilkington, *The Methodist Publishing House: A History* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968), 1:37, 1:41; Andrews, *Revolutionary America,* 48-50; and David Hempton, *Methodism and Politics in British Society* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984), 45.

31. Wigger, *American Saint,* 114-20.

32. Asbury, *Journal,* 1:326.

33. Asbury, *Journal,* 1:413; Wigger, *Taking Heaven,* 23-4; and Pilkington, *Methodist Publishing,* 1:49-50, 51-55.

34. Lee, *Short History,* 49.

35. Methodist Episcopal Church, *Minutes of the Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Years 1775-1828* (New York: T. Mason and G. Lane, 1840), 16; Pilkington, *Methodist Publishing,* 55.

36. Bangs, *History,* 2:67-9; Pilkington, *Methodist Publishing,* 1:43; Andrews, *Revolutionary America,* 40-44, 68ff; and Wigger, *American Saint,* 118, 159ff.

37. Andrews, *Revolutionary America,* 197; Wigger, *Taking Heaven,* 19; and Hatch, *Democratization,* 90-91.

38. Lee, *Short History,* 129.

39. *Lee, Short History,* 129; Pilkington, *Methodist Publishing,* 1:71, 1:77; Andrews, *Revolutionary America,* 198; Robert Emory, *History of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York: Lane & Scott, 1851), 81-82.

40. Pilkington, *Methodist Publishing,* 1:95

41. Melville Horn, ed., *Posthumous Pieces of the Reverend John William de la Fletchere* (Philadelphia: Parry Hall, 1793), n.p. See also Pilkington, *Methodist Publishing,* 1:102.

42. For additional examples of this rhetoric aimed directly at readers see Lucas Endicott, "Settling the 'Printing Business': John Dickins and the Methodist Episcopal Book Concern from 1789-1798," *Methodist History* 48, no. 2 (January 2010): 88-89.

43. Methodist Episcopal Church, *Journals*, 1:45-46; and Bangs, *History,* 4:427.

44. Hatch, *Democratization,* 142; and Hempton, *Empire,* 122.

45. See James Green, "The Rise of Book Publishing," in *An Extensive Republic: Print, Culture, and Society in the New Nation, 1790-1840,* eds. Robert Gross and Mary Kelley (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 86-88, 93-95; Wigger, *American Saint,* 275; and Pilkington, *Methodist Publishing,* 1:127.

46. Wigger, *Taking Heaven,* 197-200.

47. Lee, *Short History,* 48.

48. See Bangs, *History,* 1:89 and Abel Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America* (New York: Carlton & Porter, 1866): 1:165-66.