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Abstract

This thesis examines the central influence of anti-Catholicism upon the construction of English Canadian nationalism during the first half of the twentieth century. Anti-Catholicism provided an existing rhetorical and ideological tradition and framework within which public figures, intellectuals, Protestant church leaders and other Canadians communicated their diverse visions of an ideal Canada. The study of anti-Catholicism problematizes the rigid separation that many scholars have posited between a conservative ethnic nationalism and a progressive civic nationalism. Often times these very civic values were inextricable from a context of Britishness. Hostility to Catholicism was not limited only to the staunchly Anglophile Conservative party or to fraternal organizations such as the Orange Order; indeed the importance of anti-Catholicism as a component of Canadian nationalism lies in its presence across the political and intellectual spectrum. Catholicism was perceived to inculcate values antithetical to British traditions of freedom and democracy. It was a medieval faith that stunted the “natural” development of its adherents, preventing them from becoming responsible citizens in a modern democracy. The concentration of Catholicism in Quebec further inflamed many in Canada who saw French Canadian Catholics as anachronistic barriers to a united, democratic and modern Canada.
Acknowledgements

McMaster University, the L.R. Wilson Institute for Canadian History, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and the Ontario Graduate Scholarship have all provided funding for the research for this project. I would like to thank all of these institutions for allowing me the opportunity to write and complete this study that I have been interested in for seven years. I would also like to thank the Inter-Library Loan Staff at Mills Library for processing all of my various requests so efficiently and working with me personally when there was a hiccup.

I originally became interested in this project during the fourth year of my undergraduate studies at York University while taking a class on Canadian political history with Dr. Paul Stevens. Dr. Stevens encouraged me not only to write my first lengthy term paper on anti-Catholicism during the general election of 1896 but also to apply for graduate school. While pursuing my Master’s degree at York University I was supervised by Dr. William Westfall, who helped me further refine my understanding of the relationship of anti-Catholicism to English Canadian national identity. Dr. Westfall also provided an unending supply of encouragement and support for my Major Research Paper and my decision to continue in my graduate studies at McMaster University.

While at McMaster University I have received the constant support, both academically and personally, of my supervisor Dr. Michael Gauvreau. This project would not have been possible without his suggestions, his erudition, his seemingly endless patience and his friendship. In particular, my focus on the twentieth century, the selection
of intellectuals and much of the theoretical framework owe a lot to Dr. Gauvreau’s feedback. In addition I have benefitted greatly from the comments of the members of my committee, Dr. Stephen Heathorn and Dr. Martin Horn. I would like to thank them not only for their time but also for their unique perspective on a project that attempted to move outside of just Canadian history. My external advisor, Dr. Paul Litt, also contributed a keen eye for detail and invaluable commentary for my future studies. Dr. Nancy Christie, who patiently listened to me experiment with my ideas of her own free will, also provided me with important suggestions, constant support and friendship. My comprehensive course supervisors, Dr. Ken Cruikshank and Dr. Nancy Bouchier, also need to be acknowledged as they helped me maintain my enthusiasm for Canadian history during an especially trying period and throughout my time at McMaster.

Several colleagues also need to be acknowledged for tolerating my perpetual discussion of anti-Catholicism. I am grateful to Ron Collier, Mark Gulla, John Hillhouse, Nick Longaphy, Devon Stillwell, Jennifer Tunnicliffe, Ryan Vieira and Kate Walker and for always listening to me and keeping me grounded. I am thankful for their friendship and for sharing my passion for history.

My family has also provided unquestioned support. I could not have asked for a more generous family, willing to not only read drafts of my thesis, but also to provide welcome distractions. Finally, this project would not have been possible without Catherine Oakleaf. She has not only been essential in the editorial process of my dissertation but in making sure that I stayed focused on my research and did not lose my mind. This study is for her, without whom I would be a less complete person.
# Table of Contents

Abstract .................................................................................................................................................................................. iii

Acknowledgements ........................................................................................................................................................................ iv

List of Abbreviations ...................................................................................................................................................................... vii

Introduction: Understanding Canadian Anti-Catholicism ........................................................................................................... 1

Chapter 1: “[D]ispel[ling] the mediaeval darkness”: Disloyalty and Immigration, Anti-Catholicism in Canada, 1905-1929 .................................................................................................................... 43

Chapter 2: “Protagonists of Democracy”: Fascism, Birth Control and Quebec, Canadian Anti-Catholicism during the Depression ........................................................................................................ 121

Chapter 3: “[B]onusing [sic] families who have been unwilling to defend their country”: Anti-Catholicism and the Second World War in Canada ......................................................................................... 202

Chapter 4: “[I]t resembles too much the technique practiced by the Kremlin”: (Counter-) Modernity, Totalitarianism and a Policy of Containment, Anti-Catholicism in the Canadian Cold War, 1945-1965 ........................................................................................................ 287

Conclusion: “[T]he greatest criminal organization outside the Mafia:” Anti-Catholicism in Post-1960s Canada ........................................................................................................................................................................... 373

Bibliography ..................................................................................................................................................................................... 391
List of Abbreviations

Acadia University Archives: AUA
A.R. Kaufman fonds: ARK
Arthur Lower fonds: AL
Canadian Council of Churches: CCC
Canadian Forum: CF
Canadian Historical Review: CHR
Canadian Protestant Association: CPA
Canadian Protestant League: CPL
C.E. Silcox fonds: CES
Commission on the Church, Nation and World Order: CCNWO
Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship: CCCC
Co-operative Commonwealth Federation: CCF
Defence of Canada Regulations: DCR
Displaced Persons: DPs
Donald Creighton fonds: DC
Dorothea Palmer fonds: DP
Eugene Forsey fonds: EF
Eugenics Society of Canada: ESC
Evangelical Christian: EC
Fellowship for a Christian Social Order: FCSO
F.R. Scott fonds: FRS
George Drew fonds: GD
Glenbow Museum Archives: GMA
Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate: GW
Guelph Ministerial Association: GMA
Harold Innis fonds: HI
Inter-Church Committee for Protestant-Roman Catholic Relations: ICC
Ku Klux Klan: KKK
League of Social Reconstruction: LSR
Library and Archives Canada: LAC
Military Service Act: MSA
Montreal Catholic School Commission: MCSC
National Resources Mobilization Act: NRMA
New Canadian Service Bureau: NCSB
Parents’ Information Bureau: PIB
Parti Québécois: PQ
Progressive Conservative Party: PC
Protestant Action: PA
Queen’s Quarterly: QQ
Queen’s University Archives: QUA
Saturday Night: SN
Social Service Council of Canada: SSCC
Solon Low fonds: SL
Springbank Loyal Orange Lodge fonds: SLOL

Toronto Bible College: TBC

Union Nationale: UN

United Church Observer: UCO

United Church of Canada Archives: UCA

University of Waterloo Archives: UWA

Wartime Elections Act: WEA

Wartime Information Board: WIB

Watson Kirkconnell fonds: WK

William Burton Hurd fonds: WBH

William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections, McMaster University: MU

World Council of Churches: WC
Introduction: Understanding Canadian Anti-Catholicism

In response to criticism of his 1965 lecture, “Church and State,” prominent Canadian historian Arthur Lower stated: “The only point I try to make … is that the individual’s right to decide for himself, not only in religion, but in all other spheres, is the founding principle of Protestantism. The very essence of Catholicism, on the other hand, is the necessity of the individual’s submitting to authority,” adding that “[t]here is still a ‘burning at the stake’ waiting for the disobedient Catholic, it must be remembered – in the form . . . of excommunication.” Lower went on to outline how the distinctly Protestant values of individualism and self-government in church and state were the defining characteristics of modern industrial society. In fact for Lower, Protestantism was not only synonymous with modern society but also with democracy itself, a teleological worldview most famously encapsulated in Max Weber’s Protestant Work Ethic. According to Lower, Protestantism minimized coercion and authority. Lower framed his notion of the modern state in stark opposition to the alleged arbitrariness of Catholicism: “We [Protestants] obey laws because we feel that we had a part in making them. What Catholic had a part in making the Dogma of the Bodily Assumption of the Virgin?”

Anti-Catholicism, such as that voiced by Lower, has proven to be an underdeveloped topic of historical study not only within the field of Canadian history. This omission is particularly glaring because anti-Catholicism was so prevalent throughout the twentieth century; a study of anti-Catholicism in the post-World War Two years in Canada is the most obvious omission. Although Canadian history is rich with
studies of the nature of Canadian Protestantism and its relation to Canadian national identity in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the prominence of anti-Catholic rhetoric within these spheres has been largely overlooked. This project will fill this historiographical gap and build upon the small body of existing literature by demonstrating that anti-Catholicism in Canada from 1905-1965 was a cultural and intellectual measuring stick against which conceptions of English Canadian national identity were formulated. During this period, anti-Catholicism contained its own interior logic and purpose and was not simply the realm of an illiberal “lunatic fringe,” such as the Ku Klux Klan. Instead, anti-Catholicism was central to the discourses of mainstream intellectuals, politicians and civic organizations, such as Arthur Lower, C.E. Silcox and George Drew along with the allegedly ecumenical Inter-Church Committee on Protestant-Roman Catholic Relations (ICC) and various Protestant church federations. Anti-Catholicism was also evident among prominent leftist intellectuals and activists, such as Eugene Forsey, F.R. Scott and J.S. Woodsworth, who held a caricatured perception of the Catholic Church as authoritarian, regressive and harmful to the Canadian body politic, particularly during the Depression. The eclecticism of anti-Catholic sentiment supports Jeffrey McNairn’s sage advice that intellectual historians cannot simply assume a narrow definition of ideological cohesion hived off from any wider social context; ideas are infinitely complex and always reflect their context, with many different ideas being labeled and relabeled with no attention paid to the potentially staid definitions constructed by historians. As these diverse intellectuals negotiated and indeed constructed Canada’s national identity during the first half of the twentieth century, the predominance of anti-
Catholicism, which was consistently decried as anti-Canadian itself, demonstrates that the allegedly secular Canadian nationalism that emerged during this period was in fact deeply and specifically Protestant. My project therefore contributes to discussions of Canadian nationalism by adding religious, and anti-Catholic, nuances.

But what is anti-Catholicism? At its simplest, the definition of anti-Catholicism is hostility to Catholicism as a belief system, the Catholic Church as an institution and to Catholics as adherents to this particular belief system. Yet anti-Catholicism loomed large as a historical subject in Canada. It was more than offering simple criticisms of the Church or individual Catholics over their theological traditions or position on social, cultural or moral issues. Instead, anti-Catholicism engages with a coterie of stereotypes, tropes and themes with a particular historical significance that present Catholicism as a false faith while questioning its position in modern society and reducing the Catholic Church to a power-hungry caricature. American historian Mark Massa has identified three major forms of anti-Catholicism. Cultural anti-Catholicism proclaims American culture to be specifically Protestant (often synonymous with democratic) in its “ordering” and composition, emphasizing certain allegedly Protestant values like freedom of thought and access to the “true” Gospel. Catholicism, on the other hand, was too “European” and authoritarian in nature. Intellectual anti-Catholicism portrays Catholic traditions and theology as inherently opposed to various formative historical moments, such as the Reformation and the Enlightenment, and therefore hostile to the secular state. Intellectual anti-Catholicism was particularly prominent in American universities and exploded in the postwar era. Social-scientific anti-Catholicism was hostile towards Catholicism because it
was believed to be an impediment to the development of a truly pluralist society where religion had been thoroughly privatized. Proponents of this perspective were engaging in a process of “boundary-making” whereby the Church was castigated for its continuing assertion of authority in the public sphere, its assumed authority over sexual and moral issues and its rigid hierarchy. As Massa suggests, anti-Catholicism is hardly a simple phenomenon; it is multifaceted with numerous competing thematic elements.

It is impossible, however, to completely sever Massa’s three main types of anti-Catholicism from each other or from the “vulgar” form of anti-Catholicism that is based on a caricatured perception of the Catholic Church and the Pope, particularly in the early twentieth century. While not all anti-Catholics saw the pope as Antichrist, many did see Catholicism as a false faith that prevented Catholics from adapting to the modern world. Steven Pincus has noted that in the seventeenth century, Popery was believed to consist of two insidious elements: religious enthusiasm and political tyranny. Thus for many “Cromwellian moderates” the political machinations of Catholicism needed to be thwarted. In Canada in the twentieth century these Catholic political strategies consisted of such schemes as the out-breeding and “swamping” of good British stock and their attempt to influence the educational and political sphere. Others, described by Pincus as “religious radicals,” relied on Biblical language equating the Papacy with Antichrist and believed any truck or trade with Catholics was tantamount to subversion. Yet Pincus’ categories often overlapped in his study and twentieth century Canada was no different in the constant negotiation deciding what defined a true Canadian. This perspective constructed a corrupt clergy or the Vatican as the puppet-master pulling the strings of
Catholics who fought for socio-political goals, such as further integration into society while refusing to accept the core traditions of this society. In addition, the blind loyalty of Catholics to their hierarchy and its “foolish” doctrines were inextricably tied within the framework of anti-Catholicism to the nationally detrimental actions of individual Catholics. Their faith thus prevented them from being able to fully participate in civil society, a society defined by its devotion to non-Catholic values such as freedom, liberty and democracy.\footnote{Beyond demonstrating the lingering theological themes that were embedded within socio-political anti-Catholicism my project will demonstrate the high degree of similarity between “vulgar” and “genteel” forms of anti-Catholicism. The revision of this rigid divide is extrapolated from Alan Mendelson’s study of anti-Semitism among the Anglo-Canadian elite. Mendelson argues that “genteel” anti-Semites strove to differentiate themselves from the “vulgar,” anti-Semitism of the Nazis and street gangs by presenting prejudice as having been gained through reasoned, rational thought which did not promote or engage in physical violence. The separation between genteel and vulgar anti-Semitism has been widely accepted in the literature, which, according to Mendelson, has consequently validated the anti-Semitism of elite figures. For Mendelson “genteel” anti-Semitism is perhaps even more insidious as it masks itself in a veneer of objectivity, thereby making anti-Semitism respectable. In reality both types of anti-Semitism relied upon prejudicial, caricatured assumptions about Jews, for example characterizing them as inherently dangerous to the functioning of civil society or purporting Jews to be fundamentally alien people exhibiting certain unalterable characteristics.}\footnote{10}
Mendelson’s model lends itself well to the anti-Catholicism that existed in Canada in the twentieth century. Many intellectuals and prominent Protestant figures engaged in an “objective” condemnation of Catholicism while simultaneously expressing outrage at the “unpatriotic” excesses of the Orange Order or the fiery fundamentalist Rev. T.T. Shields. Yet this reveals a glaring irony because their conclusions were often the same: Catholicism was a “fossilized faith” hindering the development of Canada in the modern world. In addition, some Protestant Canadians perceived Catholicism as a rival form of (counter-) modernity providing a systematic alternative to liberal democracy which Protestantism was potentially unable to match; this elicited anxiety amongst some that while Catholicism was gaining in social respectability and sheer numbers, the Protestant tradition was losing its vitality. Allison O’Mahen Malcom has noted that studies of the Orange Order in Canada and American nativism have tended to separate the anti-Catholicism of these groups, labeled as extremism, from mainstream Protestant opinion, perpetuating the historical assumption that mainstream Protestants did not share the vehement hostility to Catholicism. For Malcom this divide is artificial as Orangeism, in particular, was accepted as an embodiment of conservatism and loyalism in the nineteenth century and into the twentieth. Catholicism needed to be challenged, reformed (with all of the Protestant connotations of this word) or, in perhaps the major difference between “vulgar” and “genteel” anti-Catholicism beyond the violence of the language, even expunged from the nation in general. Protestants of all denominations, ideology and societal positions felt the Catholic threat.
This detailed analysis of anti-Catholicism challenges long-standing assumptions about the history of Canadian nationalism, which have typically posited teleological interpretations of its development. Ramsay Cook’s interpretation is perhaps the best-recognized example. Cook’s contribution to Canadian historiography is undeniable. However, he actively participated in the construction of a normative framework of Canadian nationalism within which later Canadian historians have operated. Cook concluded that the major problem throughout Canadian history was that Canada was too nationalistic, in total contradistinction to explicitly nationalist historians who have bemoaned what they perceive to be a lack of Canadian identity in the face of the American colossus. Cook positions himself as an anti-nationalist because he recognizes nationalism to be emotional and irrational and therefore counterproductive to the success of a modern pluralistic society. Cook believes that there is a fundamental difference between the nationalist state and the nation-state, which is not culturally or ideologically national but is instead based on a Canadian political identity fostered by successful federalism. In Cook’s analysis, eschewing nationalism was necessary to ensure the functioning of the nation itself.

Raymond Breton shares Cook’s perspective, adding that Canada needed a strict civic nationalism as ethnic nationalism would hinder a nation such as Canada, advocating a separation of the “cultural … from the political” in order to preserve the nation in the face of regressive, emotional tendencies such as ethnic nationalism. The major problem with Breton and Cook’s interpretation is that it fails to acknowledge the residual “ethnic” elements that linger in their notion of civic nationalism; for Cook and Breton, allegiance
to the “neutral” nation-state and “universal” values, such as democracy and liberty, transcend parochial identities while allowing individuality to flourish. As Philip Buckner has noted, there is a tension in Cook’s work between the need to favour the “national experience” over “regionalist” histories that he perceives as a threat to the substance of the Canadian nation-state while simultaneously condemning Canadian nationalism.\(^\text{17}\)

Cook’s emphasis on the “national experience” also seems to contradict one of his most influential methodological concepts, that of limited identities. The idea of limited identities seeks to examine the local, smaller components of Canadian identity, which by its very nature was fragmented and not unified by a cohesive national experience, according to Cook.\(^\text{18}\) The “limited identities” approach does fit, however, into Cook’s liberal civic nationalist teleology, as he envisioned a united Canada that had shed its adherence to crass Britishness, an ethnic concept, and embraced the pluralist federalism of the Canadian nation-state. Anti-Catholicism in Canada, on the other hand, demonstrates the continuation of explicit and implicit assumptions of Britishness that existed within civic identity throughout the 1960s and into the 1970s. It also exemplifies the exclusionary nature of ostensibly “universal” concepts of nationalism that embrace tolerance and the state. Bernard Yack, in his excellent study of nationalism, believes this process of dichotomization to be a dangerous solution to the very real challenges posed by aggressive ethnic nationalism. For Yack, civic nationalism is itself rife with ethnocentrism, embodying the historical and cultural baggage of the American and French Revolutions; in other words, the “civic nation” is not neutral, as Canadian scholars have posited, but laden with assumptions about “rational” and “voluntary” citizen
participation. The central myth of the civic nation that Yack refutes is the total freedom of choice for citizens belonging or participating in a civic nation as it refuses to recognize the continuation of, and even intrinsic reality of, marginalization. This Western conceit, for Yack, represents “a mixture of self-congratulation and wishful thinking.” Through the prism of anti-Catholicism, it becomes apparent that civic and ethnic nationalism, far from being oppositional, frequently co-exist within nationalistic discourses.

Carl Berger, in his seminal work *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914*, provides a more nuanced analysis of Canadian identity. He challenges the simplistic view of liberal nationalists, such as O.D. Skelton (and Cook) that imperialism and Britishness were embarrassing remnants of Canada’s colonial past. Berger posited the simple but important idea that imperialism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was a species of Canadian nationalism. Imperialists interpreted history and the destiny of the nation differently from Skelton or Mackenzie King, yet still recognized Canada as a unique nation with its own traditions worthy of respect and preservation. Berger also denied the validity of privileging one concept of nationalism because there was always a multiplicity of nationalisms in any given nation in any historical period. Berger believed that imperialist sentiment embodied a particular component of the Canadian nationalist project. However, as Michael Gauvreau has pointed out, while Berger undermined liberal historians such as Cook, he continued to promulgate the consensual project that often exists within Canadian intellectual history, namely that nationalisms are uniform within distinct ideological frameworks such as civic or ethnic nationalism.
In this project, I examine a variety of differing conceptions of Canada throughout the twentieth century in order to analyze conflicting, often contradictory nationalist visions and projects rather than imposing an essentializing nationalist framework over a multi-faceted phenomenon. In addition, Berger’s proclamation that imperialism “died” due to WWI is in need of revision.\(^{23}\) The presence of anti-Catholicism in various manifestations throughout the next several decades of Canadian history provides the historian the opportunity to track the continuation, and periodic inflammations, of aggressively “British” rhetoric, particularly during WWII. Discourse surrounding Catholicism often owed much to the British Protestant heritage that many intellectuals, public figures and religious leaders shared; this sentiment did not decline when discussing Catholicism but shifted its focus and composition. By tracing the various trajectories of anti-Catholicism during this period, it becomes apparent that anti-Catholicism not only played a central role in defining English Canadian national identity, but also in subverting the rigid nationalist typology elucidated by some scholars.

This perspective in Canadian historiography is most prominently argued recently by Jose Igartua in his study *The Other Quiet Revolution: National Identity in English Canada, 1945-71*, in which he positions ethnic nationalism as conservative and particularistic, privileging the British connection, while civic nationalism is based on “universalist” values, such as liberty and allegiance to the state.\(^{24}\) Igartua argues that English Canada shifted suddenly in the 1960s from a British, ethnic nationalism to a universalist, civic nationalism in response to the changing ethnic composition of the country and the growing sympathy amongst the Pearson government and English
Canadians with French Canada’s grievances. Igartua is careful not to advocate a radical divide between ethnic and civic nationalism, but he still presents the former as conservative and reactionary and the latter as liberal and progressive. Although anti-Catholicism was often based on a dedication to direct British lineage and the preserving of the British connection, it was just as often based on the idea that Protestantism itself, as distinct from Britain and grounded in a particular reading of history represented by the Reformation, upheld the ideals of liberty, democracy and freedom exclusive to Catholicism. The linking of Protestantism with liberty, democracy and individualism helps explain the concern many Protestant Canadians felt in the face of a changing nation, particularly the perceived eclipsing of Protestantism by rival faiths. It was through this conception of the world and the influence of Protestantism that liberal mainstream intellectuals were able to vilify the Catholic Church internationally and in Canada (particularly in Quebec) by promoting civic, universalist values emptied of overt ethnic references. Igartua thus draws too sharp a distinction between civic and ethnic nationalism and too quickly assumes the disappearance of ethnic nationalism in the face of the civic challenge. As mentioned earlier, Yack has demonstrated that conceptions of civic nationalism simply “redescrib[e] contingent communities of memory and experience as if they were nothing more than voluntary associations of individuals, united by their shared attachment to a body of moral and political principles.” This imposition of order upon conflicting, and often excluded, identities or memories replicates that of ethnic nationalism; it is simply not as explicitly based upon blood and claims a neutral, voluntary character as opposed to the violence and bigotry of ethnic belonging. Indeed
these Protestant intellectuals promoted an exclusionary nationalism, which did not include Catholicism, in order to preserve specifically Protestant conceptions of liberalism and freedom.

In an excellent recent study of the triangular relations between Canada, Quebec and France in the postwar era, David Meren briefly refers to the ambiguities of the civic-ethnic divide. While he seems to agree with Igartua’s “other quiet revolution” model for English Canada in which the British conception of the nation became eclipsed by a changing nation, Meren offers less certainty with regards to Quebec. For Meren French traditions of nationalism throughout modern history were often political, but this has not precluded the periodic privileging of ethno-cultural attributes, as in Vichy France. In fact the very universalism so valued by republican France has often carried with it ethno-cultural connotations regarding which people are included in the subjective “we” of France. The tools of the political-civic nation, such as “rational(izing) administration, social science and assimilating techniques” have been used to particularize, not universalize, segments of the population. For Meren therefore the danger of any a priori understanding of “‘Frenchness’ … or, for that matter, ‘Canadianness’ or ‘Quebecite’ … has the potential to lend itself to a chauvinistic nationalism.” I contend that this a priori understanding was present in the liberal, civic nationalism of some Protestant Canadians into the 1960s.

C.P. Champion has offered a more sustained critique of Igartua, accusing him of continuing a long Canadian tradition of condemning Britishness as archaic, racist and representing a “pre-Canadian” heritage. Champion does not profess a simplistic
perspective that Britishness was racist or that it quickly disappeared in the 1960s. Rather, Champion sees Canadian intellectuals, politicians and popular culture as adhering to traditions of Britishness throughout the postwar era. According to Champion, this vein of Canadian Britishness was distinctly liberal, emphasizing diversity and tolerance, a “second Britain” to the crass chauvinism of some imperialists. Perhaps Champion’s most valuable contributions to this history is his assertion that Britishness remained central to Canadian identity during the Pearsonian era and beyond and his observation that Britishness is a multifaceted phenomenon that manifested itself in diverse ways. Champion’s study is limited, however, by his overt Anglophilia. Champion theorizes that the perpetuation of civic nationalism was the fulfillment, rather than the rejection of, the liberal conception of Britishness. Champion’s analysis is limited because he assumes liberal proclamations of tolerance to be evidence thereof. This perspective echoes that of Tory intellectuals during the 1940s and 1950s who believed Britishness itself represented universalized values. My research reveals that intellectuals, public figures and civic organizations that identified themselves as perpetuating liberal ideals were in fact unable to accept Catholicism as a valid component of the modern nation, due to its perceived authoritarianism and its alien place in Canadian tradition. The implicitly and explicitly Protestant values of freedom, tolerance and liberty were used to argue against the inclusion of Catholicism within Canadian society. This observation demonstrates that the historiographical dichotomization of civic and ethnic nationalism, and the positioning of civic nationalism as inherently liberal, does not allow for the flexibility and nuance of such ideologies in Canada’s history.
Anti-Catholicism was not, however, a static rhetorical strategy and instead was a dynamic component of English Canadian nationalism. While anti-Catholicism frequently shared similar themes and tropes, various interest groups and individuals mobilized it for different purposes during different periods and contexts. From 1905-1929 anti-Catholic rhetoric was focused on the preponderant influence this “backward” religion had upon the nation to undermine the hopes of Progressive Era reformers who advocated for increased democracy and national efficiency. This “progressive” anti-Catholic mode singled out Quebec during WWI as disloyal and anti-progressive, while largely Catholic (or Orthodox) immigrants in Western Canada were attacked as hindering national development, particularly in the 1920s. Many leftist intellectuals clung to progressive anti-Catholicism into the 1930s as they saw Catholicism as a barrier to democratic progress or indeed as a threat to its very existence. Catholicism was instead a reactionary force facilitating demagoguery and corruption. Those who ascribed to this brand of anti-Catholicism also believed it to be the foremost enemy of another progressive cause célèbre, contraception, along with the more extreme practice of eugenics. Progressive anti-Catholicism also contained an explicit devotion to British institutions and traditions, which included the Protestant faith which progressives, liberals and conservatives all shared in this period. Indeed British civic values, held to be universal, were tinged with ethnicity which became evident when “other” groups, such as French Canadians and non-British European immigrants, were assumed to be irreconcilable to these fundamentally British values as Catholics stubbornly maintained their religious traditions.
With the outbreak of the Second World War anti-Catholicism became politicized in Canada, becoming notably embraced by the Progressive Conservative (PC) party and particularly George Drew. Catholic Quebec was the target of the vast majority of anti-Catholic sentiment as it was once again perceived as disloyal due to the authoritarian and alien nature of the French Canadian Church. It was thought to be actively preventing Canadian unity for the prosecution of the war effort. This war effort revived a fierce ethnic nationalism in English Canada which allowed anti-Catholicism to become an important discursive strategy in the fight for Canada and Britain. The revitalization of anti-Catholicism using explicitly “British” language challenges Berger and John English’s claim that the Unionist experiment permanently discredited imperialism and was therefore a “casualty” of the First World War. Instead, imperialism flared up in a time of national crisis, now steeped in the anti-Catholicism that was already strong in Canada, savaging Catholicism as un-Canadian and harmful to the Allies. Drew and his coterie continued to utilize anti-Catholicism for political capital even after the war ended, but the Cold War witnessed the “universalizing” of anti-Catholicism away from the Tories’ narrow ethnic basis focused on French Canadians. Anti-Catholic sentiment began to encompass broader concerns about Catholic illiberality. This was catalyzed by the polarization of the world between atheistic totalitarianism and liberal democracy, the latter perceived to be fundamentally based on Christianity and the traditions of the Reformation. It is in this period that the final manifestation of mainstream ethnic nationalism in English Canada began to bleed into the civic nationalism which was emerging. Anti-Catholicism thus demonstrates not only the nature of Canadian
nationalism, but also illuminates the exclusionary nature of a normative civic nationalism claiming an adherence only to “universal” values and shorn of regressive ethnic residue.

Contained within much of the material analyzed for this study are references to Canada’s inherently “British” nature. Britishness, along with nationalism and anti-Catholicism, is a complex concept that shifted in meaning when mobilized by different individuals, political parties or interest groups. Yet an appeal to British traditions and British institutions underlay much of the anti-Catholic sentiment of this period in Canada. In recent years Britishness has become a subject of debate within the British historical community, centring on questions such as the dating of the formation of Britishness, the role of Empire in forming British identity or the differences between Britishness and Englishness. Linda Colley, for example, claims that Britishness was invented by 1707 with the Act of Union with Scotland motivated by Britain’s various wars, which necessitated a united people, and Protestantism, which encouraged a unitary identity in the face of the continental (largely Catholic) threat. This identity was of course subject to significant revisions and challenges in the subsequent years. Colley has come under criticism by other scholars for simplifying the formation of British identity, or for believing that identity is invented and not simply the result of a gradual historical process, but what is important in the literature on Britishness for this study is that it is presented as fluid and adaptable by necessity to almost any historical situation and is not treated simply as jingoism. Britishness within the United Kingdom was always a process of trying to subdue local loyalties, traditions and nationalisms to an overarching ideal of what defined Britain and its Empire. According to Krishan Kumar and Peter
Mandler, this process was more prominent at different times than others, such as the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, with particularly potent forms of Englishness constantly challenging the dominance of Britishness, which encompassed a wider identity.\(^40\) In fact, according to Mandler’s work, lusty proclamations of Britishness declined after WWI despite the fact that the Empire had reached its greatest size. The vicious civil wars in Ireland had demonstrated to the British that the imposition of British traditions did not always guarantee peace and order and the increasingly shrill appeals to imperialist sentiment by Ulster Unionists convinced many that perhaps this expansive aspect of the British was not truly British at all. This, for Mandler, caused interwar Britishness to decline in favour of an inward-looking English national character.\(^41\)

The changing nature of Britishness in the mother country was important to many in Canada who maintained an allegiance to the British connection. As Kumar has stated, Britain and British were the terms many outsiders used to describe the United Kingdom and its residents;\(^42\) yet for Anglos in Canada “British” was also how they described themselves at their core, referring to their institutions, traditions and dominant cultural trends. If the mother country was perceived as aloof or inward-looking, as Mandler maintains that it was during the interwar period, many English Canadians emphasized their continued devotion to British ideals, including Protestantism. As Jonathan Vance has noted in his study of Canadians serving and living in Britain during and between the World Wars, the idea emerged that it was Canada’s responsibility to represent traditional British values in the face of the complacency of the mother country. These values, such as democracy and social order,\(^43\) were necessary for the proper functioning of not only
society but in fact the international community. Many English Canadians saw in themselves the ability and responsibility to protect and cultivate these values and traditions; anti-Catholicism fit into this process of self-definition as it was also central to what many perceived as the traditional British identity. Britishness in Canada thus reflected trends in Britain but was also determined by socio-political developments on the home front. It was not just derivative of Britain but was a component of a reciprocal relationship in which English Canadians saw themselves—in the words of James Belich—as “Better Britons,” separated from the crass interest politics of the mother country. Protestantism remained central to this identity in Canada through the Second World War and influenced attitudes towards Catholics and the place of Catholicism within the Canadian body politic.

In his study of Canadian evangelicalism, Mark Noll briefly mentions the prominence of anti-Catholicism in the North Atlantic Triangle, believing that anti-Catholicism was a central component of “Protestant self-definition.” Nancy Lusignan Schultz contends that in order to fully comprehend anti-Catholicism in the nineteenth century one needs to remember that Protestants have often based their entire identities “upon this adversarial relationship to Catholicism.” Susan Griffin expands upon this solely confrontational relationship in her analysis of anti-Catholic literature, believing that “Protestantism’s legitimacy depends upon tracing its origins to, and differentiating itself from, Roman Catholicism.” Catholicism represented the irrational and medieval past of Protestantism that the Reformation had broken from. However, the Catholic Church did not disappear thereafter and it remained as a constant reminder of the primal,
unenlightened past and a perceived persistent opponent and rival to modern society. The Catholic Church was in this way both the enemy of Protestantism and its closest kin. The oppositional discourse of anti-Catholicism speaks more about the Protestant culture of the time than it does about Catholicism, expressing the anxieties of Protestants of various denominational and political stripes of losing cherished values and social influence. The study of anti-Catholicism allows for a more nuanced understanding of the extreme complexity of the values, fears, cultural assumptions and conception of history being both constructed and perpetuated by Protestant Canadians during this historical period.

According to Noll this “self-definition” in America largely revolved around Americans’ messianism, fearing that Roman Catholicism was interfering through its machinations and belief system with America’s divine mission. Canadian anti-Catholicism, on the other hand, more consistently reflected the older English, Scottish or Ulster prejudices since Canada continued to value the British connection. This was embodied in the suspicion that Roman Catholics could not be loyal to British traditions due to their allegiance to the pope. In Canada the added presence of a large and influential French Catholic population from the very beginning of the nation firmly entrenched anti-Catholicism in Canada’s history. The great scholar of evangelicalism David Bebbington has also noted that anti-Catholicism proved to be a major aspect of the common Protestant culture shared between Canada and the mother country, distinguishing its evangelicalism from an otherwise purely continental hue. Bebbington adds that this anti-Catholicism was fed by the presence of French Catholicism, although he does not
mention the centrality of Catholic immigration to this sentiment in the late nineteenth and deep into the twentieth century.⁵²

These sources only briefly mention anti-Catholicism, referring to it in its nineteenth century manifestations and focusing only on its relation to evangelicalism. There are a handful of other studies of Canadian anti-Catholicism in the nineteenth and early twentieth century in Canada, most of which analyze specific events, organizations or regions of Canada and offer specifically political-economic explanations of anti-Catholicism.⁵³ While these are valuable resources revealing the prominence of anti-Catholicism in Canada in this period, they do not analyze the patterns of anti-Catholic thought or its central role in Protestant self-definition. J.R. Miller has provided more comprehensive examinations,⁵⁴ such as his broad but brief overview entitled “Anti-Catholicism in Canada: From the British Conquest to the Great War.” While this article must be seen as an introductory addition to the literature, the conclusion that anti-Catholicism was both an “analytical tool and an instrument for combating what the analysis revealed to be the problem” is innovative.⁵⁵ Miller’s more focused “Anti-Catholic Thought in Victorian Canada” has established that anti-Catholicism, in addition to its important political aspect, also “had a theological face and a social demeanour.”⁵⁶ Miller skillfully demonstrates the complexity of anti-Catholicism through an analysis of domestic anti-Catholic literature, eschewing the tendency of earlier studies to focus on one limited time period or event. Anti-Catholicism is shown in its various contexts as first being a reflection of British values that progressed into a distinctly Canadian phenomenon concerned with French Canadian nationalism, economic stagnation and the Fenian raids.⁵⁷
A.J.B. Johnston has also proved influential to the present study, particularly his belief that Protestant Nova Scotians in the mid-nineteenth century “projected [their] anxieties onto their Catholic fellow citizens, depicting them as the inverted image (passive, docile and backward) of the ideal which they set for themselves.” Therefore “Catholics . . . were well suited for their role as scapegoats[.]”

While twentieth century anti-Catholicism has proven a fruitful topic of analysis in American historiography it is almost completely absent in the Canadian literature. It is mentioned in some studies of the early twentieth century, for example in relation to the passing of Regulation 17 in Ontario or in the formation of the nascent welfare state, but not as a major theme. Other studies limit themselves to specific organizations, such as the Orange Order or the Ku Klux Klan. Work on the Klan or the openly anti-Catholic J.T.M. Anderson government of Saskatchewan, which the Klan helped elect, provide good case studies for anti-Catholic sentiment and its influence in the Prairies in the interwar period. This literature, however, does not analyze anti-Catholicism extensively and does not posit it as a central component of the intellectual firmament of English Canada. Instead anti-Catholicism is often presented as an episodic occurrence that only emerged during particular crises. The postwar period in particular is almost uncharted territory for the study of anti-Catholicism in Canada. Nancy Christie has provided two invaluable contributions to the role of anti-Catholicism in the formation of a postwar Canadian identity. However this topic was not the primary focus of her articles. This project will build upon Christie’s questioning of the hegemony of this era through the lens
of Protestant intellectuals and their perceptions of Catholicism and its “detrimental” effects on Canadian society and English Canadian nationalism.

The presence of anti-Catholicism throughout the political, ideological and religious spectrum in Canada opens up space to question the alleged dichotomy between civic nationalism and ethnic nationalism which allows an engagement with an excellent existing international literature. Anthony Smith, who has written prolifically on the subject of nationalism, paints the civic-ethnic framework as being influenced by Hans Kohn’s theory positing Western and non-Western forms of nationalism. The former was rationalist, enlightened and liberal while the latter was authoritarian, shrill and even mystical. In Smith’s opinion this theory became normative for many European-trained scholars as it privileged the “Western” tradition. The popularization of the civic-ethnic dichotomy by its adherents, such as Michael Ignatieff, has furthered the reach of this normative framework that is too simplistic for Smith. Instead Smith draws attention to the fact that civic nationalism, no matter how liberal in its claims and how vociferous in its denunciations of ethnic nationalism, can still be utilized to endorse illiberal policies and beliefs. “Civic nationalism’s failure to endorse minority group rights may be consonant with liberal individualism and individual human rights,” Smith writes, “but only by conveniently overlooking the group rights accorded to the majority (host) nation.”

In a thorough rethinking of the dichotomy Jocelyne Couture, Kai Nielsen and Michel Seymour attack civic nationalists for their arrogance, as they have used this normative framework to castigate any criticisms of civic nationalism as a primitive ethnic
aberration. For these authors civic nationalists are often forced to conceal the fact that the state to which they hold allegiance is still composed of a majority group; within the modern multicultural/multinational state this institutionalization of civic nationalism inevitably leads to marginalization and friction between minority and majority groups. Civic nationalism functions by ignoring significant differences and problems while acknowledging minor issues as it strives to assimilate differences and to ease tensions. Thus civic nationalists, such as Cook himself, by accepting the nation-state as the prism through which to view society, embrace an exclusionary nationalist principle for which they condemn their ethnic nationalist enemies. It is this blindness to the potential exclusivity that this “universalized” concept of the Canadian nation, based on a troubling normative framework, which will be revised in this project. This important exclusivity thus represents a contingent universalism.

My work also speaks to the literature dealing with the complex relationship between liberalism, anti-Catholicism and the formation of nationalism. Michael Gross’ study *The War Against Catholicism: Liberalism and the Anti-Catholic Imagination in Nineteenth Century Germany* has proven particularly influential. In his book Gross states with regards to the Kulturkampf in Germany that “[t]he Kulturkampf emerges . . . not as an exception to liberal principles but as the culmination of liberal demands for a modern German … order. Anti-Catholic discourse was not derivative but constitutive of liberalism; it was not an ancillary expression but, on the contrary, at the core of liberalism in Germany.” In the edited volume *Culture Wars: Secular-Catholic Conflict in Nineteenth Century Europe* Christopher Clark and Wolfram Kaiser argue along a similar
line, undermining the idea that liberalism was void of prejudice or exclusionary practices, especially in the anti-clerical crusades carried out by liberals in the second half of the nineteenth century in Europe. Kaiser adds that liberals and anti-clericals united in the name of “the nation” and progress to prevent the triumph of the ultramontane model in Europe as this would allow a foreign system to guide the lives of modern Europeans. Therefore only within a strict modern liberal framework could Catholicism claim the benefits of the liberal, tolerant state; otherwise, if ultramontanists persisted in their authoritarian, centralist agenda they were to be excised from the nation. In one of the most recent works dedicated solely to the study of anti-Catholicism, Timothy Verhoeven states that the Catholic Church was portrayed as unchanging and monolithic, representing a significant barrier to human progress through its harmful archaic traditions in the nineteenth century. One of the major goals of this project is to move this vital scholarly discussion to Canada and into the twentieth century, as so much of the literature addressing nationalism, national identity and the relationship of religion to these phenomena have omitted the central role of anti-Catholicism therein.

One exception is Justin Nordstrom’s analysis of American print culture in the early twentieth century that focuses specifically on the prominence of anti-Catholicism in the pages of a select number of Progressive Era newspapers. Nordstrom’s study attempts to navigate the difficult waters of defining nativism, disagreeing with John Higham that anti-Catholicism was only nativistic when attacking Catholics due to their ethnicity. This model assumes that the anti-Catholics were always Anglo-Saxon Protestants and that the Catholics being marginalized were always recent immigrants or from a major
minority group. Instead Nordstrom, borrowing from David Brion Davis’ influential article analyzing the narrative tradition of “counter-subversion” in American history, believes that American anti-Catholicism in this era focused on cultural and ideological issues, not just, or primarily, ethnicity. This form of nativism is dubbed “ideological nativism.” It is through this prism of ideological nativism that Nordstrom seeks to collapse the normative dichotomy between civic and ethnic nationalism as these anti-Catholics presented a consciously civic conception of American identity which was equally as exclusive as any ethnic Americanism. While the differences and similarities between American and Canadian anti-Catholicism will be discussed in detail later, Nordstrom’s observation that there was an idealized civic vision of “nation” which was particularly exclusive of Catholics in North America in the twentieth century is an important aspect of this study.

William Katerberg has also provided an excellent theoretical study of the integrative relationship between nativism, parochial identities and liberal democracy in North America. In Katerberg’s mind both nativism and liberal democracy often emerge from the same “protoplasmic pool,” the desire for belonging and community. Parochial identities and nativism have always been aspects of liberal democracies, and Katerberg questions the assumption that liberalism, along with other ideologies such as socialism, exist as “secular phenomena,” or in other words outside of ethnic, nationalist, religious or moral commitments. The liberal-democratic nation-state, while being the fundamental symbol of civic nationalism, has also proven unable to subsume ethnic and religious rivalries due to the contradictions inherent within liberal democracy itself. These contradictions, particularly the desire (perhaps need) to construct meaningful human
identities in a state which castigates all “parochialism” as illiberal and yet which is itself the product of the development of certain historical circumstances which have privileged its existence, are often what produces parochial identities. Thus for Katerberg liberal democracies and nativism are inextricable; one cannot exist without the other. This is a useful theoretical framework as it demonstrates the potential for exclusivity within liberal democratic nations in all but the most abstract formulation. Prejudice towards those deemed backward or unfit for what a particular society values in a given context no matter how universal is not an unnatural aberration of modern liberal society in this interpretation limited to extremists such as the Klan, but often constitutive of liberalism and civic nationalism. For Katerberg, “Liberal democracies cannot escape history.”

The first chapter of this study will examine the period from 1905-1930, focusing on concerns about Catholic immigration to Western Canada, the Protestant character of the Unionist government and the link between anti-Catholicism and the “progressive” ideological agenda of this period amongst many public figures. This era has been viewed by some historians as the last gasp of the traditionalist imperialism of Anglophilic Tories, but what is clear when one examines this period from the perspective of anti-Catholic sentiment is that there was no simple transformation of Canadian nationalism into the autonomist-liberalism of King and Skelton. Many Protestant Canadians still regarded Catholic Quebec with suspicion and the conflicts over conscription during the war did nothing to lessen these views, often couched in patronizing rhetoric presenting French Canada as a backward, medieval “priest-ridden” land. An adherence to British traditions also remained, if less fervently than before and during WWI, with Catholicism
still portrayed as an alien influence. This became especially apparent in Western Canada
as Protestant Canadians grew increasingly disturbed with the racial and religious
composition of the Prairies and its effect on the future prosperity of Canada, a nation that
was trying to assert its place in a changing world. Progressive thought in this period
regarding immigration and government reform, along with traditional Protestant Canadian
suspicions regarding Quebec, therefore carried a distinct ethnic-religious component
which is sometimes ignored. Universal progressive values, such as efficiency and social
science, were in fact often expressed through the prism of Anglo-Saxon Protestantism,
which itself was constitutive of conceptions of English Canadian nationalism in this
period. Anti-Catholicism continued to serve as a useful tool to define who belonged to the
modern nation and what values were acceptable.

Chapter two details both the continuity and change of anti-Catholic sentiment into
the Depression decade. The concern with immigration remained central in this decade, yet
the issue of reproduction and contraception emerged as a locus of concern. This fear
intersected during the Depression with the older anxiety of English Canada that French
Catholics were engaged in a “revenge of the cradles” by reproducing as quickly as
possible at the behest of their nationalistic clergy in order to counter Anglophone
Protestant influence in Canada.86 Many figures, such as C.E. Silcox and W. Burton Hurd
were afraid of the eclipse of Protestantism as the defining spiritual force in Canada due to
these numbers and thus vigorously advocated birth control. They contextualized their
birth control advocacy in rhetoric obsessed with the future welfare of the nation,
sometimes in blatantly pro-eugenics language engaging with anti-Catholic stereotypes
concerning the breeding habits of inherently ignorant, poor Catholics and the exploitation of this ignorance by the clergy. This is tied to the belief held by many prominent leftists, such as Eugene Forsey and F.R. Scott, who positioned the Catholic Church in Quebec as an inherently authoritarian institution that prevented French Canadians from participating “properly” in Canadian society. Many leftists involved with the nascent Co-Operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order (FCSO) or the League of Social Reconstruction (LSR) saw the Catholic Church as sympathetic to the growing international threat of fascism and Nazism during the Depression and warned their fellow Canadians in a series of articles about the threat to civil and religious liberty it posed. These individuals portrayed themselves as the defenders of democracy against the demagoguery and authoritarian excesses of Catholicism. Anti-Catholicism in this context served to subtly legitimize aspects of the leftist movement as these sentiments were widely held amongst Protestant Canadians, making the left not seem as “Godless” or radical as they were perhaps once seen. This decade also saw the further fusing of civic nationalism, dedicated to a society based on equality, civic participation and civil rights, with an ethnic nationalism that privileged the British nature of Canada.

Chapter three reveals the temporary narrowing of anti-Catholicism during the Second World War, a subject not tackled in the literature. Hostility to Catholicism centred almost entirely on the suspected dubious loyalty of French Catholics and the hierarchy in that province, continuing the equation of French Catholicism with fascism and Nazism. This manifested itself in the vehement proclamations of the “Battling Baptist” Shields, but also within the federal PC party, its supporters and its Ontario wing, coalesced around
Ontario premier George Drew. The Tories during the war emphatically condemned French Canada’s influence over what they claimed was a crassly opportunistic King government. French Catholic influence was viewed to be the cause behind the refusal to implement full conscription, the introduction of family allowances, which was viewed by many Protestant figures as irrefutable evidence of the “revenge of the cradles” and the supposed transformation of Canada into a totalitarian state resembling the enemy. While there remained a marginal discourse referring solely to the loss of liberties and freedom in the face of an aggressive Catholicism, in the heated atmosphere of a world war the staunch Britishness of Canadian liberties was re-emphasized by an angered political Conservatism, often eschewing even platitudes of understanding when attacking French Catholic Canada.

The revitalization of anti-Catholicism within the PC party during World War II distinguishes Canada from Britain as theorized by S.J.D. Green in his work *The Passing of Protestant England: Secularisation and Social Change, c. 1920-1960*. Green hypothesizes that after WWI British politics de-Christianized. This was due to the disappearance of a large segment of Irish Catholic MPs with the founding of the Irish Free State, the collapse of the Liberal party, along with the “nonconformist conscience” that had for so long been synonymous with the party, and the rise of the religiously eclectic Labour Party. Green believes that the Tory party, identified fairly or not as the “Church of England party” by many, had to meet this new challenge by embracing its own brand of religious eclecticism, a process that was surprisingly embraced by the Church of England itself as it could now claim to be nonpartisan and thus the true
national church.\textsuperscript{89} In contrast, in Canada the Tories, particularly George Drew, Herbert Bruce, T.L. Church and the Farthings, maintained its identification with Anglo-Saxon Protestantism, in fact ramping up its rhetoric and anti-Catholicism during WWII. This continued into the postwar era, signified by the selection of Drew as federal leader in 1948. While Drew failed to defeat the King-St. Laurent Liberals, this can perhaps be explained by a desire for stability amongst Canadians following decades of turmoil along with support of the expanding social welfare state as opposed to a firm rejection of Drew’s Anglophilic Protestantism. The subsequent Tory leader, John Diefenbaker, was no less fervent in his adherence to British traditions; he had, for example, often questioned French Canadian loyalty during WWII.\textsuperscript{90} This continued identification with British Protestantism and articulation of anti-Catholic sentiment reflects what Vance observes was the belief amongst many Canadians, particularly within the Tory party, that the mother country in its modern incarnation had “lost its way.” An un tarnished Canada, loyal to traditional British values such as the monarchy, freedom and their corollary Protestantism, could be relied upon to preserve these fading values.\textsuperscript{91}

In addition to this desire to preserve traditional British values, the Liberal party in Canada continued to be identified by many as the party of Catholicism, French Canada and immigrants. The rise of a religiously eclectic socialist party in Canada, the CCF in the 1930s, did not occur at the expense of the Liberal party, which itself was quite religiously eclectic, at least since the days of Laurier.\textsuperscript{92} Unlike in Britain there was never a sudden exodus of Catholic MPs who represented a particular political unit or ethnic-linguistic group as happened with the Irish in the UK. Quebec remained central to the political life
of Canada, often repeating its tradition of voting Liberal since Laurier. Immigrants, many of them Catholic, also either voted Liberal due to the gerrymandering of the 1917 election by Borden’s Unionist government, or were perceived by Tories to vote Liberal due to crass political opportunism, corruption and their own stupidity. Catholics were viewed as easily manipulated by political machines, from Tammany to the Vatican. These Canadian particularities thus militated against the sudden or total collapse of the political importance of religion in the interwar era, with the Tories remaining largely identified, and identifying themselves as, the party of traditionalist British Protestantism.

The final chapter examines anti-Catholicism in the Cold War, a subject discussed in the American historiography, most recently by Patrick Allitt who details the decline of the public currency of anti-Catholicism in the United States during the 1960s, but largely absent from the Canadian literature. Anti-Catholicism became “universalized” in this period, as the major strain of discourse was largely detached from any particular immigrant, ethnic or linguistic group. Anti-Catholicism in Canada began to resemble a North American ethos by comparing the Catholic Church and Catholicism to the Soviet Union and totalitarian Communism. These systems were viewed by mainstream intellectuals, church figures and organizations as powerful rivals, threatening the peace and stability of a world polarized between totalitarian materialism and liberal democracy. The place of Protestantism as a defining component of English Canadian identity, along with its dynamism and strength, in the face of these threats was questioned and the alleged general secularization of society was interpreted by some as evidence that rival belief systems were overwhelming Canadian society, with Catholicism somehow
maintaining itself in the face of modern trends. Anti-Catholicism was once again expressed by those figures that were self-consciously liberal, striving for the achievement of a liberal democratic, perhaps Protestant influenced, consensus in a divided world.

This transition towards North American concerns, a fact many scholars have noted (and lamented) as characterizing Canada in the postwar period, does not suggest that promotion of Britishness ended, but simply that Canada’s place in the North Atlantic Triangle was leaning decidedly towards the United States. Britishness did emerge when discussing French Canada’s “shirking” of its role in the war, even if the vitriol of the Second World War declined in acerbity. There was a palpable concern amongst many that the Church was still quietly striving to dominate the nation, again resembling the totalitarian enemy. Cold War anti-Catholicism demonstrates the continued exclusionary nature of the civic nationalism which many scholars believe became particularly dominant in this era, countering whiggish views that Canada inevitably became increasingly tolerant and liberal in the postwar period. Catholicism was still for many a mysterious faith motivated by greed and power.

Echoes of the older belief in Britishness linger in this rhetoric and Protestantism remained central to that identity. This Protestant view of Canada did not disappear but instead transformed into a means to express anxiety for a changing nation in a dangerous world. Explicit, chauvinistic Protestantism was rarer, however, and limited mostly to figures such John Farthing, Silcox or Drew. This small group continued to condemn the slow fading of British Canada, emphasizing the universality of the British tradition itself. It was this appeal to universality, grounded as it was in the particularism of
British institutions of democracy and religion that allowed ethnic nationalism to blend into civic nationalism in Canada, not a sudden transformation of the ideological foundations of the nation. The universality that was appealed to was a contingent universalism which required adherence to a strict set of values defined by those very groups or individuals rebuking Catholicism, with Lower being the notable example. The Protestantism so long held to define Canada was emptied of much of its ethnic particularities. Yet much of the discourse of anti-Catholicism in this period remained grounded in long-held English Canadian traditions, particularly Catholicism’s inability to properly integrate into a nation more dedicated to universal values of freedom and democracy than ever. The continuance of this sentiment allows the historians to detect a subtle distinction between Canadian intellectual culture and that of the United States, as detailed by Allitt. According to Allitt a growing culture of tolerance, the declining ghettoization of white, Catholic ethnic groups due to suburbanization and the increasing partnership of politically aligned Protestants and Catholics broke down long-standing suspicions. In Canada an implicit Protestantism linked with a pride in British institutions continued to characterize aspects of mainstream Canadian intellectual culture through the 1960s prolonging certain suspicions regarding Catholicism.

This Protestantism, according to Mark Noll, approaching the meeting of Vatican II often embraced a caricatured view of the Catholic Church as monolithic and backward, a viewpoint bred out of the lack of contact between these two great segments of Christianity. For Noll, almost up until the time of Vatican II, which eased the divide in understanding between the two branches, to “be an active Protestant in many parts of the
world was of course to believe and practice certain Protestant verities. But it was also to be self-consciously and very seriously anti-Catholic.”¹⁰⁰ This is not to say that religion decided politics in Canada, but simply that Christianity as a locus of understanding in the country did not disappear from public life as abruptly as it did in other nations. Yet, as mentioned earlier, the perceived decline of Protestantism itself proved a major issue for many Protestants who saw in the “de-vitalization” of their faith tradition the collapse of the British traditions of liberal democracy, portraying Catholicism and its concomitant values as the potential beneficiary. Anti-Catholicism therefore remained important to the self-definition of many Protestant Canadians despite the decline of Christian influence in Canadian society in the 1960s and 1970s. Noll has explained this transformation in Canadian society as resulting from both large structural factors in Canadian history, particularly the inability of Canadian institutions to adapt to a rapidly changing society due to their more hierarchical nature in comparison to the US, and contingency, especially the slow, contentious embracing of social Christianity by the mainline Protestants and Catholics. This embrace was too late for Noll as society had already moved on, with the state and the new ideology of multiculturalism facilitating Canadian cohesion, not religion.¹⁰¹

While Christianity in Canada may have become a less potent force in public culture, anti-Catholicism persisted into the 1970s as will be demonstrated in the conclusion. Anti-Catholicism is inextricably linked as an organizing framework to the promotion of progressive, liberal values, with or without explicit reference to a particular religion. These values are often identified as stemming from the Protestant Reformation
and the British tradition in the North Atlantic Triangle. Catholicism was seen as an alien force, invading and challenging this modern space for influence and allegiance. Raymond Tumbleson positions hostility to Catholicism as fundamental to expressing faith in the teleological progress from medieval times to the superior character of modern society. Tumbleson answers his rhetorical question “What is anti-Catholicism?” with the following: “It is the ghost in the machine, the endless neurotic repetition by self-consciously rational modernity of the primal scene in which it slew the premodern as embodied in the archetypal institution [the Catholic Church], arational and universal, of medieval Europe.” Anti-Catholicism, therefore, serves as a manifestation of the subtle, yet very real continuation of the influence of Protestantism in Canadian society.

National, religious or cultural identities are complex and multifaceted; anti-Catholicism provides a useful link between these facets, embodying theological, national and moral fears and norms. Studying anti-Catholicism as a historical subject containing its own logic and within a particular context can be seen to reflect how Protestants viewed and organized their world. In Canada this sentiment was common, revealing, through the tropes and rhetoric of a dynamic anti-Catholicism, the shifting nature of English Canadian national identity throughout the first half of the twentieth century. This national identity was repeatedly equated with the assumedly Protestant values of freedom and democracy.
This is in contrast to John Moir’s contention that at least in Toronto anti-Catholicism should be termed “anti-papalism,” as it was almost entirely political as opposed to theological. I believe that this is a gross oversimplification of anti-Catholicism. John Moir, “Toronto’s Protestants and their Perceptions of their Catholic Neighbours,” in Catholics at the ‘Gathering Place’: Historical Essays on the Archdiocese of Toronto, 1841-1991, eds., Mark McGowan and Brian Clarke (Toronto: Canadian Catholic Historical Association, 1993), 324.

Mendelson notes that this was a major component of anti-Semitism, combining Christian theological supercessionism and triumphalism. *Ibid.*, 4.


*Ibid.*, 5-7. Cook views the intellectual nationalists as co-opting what the Fathers of Confederation set out to do for their own nationalist agenda, portraying them as attempting to create a highly centralized and British-based federal system.

*Ibid.*, 8. Cook sums up this support of a civic-based identity brilliantly: “That is why I believe in the validity of the paradox that the greatest threat to the Canadian nation-state has frequently come from nationalism.”


Also see Michael Ignatieff, *Blood and Belonging* (Toronto: Viking, 1993).


Phillip Buckner, while agreeing that the ethnic conception had largely disappeared by the late 1960s except amongst some English Canadian intellectuals, believes that these two forms of Canadian nationalism coexisted for some time and that there was no sudden disappearance of the Canadian allegiance to Britishness. See Buckner, “Canada and the End of Empire, 1939-1982,” in *Canada and the British Empire*, ed. Buckner (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 122-124.


evangelical Protestants saw history as resulting in both a “cyclical return to origins,” the pure Christianity commented on this phenomenon when summarizing the evangelical conception of history. Many

Ibid, 9-10.

Ibid, 38-39. This Anglophilia is repeated by Andrew Smith. Smith believes that the “Canadian success story” in the modern world is largely due to the positive aspects of the British Empire, such as political institutions and economic and cultural trends, valorizing the British connection. Smith, “Canadian Progress and the British Connection: Why Canadian Historians Seeking the Middle Road Should Give 2 ½ Cheers for the British Empire,” in Contesting Clio’s Craft: New Directions and Debates in Canadian History, eds. Christopher Dummitt and Michael Dawson (Londond: Institute for the Study of the Americas, University of London, 2009), 81-83, 97.

Some analysts of anti-Catholicism tend to treat it as a constant because certain themes have remained consistent over centuries. In reality these anti-Catholic themes, tropes and arguments are constantly adapted to the context of the period and manifest themselves through different means. For works which position anti-Catholicism as largely consistent for long periods of time, see Robert P. Lockwood, ed., Anti-Catholicism in American Culture (Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor, Inc., 2000); Raymond D. Tumbleson, Catholicism in the English Protestant Imagination: Nationalism, Religion, and Literature, 1660-1745 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).


Colley, Britons, 4-19, 368-372.


Colley, Britons, 368-372.

Kumar, The Making of English, xi-xii; Mandler, The English National Character, 133-139.


For Mandler the desire for social harmony underlay all of the major expressions of interwar English national character. Mandler, The English National Character, 168.

Jonathan Vance, Maple Leaf Empire: Canada, Britain, and Two World Wars (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2012), 221-222.


Kumar, The Making of English, 37.


Nancy Lusignan Schultz, introduction to A Veil of Fear: Nineteenth Century Convent Tales by Rebecca Reed and Maria Monk, ed. Schultz (Indiana: Purdue University Press, 1999), xxix.


Griffin, Nineteenth Century Fiction, 10. Tumbleson, Protestant Imagination, 13. Michael Gauvreau has commented on this phenomenon when summarizing the evangelical conception of history. Many evangelical Protestants saw history as resulting in both a “cyclical return to origins,” the pure Christianity
of the pre-Catholic period, that “would ensure a linear and final unfolding of the true faith.” The Catholic Church and the evangelical faith were portrayed as binaries engaged in an ancient battle, with the victor deciding the future of social progress. This would propel civilization toward enlightenment and eventually salvation. Michael Gauvreau, “Protestantism Transformed: Personal Piety and the Evangelical Social Vision,” in The Canadian Protestant Experience, 1760 to 1990, ed. George A. Rawlyk (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1990), 82-88.

54 There is another notable contribution: the introduction of Creed and Culture by Terrence Murphy and Gerald Stortz divide the various kinds of anti-Catholicism in Canada into three phases: official anti-Catholicism, theological anti-Catholicism, and a “Canadian” phase, characterized by ethnic and linguistic prejudice couched in classic anti-Catholic rhetorical forms; Terrence Murphy and Gerald Stortz, eds., Creed and Culture: The Place of English-speaking Catholics in Canadian Society, 1750-1930 (McGill-Queen’s University: Montreal, 1993), xxiv-xxvi.
Ph.D.—K. Anderson; McMaster University—History

63 Wilson, ed., The Orange Order; Cecil Houston and William Smyth, The Sash Canada Wore: A Historical Geography of the Orange Order in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980).
66 Franklin Walker has pointed to the importance of anti-Catholicism in the tense debates over Catholic education in Ontario, but once again anti-Catholicism is not the focus of Walker’s study nor does he look outside of Ontario. Walker, Catholic Education and Politics in Ontario, Volume III: From the Hope Commission to the Promise of Completion (1945-1985) (Toronto: Catholic Education Foundation of Ontario, 1986), 22-23, 40-41; Walker, Catholic Education: A Documentary Study. A recent exception is James Pitsula’s Keeping Canada British: The Ku Klux Klan in 1920s Saskatchewan (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2013), which contains a chapter entitled “Anti-Catholicism.”
68 Anthony D. Smith, The Cultural Foundations of Nations: Hierarchy, Covenant, and Republic (Britain: Blackwell Publishing, 2008), 16-17. In her book Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), Liah Greenfeld adds to this discourse positing two major types of nationalism: individualistic-libertarian and collectivistic-authoritarian with some subtypes, such as ethnic and civic nationalism. For Greenfeld, while civic nationalism can be collectivistic-authoritarian, it is almost always individualistic-libertarian, and individualistic-libertarian nationalism can only be manifested in the civic form. She also reflects Kohn further by tracing individualistic/civic nationalism to Britain and its importation to North America and collectivistic/ethnic nationalism to the Continent, particularly Russia and Germany. Greenfeld, Nationalism, 11-14.
71 Ibid, 7-8.
cheap labour, the Liberal party, who wanted votes, and the Roman Catholic Church, who wanted to increase massive unemployment. The three institutions Farthing blamed were the railway in foolish immigration policies of the 1910s and 1920s that flooded the region with cheap labour despite ignore the realities of Western C

the Prairies were hostile towards the recent Dominion

update his friend as to the political atmosphere of the Prairies.

Political Thought in the Thirties and Forties

CCF endorsed publicly by many Quebec bishops. See Gregory Bau

January 23

(2011), 34

also the negative freedoms of mainstream liberalism, protecting individual rights.

to protecting truly democratic values, embracing not

and King Gordon, allowing these views to be used as a foil against which to measure their own dedication

CHR

Socialists Discovered Democracy: The League for Social Reconstruction Confronts the ‘Quebec Problem,’” Daedalus
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In a letter to Conservative premier of Ontario George Drew, Calgary lawyer Hugh Farthing attempted to update his friend as to the political atmosphere of the Prairies. Farthing informed Drew that the people of the Prairies were hostile towards the recent Dominion-Provincial Conference (1945-1946) as it continued to ignore the realities of Western Canada. This was part of Canadian history to Farthing, demonstrated in the foolish immigration policies of the 1910s and 1920s that flooded the region with cheap labour despite massive unemployment. The three institutions Farthing blamed were the railway industry, who wanted cheap labour, the Liberal party, who wanted votes, and the Roman Catholic Church, who wanted to increase
their numbers and power through this fatal mistake. Farthing claimed that the Liberal government enthusiastically agreed to this because they wanted to create a “Tammany Hall with foreign voters,” referring to the infamously corrupt political machine that for decades controlled the Democratic Party in New York and which relied on the large Irish Catholic population of the state to function. Hugh Farthing to Drew, August 1st, 1946, file 474, vol. 54, George Drew fonds (hereafter GD) Library and Archives Canada (hereafter LAC). For the perceived, and sometimes real, connection of the Catholic Church with Tammany Hall in the minds of Protestants see Samuel J. Thomas, “Mugwump Cartoonists, the Papacy, and Tammany Hall in America’s Gilded Age,” Religion and American Culture 14 (2004): 213-215.
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Chapter 1

“[D]ispel[ling] the mediaeval darkness”: Disloyalty and Immigration, Anti-Catholicism in Canada, 1905-1929

While serving at an internment camp for enemy aliens in Kapuskasing, Ontario during World War One, future public intellectual and president of Acadia University Watson Kirkconnell sent a particularly vitriolic letter to his father expressing his unconditional support for Robert Borden’s victorious Union government in the 1917 election. Kirkconnell was adamant that no “French Catholic curs” be allowed into Borden’s cabinet, adding “I used to think that Aunt Jane might be exaggerating in her denunciation of the French but we know Quebec now. Colonel Date calls them ‘the cockroaches of Canada’ and he is not far out.” In Kirkconnell’s opinion the arrival of the Union government pitted Catholic against Protestant in Canada, but it was going to result in the elimination of petty partyism and the selfish influence of the French Catholic. The exclusion of French Catholics from influence in government was central for Kirkconnell as they had proven their disloyalty to the cause of British Canada in the War, claiming that thousands of “French scum” were hiding in Northern Ontario “at the direction of the clergy,” armed with guns and provisions in order to avoid being enlisted. These cowards, according to Kirkconnell, “would not even come out to vote for Laurier and the Pope.”\(^1\)

In the early twentieth century French Canadian Catholics were believed to be disloyal and unable to exist within a progressive and changing nation; this belief became evident in the intense conscription crisis that took place during the War. Other Catholics, mostly continental European immigrants, also felt the brunt of anti-Catholicism in this era. Issues
such as immigration and the influence of French Canadians in politics were central to English Canadians and the rhetoric and tropes used by commentators belonged to a long tradition of anti-Catholicism. Catholics were believed to be antipathetic to a nation dedicated to British—and thus implicitly Protestant—ideals of freedom, liberty and self-sufficiency. Anti-Catholicism in the years 1905-1929 served to solidify an emerging Canadian identity, yet it was a complex and multifaceted identity contingent upon the understanding of the nature of the threat Catholicism presented. As mentioned earlier, Steven Pincus has referred to the anti-Catholicism of the seventeenth century as embodied in two patterns: “Cromwellian moderates,” who were angered by the political intrigues of the Church, and “religious radicals,” who castigated the Catholic Church as theologically harmful and the pope as the Biblical Antichrist. The latter pattern was maintained explicitly by fundamentalist Protestants in Canada in the early twentieth century, but there was also great concern about the Catholic desire to “out-breed” good British stock in order to transform the nation. There is constant slippage between these two categories in this period, however, as Catholics were believed to be easily controlled by a selfish, power-hungry hierarchy, manipulated to carry out the sinister desires of the clergy; the existence of this perspective prevents the historian from being able to easily sever theological from socio-political anti-Catholicism in this period. What is clear is that anti-Catholicism was prominent amongst many intellectuals and church figures in Canada and that Pincus’ categories often overlapped in the negotiation deciding what defined a true Canadian.
Indeed this inability to completely separate theological from socio-political anti-Catholicism in Progressive Era Canada perhaps distinguishes it from its American cousin, at least according to Justin Nordstrom. Nordstrom, in one of the few detailed analyses of Progressive Era anti-Catholicism, believes that American anti-Catholicism in this period was focused almost entirely on the alleged inability of Catholics to be loyal to democratic values and institutions and was not at all concerned with theological differences. While Nordstrom may be exaggerating the lack of explicit theology in American anti-Catholicism in this period, and is ignoring the emergence of fundamentalism which was rabidly anti-Catholic, organized Protestantism and an often implicitly theological discourse underlay English Canadian progressivism while simultaneously purporting to be concerned only with improving the efficiency and democracy of society. Protestantism was not simply a traditionalist remnant within this progressivism or English Canadian nationalism, but in fact nourished these sentiments, positioning Catholicism as a disruptive element within the body politic due to its conservative, reactionary and authoritarian nature. The clearest examples of this emerge in two previously unrelated periods and events, namely the formation of the Unionist government in 1917 with its heavily Anglo-Protestant and progressive character and the concern in Western Canada with the continental European immigrant, culminating most fiercely with the election of the J.T.M. Anderson government in Saskatchewan in 1929 with the open help of the Ku Klux Klan. Robert Borden, many of the figures associated with his government during WWI and other intellectuals not associated with the Tories at all, such as O.D. Skelton, viewed French Canada and Catholicism as hindering the development of a better,
progressive Canada. In this way, they can be seen as embodying Pincus’ “Cromwellian moderates.” The ubiquitous Protestantism, however, of these figures and their concern with the political intrigue and authoritarian dominance of priests speaks to an older, more theological, concern. It is here that I will expand upon John English’s excellent study of the Union government, as he only briefly mentions religion as a component of the Unionist experiment, and even then only as a barrier to the involvement of Quebec and the justifiable hostility to working closely with Orangemen and vigorous Protestant reformers.\(^4\) Protestantism was a central factor in the composition of not only this government but the intellectual culture of the time. Protestantism was believed to be synonymous with democracy and liberty, as much as Catholicism was its antithesis. Those concerned with Western Canada, such as Anglican Bishop George Exton Lloyd, J.S. Woodsworth, novelist Ralph Connor and Anderson himself, also distort the distinctions between religious and socio-political anti-Catholicism. They often repeated the old anti-Catholic trope of a population completely ignorant of Scripture and learning and dominated by their priest, preventing them from properly participating in civil society.

Building upon this, another distinctive aspect of Canadian anti-Catholicism in this period is the shift from focusing on all Catholics, as in the nineteenth century and in the United States, to concentrating on French Canada and recent continental European immigrants. Hostility towards English-speaking Catholics, which in Canada in this period was comprised mostly of the Irish, was rare within the intellectual community or organizations dedicated to the reforming of Canadian society; this reflects what Mark
McGowan has described as the slow but very real integration of Irish Catholics into the mainstream, Anglo-Protestant socio-economic milieu of English Canada by roughly 1910. Indeed the Great War, in McGowan’s opinion, signaled the culmination of three decades of a conscious and sincere attempt to integrate into English Canadian society represented by extensive Irish Catholic enlistment in the war effort and the periodic imperialist proclamations of Irish Catholic public figures to demonstrate total loyalty. While McGowan is perhaps overly optimistic in his account of Irish-Canadian integration, French Catholics and the “foreign hordes” of Western Canada were certainly still held to be beyond the pale of true belonging. These groups were perceived as refusing to participate in English Canadian society and even stressed their “otherness” through language, culture, traditions, and, of course, religion. They were conceived as objects to be acted upon and to be fixed, while the rest of Canadians were subjects to be protected, cultivated and included.

What was occurring in this period was the continued normalization of the synonymy of Protestantism and a democratic civic character as the base of English Canadian nationalism in the face of a potential Catholic threat. According to Stefan Berger and Christopher Lorenz, religion is assumed and “written into” national narratives, manifesting itself in the assertions of those in power and intellectuals who present religion, in this case Protestantism, as essential to the “national character” while castigating alternative religious traditions as foreign intrusions to the development of nationalism. Nationalism for these authors is always exclusionary and always contains a narrow religious basis, relying on a limited and homogenous account of national history.
that privileges particularism above all else and denies the validity of any alternative interpretation of national history or development.\(^7\) Thus English Canadian nationalism, largely based on Protestantism, was inherently exclusionary despite exhortations of inclusion and tolerance. What is revealed is little distinction between a conservative ethnic nationalism and a progressive civic nationalism based on universal rights, as Catholics were portrayed as unsuitable for these rights; this was true unless they sheared themselves of the troublesome aspects of their religion, namely the authority of priests, the power of the hierarchy and their upholding of ritual and seemingly archaic traditions. Perhaps Michael Gauvreau and Nancy Christie were too generous when discussing the role of the Protestant churches in social reform efforts amongst immigrants in Western Canada and their progressive nature. They are correct however in stressing these reformers’ focus on re-establishing the prestige of organized Protestantism on the Prairies.\(^8\) It was feared that Catholicism, or other non-Protestant Christian traditions, were gaining preponderantly in influence, threatening the continuance of the Protestant traditions of individual liberty and democracy. This was a period of transition, but it was also a period of stabilization, as the Bergerian notion of an imperialist-nationalism metamorphosed into an English Canadian nationalism concerned with the composition of the nation religiously and racially, especially with Western immigration, the place of French Canada in Canada’s civic culture and the nation’s future in an industrialized and modernizing world. Protestantism was central to this discourse and formation of identity, while anti-Catholicism served as a tool to define an idealized nation.
Anti-Catholicism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was part of the atmosphere and culture of the society. George H. Doran, a Canadian expatriate who gained prominence as a publisher in the United States, noted that hostility towards Catholicism was a major aspect of his life during his childhood in late nineteenth century Canada. It was also part of his early adolescent career, when he mistook someone describing his boss as being “of great catholicity of spirit” as accusing his superior of being Catholic and thus of the church of the “scarlet woman.” In fact he even met Charles Chiniquy, the popular and slanderous writer of such anti-Catholic tracts as *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome.* Beverley Baxter, prolific contributor to *Maclean’s,* recalled the separation that existed between Catholic and Protestant youths in his childhood in early twentieth century Canada and the near constant conflict that occurred in his neighbourhoods. Influential and prolific historian Arthur Lower recalled not only the heavy influence of Methodism on his youth, but also the sectarianism that resulted between Catholics and Protestants in his hometown of Barrie after the 1896 election which saw the victory of Wilfrid Laurier, the first French Canadian and second Roman Catholic prime minister. One of his playmates was constantly warning him that “the Catholics” were now going to slaughter the children as they slept. Similarly in the surrounding (and heavily Orange) township of Essa, Lower recalled one resident proudly telling him that “‘There ain’t a single Catholic in the township of Essa.’” Heather Gilead was more detailed, remembering the lurid stories that her mother and her friends told concerning the sexual liaisons of priests and nuns in convents. Gilead aptly summarized much of the anti-Catholicism she was exposed to growing up in Alberta and
the Midwestern USA in the early twentieth century by stating that Catholics were seen as embodying values antithetical to North America: it was “their Roman Catholic Church,” not a church that belonged to the continent. For many Protestant Americans and Canadians, Catholics violated the sexual taboos of the era and Gilead recalled being surprised by the normality of Catholics when she actually met them because she had assumed that they would possess devious magical powers. Despite its apparent ubiquity in the childhood of these memoirists, anti-Catholicism was not simply a nostalgic aspect of the reminiscences of those who grew up in this era only to be disregarded in adulthood, but was also a central component of the intellectual framework of Protestant Canada through the first decades of the twentieth century.

As mentioned earlier, Justin Nordstrom posits that the major issue with regards to Catholicism in American Progressive Era print culture was whether Catholics could be loyal Americans. According to Nordstrom popular journalists in this era used a powerful antipathy to Catholicism in order to fuse together the broad themes of progressivism, patriotic nationalism and masculinity within the familiar framework of anti-Catholicism. Employing this familiar rhetoric guaranteed the popularity of anti-Catholic literature because it simplified a rapidly changing world by using a common intellectual thread. In Nordstrom’s study, it was this updating of nineteenth century anti-Catholic tropes and themes, such as a Catholic conspiracy against Western liberties or the inability of Catholics to be self-sufficient and loyal citizens, for the Progressive Era that caught the attention of readers and facilitated the continuance and spread of anti-Catholicism in this period. The intellectual currents of progressivism and “New Liberalism” along with the
specific anti-Catholicism of this period that Nordstrom details also affected Canada. Barry Ferguson has argued persuasively that this liberalism, which stressed equal political and individual rights guaranteed by a moderate activist state, was one of the defining characteristics of Canada in the first three decades of the twentieth century. The specific flavour of “New Liberalism” echoed the belief expressed by social scientists such as O.D. Skelton and Adam Shortt that social scientists were indispensible to the ensuring of a modern, liberal-democratic society in Canada as existed in the USA and Britain by helping to craft rational and effective public policy. Efficiency was the watchword of the day, just as partisan politics were perceived to be destructive. The Borden Tories for their part embraced this rhetoric and were determined to stamp out the corrupt and inefficient tradition of patronage and brokerage politics, desiring instead to create a national politics that transcended party loyalty and sectional interests.

In addition to these political developments, Gauvreau and Christie have demonstrated that Protestant churches and religious figures were central in the promulgating of modern, progressive social service that acted within the reconceptualized liberalism of the era. It was a social service model that still conceived of the individual as important, but emphasized a collectivist alternative to the laissez-faire strain of the nineteenth century. This style of liberalism characterized the brand of social Christianity often referred to as the social gospel and allowed proponents to advocate pragmatic social action and attempt to reassert and maintain their influence in the wider society. Within a framework of promoting the influence of Protestantism, the Catholic Church was seen as harmful to Canada for some English Canadians, as it represented not only a decidedly
regressive political power constantly attempting to further its own interests (a “sectional” interest), it was also concentrated in the most troublesome region of the nation, Quebec. The Catholic Church did not fit into the liberal-progressive political or culture narrative of the time. It was therefore up to Protestant English Canadians to prevent Catholics from perpetuating sectarian politics through political, social and demographic dominance.

The fear of a vast oppressive Catholic conspiracy led by the Pope in Rome, which would undermine socio-cultural liberties and civil government, was a prominent theme in the Canadian anti-Catholicism of the late nineteenth century. Charles Lindsey provided perhaps the most systematic analysis of the threat ultramontane Catholicism posed for the future of Canada in his aptly titled 1877 book *Rome in Canada: The Ultramontane Struggle for Supremacy over the Civil Authority*. In Lindsey’s opinion the ultimate goal of aggressive Catholicism was to have the voice of Rome “echo[ing] within the walls of the Canadian Parliament, in the judicial tribunals, in the legal opinions of the bar, at the hustings and in the lecture room, in school and college, everywhere.”

For Lindsey the universities of Quebec were in the process of slowly being overtaken by men either sympathetic to ultramontanism or who were simply puppets of the Pope; the Holy See had decided that instead of a direct assault on the “citadel of liberty” the Papacy would gradually eliminate any possibility of opposition by secretly infiltrating secular institutions.

Lindsey appealed to a Protestant conception of history to contrast the progressiveness of Protestantism with the medievalism of Catholicism. The intolerant New England Puritan had naturally progressed and adapted to changing times, growing steadily more tolerant until the present day, unlike the Jesuit who had remained the same
as he was in the sixteenth century, waging the same battles against governments to institute Roman rule in all nations. Whether to allow Catholics to gain any social and political power was therefore “a question which is closely connected with one of the problems of Canada’s destiny.”

Journalist Robert Sellar explored this theme into the twentieth century in his Anglo Quebec newspaper the *Huntington Gleaner* and his 1907 book *The Tragedy of Quebec: The Expulsion of its Protestant Farmers*. Nordstrom has stated that journalists were central to the Progressive Era battle against corruption and decadence in an industrializing society and Sellar was prolific in his promulgation of anti-Catholic rhetoric, editing the *Gleaner* from the 1860s until after WWI. Sellar, dubbed “Fanatic Bob” by his francophone opponents in his home region, was obsessed with the idea that the Church in Quebec and in Canada were plotting to prevent Protestants from farming properly in order to take over land and its profits. This was doubly harmful, in his opinion, as Protestants were considered to be inherently superior farmers since they were not “kept in fetters” by the Church like the habitants of Quebec. It was the Protestant farmer that was hardworking, productive and useful while the Catholic habitant, poor, stupid and ignorant, contributed little to the nation. The Catholic Church and its followers were viewed as hurting Canada’s potential future greatness. For Sellar this was not just a contemporary problem, conceptualizing an entire historical framework within which the demands of the Catholic Church in Quebec would forever be harmful. According to Sellar, Canada’s greatest mistake was conceding what was given to the Church in the Quebec Act, an Act that was passed by an ignorant Anglican British
parliament which could not conceive of religion outside of an Establishment. For Sellar this was against liberty, not defending freedom of worship, since Catholicism perpetuated slavery. In addition, concessions to the Catholic Church in the Quebec Act were directly responsible for the American Revolution, which had ruined the opportunity for a great global English-speaking Protestant alliance. Catholicism was a medieval aberration in modern times, as “Wolfe’s victory preserved in the New World what the Old World soon afterwards destroyed – the clerical and temporal institutions of feudal France.” The reactionary religion that “died at the taking of the Bastille, and which disappeared from the banks of the Seine, was spared on the Plains of Abraham and survives to-day on the banks of the St. Lawrence.” In fact Catholicism was not about spirituality at all, unlike Protestantism, but was instead an organized political system dedicated solely to gaining and achieving power through any means necessary.

Another intolerable concession was the separate school, which was being used in Sellar’s opinion for the priest’s propaganda to be taught, allowing them to maintain a stranglehold over the politics of Quebec and the nation. Sellar presented these schools as the site where the hierarchy taught about creating a papal state, secluding the pupils from their families and crushing their individuality. This destructive sentiment was present in the alleged huge increase in separate schools and religious orders all across Canada, particularly in the newly settled Prairie region, undermining the spread and maintenance of British, Protestant conceptions of liberty. The schools were being used to inculcate prejudice against Protestants, with the legal system in Quebec being manipulated to expand canon law to formerly Protestant farming areas and to eliminate
any remnants of public school education. Many Protestants witnessed this takeover of Quebec and, according to Sellar, were moving to the United States for fear that Canada was soon to be an entirely papal country.\textsuperscript{35} In the conclusion of his book, Sellar became increasingly shrill in his denunciations of Catholicism and bolder in the grandiosity of the Catholic plot in North America. Sellar believed that the suppression of Protestant farmers in Quebec and the establishment of a papal state was the initial salvo in a wider plot to take over all of New England, where French-speaking Catholics were already integrated into the manufacturing sector. The priests, by manipulating habitants through separate schools and convincing them that their language and religion were the only means of their cultural survival, aspired to create an enormous papal state consisting of Eastern Ontario, the Northwest and New England. This fantastic scenario complicates the claims of his biographer Robert Hill that Sellar was simply a staunch proponent of the nineteenth century liberal ideal of separation of church and state and, like D’Alton McCarthy, was an authentic representative of English Canadian nationalism who periodically engaged in excesses of rhetoric. Hill himself seems to validate Sellar’s overall claim that the French population of Quebec was attempting to colonize the Eastern Townships. While Sellar admitted “[t]hat in this twentieth century, on a continent the very air of which is democratic, a body of men … labouring to bring about the creation of a Papal nation sounds incredible,” he was convinced and convinced others that he was witness to this plot in his small, Quebec town. He feared for the future of Protestant values in North America.\textsuperscript{36}
Sellar concluded his book by warning Canadians that they needed to vote specifically for any candidate who opposed clericalism, as this, not language, race or economics, was the greatest crisis facing the nation. Sellar was convinced that French settlers and Catholic immigrants were being used to control Northern Ontario in order to dictate policy to the duped government in Toronto and Ottawa.\(^{37}\) Canada in general was becoming increasingly pluralistic in its composition, a development Sellar vociferously opposed as “these people” were bringing to Canada hatreds and prejudices that did not “fit” into a British society.\(^{38}\) To vote against clericalism was to vote for a British as opposed to a papal Canada; true British Canadians represented a “motive [that] is no narrow one; it is, by destroying privilege, to bestow equality on all. Shall Canada be a land of equal rights, or shall it not? What say you?”\(^{39}\) This was a familiar call for Protestant Canadians, resembling the Equal Rights Association of the 1880s founded in opposition to the passing of the Jesuits’ Estates Act and the privileges this was believed to bestow upon a subversive Catholic hierarchy.\(^{40}\) Sellar wanted one Canada, and this Canada was to be unmistakably British and Protestant in nature, embodied in his slogan “One Language, One School, Severance of Church and State, No Recognition of Race.”\(^{41}\)

Present in Sellar and Lindsey’s work is the intersection of a theological opposition to Catholicism and a socio-political hostility. Catholicism’s alleged superstitious, static dogma created a population easily controlled by a hierarchical clergy motivated by self-interest and power. Again this distinguishes Canada from America in this period, as Nordstrom is clear that Catholics were not attacked at a religious level, but instead at a socio-political level during the Progressive Era in the US with the all-consuming concern
being the loyalty of Catholics. It also revises Nordstrom’s tendency to strictly separate theological anti-Catholicism from socio-political anti-Catholicism, when in reality there was often a theological base underlying this sentiment. Noted French Canadian Presbyterian evangelizer Rev. C.E. Amaron contributed to this discourse when he refuted Catholicism “as no more than cold formalism. It leads to dead externalism, it kills religion and leads men to ruin.” On a trip to Italy as a young man Eugene Forsey was able to experience the Vatican and Italian Roman Catholicism firsthand. Forsey referred to a visit to the Cathedral at Ragusa, a place where many relics were held. Forsey dismissed these relics entirely, stating that for “a heretic, of course, much the best part of the whole thing is the marvelous ivory, gold and precious-stone wrought-work in which the various holy objects are encased.” Forsey’s portrayal of the Catholic congregation is patronizing, reducing them to a quaint, exceedingly reverent group handling the relics while absurdly believing them to cure illnesses. In another letter to his mother Forsey is more explicit about his disdain for Catholicism, ridiculing the policies of the churches in Verona that prevented women from wearing immodest dress out of respect for a house of God. For Forsey this was sheer hypocrisy: “Magnificent example of the Roman Church’s amiable habit of straining at gnats and swallowing camels. Another prevalent notice runs: ‘Out of respect for the house of God, do not spit on the floor.’ Delightful customs! … All this sort of thing nearly made go [sic] berserk.” The Catholic Church in his opinion was addressing petty issues instead of the pressing “camels” they were forced to swallow. One can speculate that Forsey was referring to particular religious traditions within Catholicism, such as the relics he had witnessed earlier, along with other policies he
found distasteful. For example, Frank Milligan has described Forsey’s theology as heavily influenced by the social gospel, which conceived of personal liberty and Christian liberty as synonymous. If one lived right, which was by Christ’s example, then both the individual’s freedom would be preserved and the society as a whole would benefit.

Canadian philosopher John Watson termed this the moral imperative, an idealized view of human existence that posited a moral order in an industrializing society through concrete, individual Christian choices. The perceived blind adherence of the Catholic to the whims of the hierarchy and lack of focus on the living Christ was therefore problematic and could be interpreted as not fitting into this social gospel worldview.

At a sermon about spiritual freedom by Allsworth Eardsley at the Douglas Methodist Church Forsey attended while a student at McGill, the minister echoed these sentiments stating that if one did not experience Jesus for one’s self “[y]ou might just as well sell your soul to a Roman priest as to a Methodist minister and you might just as well sell it to the devil as to either.” He continued: “I do not covet the power of the priest to tell a man what he must think, and believe, and say, and do.”48 While attending Oxford on a Rhodes scholarship, Forsey engaged in a spirited debate with his colleagues, identifying himself as the sole defender of the Christian tradition: “I found myself the solitary defender of Methodism, Anglicanism, High Churchism [sic] and, Catholicism,” but was quick to note “(These last two of course only in certain particulars—chiefly as to sincerity and sanity of at least some of their members)[.]”49 In Forsey’s view the ritualistic traditions of Catholicism and High Church Anglicanism were only defensible in that they were aspects of the Christian tradition, although they were extremely flawed. Forsey
admitted later in the letter that while he agreed with the Catholic position on divorce and birth control, citing his conviction as to the sanctity of marriage and of life, there was “Uproarious laughter from my friends at the idea that I should have a good word to say for those people.” He ended this section of the letter defending his action by theorizing that the values he defended were not exclusively Catholic but broadly Christian, reassuring his mother that he had not come under the sway of the local priest. Indeed, Forsey mentioned that he had met only a small number of Catholics at Oxford, and that “those people” did not discuss religion openly. While Catholicism may have been part of the Christian tradition in Forsey’s opinion, it was a flawed and backward interpretation.

Prominent revivalist Oswald Smith was perhaps the most public proponent of a strictly theological anti-Catholicism, common within fundamentalist circles. Smith deliberately promoted an old-fashioned gospel using modern methods, caring little for theological nuance or complexity. Instead he was devoted to world evangelization, an intense personal experience of God and the fundamentalist concept of premillennial dispensationalism. Within this latter concept was a fixation with the Book of Revelation and the Book of Daniel, which were mined for contemporary symbols and events that could be viewed as signaling the coming apocalypse. In an early edition of *Is the Antichrist at Hand?* Smith wondered whether Mussolini was the foretold Emperor of the revived Roman Empire, a figure who was, according to this theological strain, Antichrist. In Smith’s writing Antichrist/Emperor would gain political dominance in Europe and quickly align himself with the Catholic Church, as these two institutions
represented the civil and ecclesiastical Babylons discussed in Revelation. The concept of Rome representing “two Babylons” was not a novel concept in anti-Catholic tradition, as clergyman Alexander Hislop’s infamous and widely popular nineteenth century tract *The Two Babylons* promoted the idea that the Vatican was Babylon itself, the lineal descendent of the pagan mystery religions of the Bible.\(^{54}\) Smith simply updated the references, believing that the “Rome-ward” turn of many nations, for example the United Kingdom which had recently appointed an envoy to the Vatican, was an initial step in the Vatican’s consolidation of its ecclesiastical control over Europe. Smith denied that the Pope himself was likely Antichrist, a common trope amongst earlier anti-Catholics.\(^{55}\) Instead the Pope and the Catholic Church’s gross apostasy in refusing to preach the word of God would be betrayed and destroyed by the Emperor.\(^{56}\) Smith thus warned against the pretensions of the Catholic Church, painting the Church as the “very heart of Apostasy” and hysterically warned against its growing influence in North America: “[if she] had the power, today, she [the Catholic Church] would rise and massacre the Protestants just as eagerly as in the days gone by. … The spirit of tolerance is at present seen, but given the opportunity and it will be no more.”\(^{57}\)

While Smith’s grandiose cosmic story may seem bizarre to modern-day readers, Smith was not an isolated crank. He in fact was a member of a well-developed conservative fundamentalist network. Smith worked for Roland V. Bingham, founder of the successful Sudan Interior Mission and editor of the often anti-Catholic fundamentalist periodical *The Evangelical Christian*, and they remained good friends for the rest of Bingham’s life.\(^{58}\) Bingham’s periodical often professed similar opinions to Smith,
certainly influencing him in his formative years. One focus was the belief that the appointment of a representative at the Vatican by the British government during World War I was a clear sign that Rome was temporarily reviving her temporal power and was corrupted by Antichrist, which would inevitably be toppled once the true Christian nations realized her apostasy and the great battle of Armageddon would begin. Bingham was unequivocal about the threat of Catholicism and the inherent disloyalty of Roman Catholics, believing that the Catholic Church helped the Central Powers during WWI, was behind the rebellion in Ireland while dispossessing Protestants of property and in general trying to force its will upon all peoples: “where the Union Jack waved, [Catholics maintained] that the Pope is by sovereign right ‘King of Kings and Lord of Lord.’” While this seemingly extreme perspective influenced Smith, he was able to build his Toronto Gospel Tabernacle, which quickly changed its name to the People’s Church, with the major financial contribution of the intensely spiritual owner and publisher of the Globe, William G. Jaffray. This church eventually became the largest independent church in Toronto, providing an entertaining modern form to Smith’s fundamentalist, intensely anti-Catholic theology. While Smith may not have been part of the theological and cultural mainstream, he was a popular figure whose eschatological vision of the Catholic Church as an internationally influential force carried currency in his Canadian context in the early decades of the twentieth century. Smith, however, evidently did not seem to be overly concerned with Canadian politics in his writings, unlike journalists such as Sellar, reflecting the ambivalence with which fundamentalists in this period treated political engagement. Sellar, and others within the Progressive Era, envisioned a
Catholic Church not only as an international concern to Protestantism at a theological level but also as a system operating principally out of Quebec dedicated to dominating the political and cultural landscape.

The influence of Catholic Quebec on Canadian politics, or the “Eastern problem,” in this period was central to many Protestants concerned with the future of Canada. Indeed the passing of the infamous Regulation 17 in 1912 expressed this concern because it was designed in some minds to quell attempts by the French to create a bilingual and potentially clerical Canada; language and religion were often interconnected for French Canadians as well as their Protestant foes in this conflict. Irish Catholics, for example, feared that the agitation by French Canadians to repeal the language legislation would cause an end to separate schools in general and an increase in the already common hostility to Catholicism and Catholic schools. Irish Catholic leaders therefore often supported the government and were bizarrely often on the same side as the Orange Order in the dispute. W.R. Plewman, former editor of the militantly Protestant *Sentinel*, supported the measure, believing that it would preserve the English language in Canada, stem the growth of Catholicism and correct the major divisive issues in Canadian politics. Franklin Walker has quoted one particularly frank Orange petition that stated that the legislation would finally limit the incursions of the “‘French and Roman Catholic people’” into the “‘English Protestant Province’” of Ontario. Sellar, not to be outdone, believed that the question of Regulation 17 was clearly part of the Catholic plot to create a papal state in North America: “It is no question of language. It is whether schools located in Ontario, and receiving Government aid, shall be controlled by the Ontario
In a historical recount of the legislation, the ICC (to be discussed in detail in chapter 4) maintained that it was the French Catholic clergy and radical nationalists in Quebec who wanted the total secession of French Canada causing the government to limit the French language. In addition, the teachers in French schools were alleged to be improperly trained in the standards of education in Canada as they were only allowed to be trained in Normal Schools dominated by the clergy and thus French Canadian nationalist ideology. This was also not simply the sentiment of extremists and noted anti-Catholic organizations, as future Ontario Premier and Orangeman Howard Ferguson explicitly linked the religious conflict in Ontario with language during WWI by stating that French priests who were driven out of France due to anti-clericalism were leading all schools that were refusing to abide by the law. According to Ferguson, the French Catholic clergy refused to allow their followers to learn English, as evidenced by the fact that as soon as the priest left, or in schools not headed by a religious order, French Catholics prospered and learned English with enthusiasm. This “clerical tyranny” was also behind the French Catholic resistance to military recruitment because French priests taught students to avoid service or face excommunication and refusal of rites.

Behind these claims was a conception of the priest as all-powerful, determined to keep his flock ignorant in order to maintain control. In addition all political parties supported (or at the very least were non-committal in opposition to) Regulation 17, furthering the French Catholic and English Protestant divide in Ontario and the rest of Canada. Even such an eminent proponent of liberalism as Skelton saw the rhetoric from
the French Canadian side opposing Regulation 17 as exaggerated and harmful, emerging from the narrow provincialism of extremist Bourassa *nationalistes*. The ongoing controversy over the legislation has been noted by many as a key precursor to the eventual explosion of anger and English Canadian nationalism of the Great War. As Barry Ferguson has perceptively concluded, the widespread acceptance of Regulation 17 in English Canada is evidence of the inability of even the most liberal Anglo-Canadian nationalism to be truly inclusive or empathetic. French Catholics were instead perceived to be a harmful influence on the nation and in need of constant monitoring.

In a 1913 lecture entitled “French-Canadian Evangelization” Rev. Amaron asked his audience rhetorically whether they believed good Christian Canadians could stand idly by while French Catholics slowly subverted their country from within. For Amaron it was not the fault of the individual Catholics, as they were backward, primitive and easily controlled due to centuries of dominance by the aggressiveness of the Catholic hierarchy. Once again the metaphor of slavery was used, as Amaron claimed that Catholics in Quebec and throughout Canada were intellectual, moral and religious slaves. Amaron positioned himself as an advocate of colportage and the evangelization of Catholic Quebec, activities which he claimed allowed the “wheels of progress and Christian civilization” to continue. Amaron stressed the need for public schools to allow Catholics entry, asserting that thousands attempted every year, in order to undermine the harmful influence of the priest. He and other evangelizers were not, therefore, attacking Catholicism or Catholics as illiberal bigots, but they were instead spreading the truth of the gospel, “dispel[ling] the mediaeval darkness of Quebec.” In his famous study of
immigration in Western Canada, *Strangers Within our Gates: or, Coming Canadians*, J.S. Woodsworth reiterated Sellar’s vehement opposition to separate schools in Canada and both Amaron’s and Sellar’s concern with the influence of Catholicism. Woodsworth saw the separate school as allowing the priest to exert total control over French and Belgian immigrants and other Catholic Canadians, preventing them from achieving independent thought and self-realization.⁷⁶ For Woodsworth these institutions were the most dangerous obstacle to the unified nationality he desired and they hindered the underlying assumption of that nationality, namely assimilation of differences.⁷⁷ As Daniel Coleman has stated, Woodsworth was a “progressive liberal” who had a vision for an improved Canada which included “foreigners,” even Catholics; but this liberal inclusivity relied on the assumption that the Catholic hordes would need to be “improved” through education and contact with the pinnacle of civilization, Britain.⁷⁸ A fusing of racial assumptions, Protestant triumphalism and English Canadian nationalism allowed for individuals of all political, intellectual and denominational stripes to believe that assimilation of Catholics was necessary for the health of Canada.⁷⁹ According to these and many other influential figures, the Catholic Church was to be challenged by the champions of the true faith in order to preserve Canada as a progressive, British and Protestant nation. Indeed these terms were synonymous in the minds of many in this era.

The alleged danger that Catholicism represented to an emerging modern nation such as Canada is also present in a short story by Presbyterian clergyman Rev. Charles Gordon, better known by his famous penname of Ralph Connor.⁸⁰ Released in cooperation with the Canadian Presbyterian Church’s Board of French Evangelization in
the early twentieth century, *The Colporteur* follows the investigation of the small Quebec town of Ste. Marie by a professor, a businessman and an “aesthetic young lady.” After stopping in a quaint café they meet a young, pox-ridden man who identifies himself as a Presbyterian colporteur, or in his words, one who spreads the truth. He and the professor engage in an argument, with the latter claiming that the colporteur is engaged in an unchristian pursuit by condemning a historic and venerable Christian church. The colporteur responds that while the Catholic Church was Christian, it was horribly corrupt, indeed harmful to the French Canadian people as they prayed to a Marian deity. The group proceeds to participate in a religious service for converted Catholics who have found the truth thanks to the colporteur. A converted old man concludes the story by repeating the oft-mentioned claim to the group that Catholicism was religious slavery and perpetuated darkness.  

The story reveals an aspect of the Protestant conception of the ignorant Catholic masses in Quebec and the almost unfettered dominance the hierarchy was believed to hold over them. The businessman, who was quite skeptical of the young colporteur initially but who acts as the voice of the entrepreneurial Protestant spirit throughout the story, responds in great alarm to these claims, stating “‘if this young man is right, it’s a serious business for Canada. A million and a half Canadians kept in ignorance, kept poor paying taxes, bullied by their priests, kept from their rights as citizens.’”  

As Brian McKillop suggests, Connor and like-minded English Canadian nationalists in this period saw French Canadians as the remnants of a feudal past, unable to come to terms with the complexity of modernity. Only after overcoming these internal divisions could the
“coming Canadian” appear. Coleman identifies Connor as a progressive liberal along with Woodsworth who did not necessarily want to exclude immigrants or French Canadians, but who wanted to improve them and thus achieve a greater, unified nation. In Coleman’s words, this portrayal of the “other” is used not to further understanding of these groups or individuals, or religions, but instead “to convey evidence of White, British, masculine civility.” It is “they” who were the beneficiaries of the largesse of white, Protestant British Canadians, and it is “they” who needed to conform to superior standards of progress. R.G. Moyle and Doug Owram have concluded that the very existence of French Canada proved to Anglo visitors to Quebec the greatness of the British Empire, as it exhibited the inherently tolerant nature of British society along with its unashamed material superiority. This distorted view of French Canada and the Catholic Church reinforced an English Canadian nationalism that believed in an identity shorn of regressive elements that stubbornly resided in French Canada. Indeed in this period there was an undeniable chasm of understanding between English and French Canada.

The conscription crisis of WWI exacerbated the existing animus between the French and English in Canada and encouraged a sharpening of anti-Catholic sentiment in the country. Gordon Heath has contributed a recent article on the attitude of the Protestant denominational press towards French Canada during the conscription crisis of 1917-1918. Heath concludes that much of the Protestant press was motivated by political pragmatism and took their role as potential nation-builders seriously, resulting in a modest, tolerant reaction to French Canadian hostility to conscription designed to counter the increasingly
shrill denunciations of French Canada from other quarters. While Heath’s observation that the emergence of the Unionist government in 1917 did not signal a total submission of Canada to the forces of Anglo-Saxon racism is cogent, he does admit that anti-Catholicism remained an important aspect of the Canadian Protestant identity. It is this tension in Heath’s account amongst those figures sincerely trying to preserve a united, democratic nation in the midst of a serious crisis while also unable to accept an autocratic Catholicism as a true expression of Christianity that is perhaps unresolved in Heath’s article. For example, Loring Christie, influential adviser to Robert Borden in his Union government, was enthusiastic about the Wartime Elections Act (WEA) which openly gerrymandered votes by enfranchising female members of military families while simultaneously disfranchising immigrants from enemy countries, stating “it foiled the schemes of the French, who … would have used the foreign vote to buttress their own opposition to conscription and to the other vigorous ideals of the rest of Canada.” Christie also did not trust Newton Rowell, the leading Liberal in the Union government as he was “an Ontario Methodist—a vicious breed—much worse than any Jesuit.” This strange comparison expressed the common distrust of the Jesuit, often viewed as the ultimate example of the manipulative and insidious Catholic Church.

Despite Christie’s distrust, Rowell himself was adamant about the negative influence the Quebec Catholic hierarchy held over the nation during the Unionist election of December, 1917. In a speech in North Bay he delivered with Conservative Ontario Premier William Hearst at his side, Rowell explained that the majority of the priests in Quebec agreed with Henri Bourassa’s “Nationalist, clerical and reactionary attitude.”
Rowell described how disloyal members of religious orders in France actually found asylum in Canada and worked to dismantle the unified war effort in Canada. “There is a Nationalist, clerical and reactionary movement at work in the province of Quebec,” Rowell concluded, dominating the political situation in that province, and its secret plan was to use “this hour of grave national peril to dominate the political situation throughout the Dominion of Canada.” Rowell explained his earlier loyalty to Laurier and the Liberals by stating that they had not yet sacrificed themselves to the reactionary clerical nationalists of Quebec, which was now the situation, and the Conservatives had finally managed to extricate themselves from this support they had garnered in 1911. The Union government was in Rowell’s mind the only alternative to clerical-nationalist government in Canada and conscientious, intelligent Canadians needed to stop voting simply out of party loyalty. The political system was no longer the same, as the Liberals and Laurier were now backed by an insidious clerical force which necessitated the obsolescence of partyism. While Skelton maintained his faith in the party system in Canada, he agreed with Rowell and others that a reactionary, ultramontane clergy, many of them arriving from France due to the anti-clerical policies of the republican government there, were causing elements of Quebec to remain distant from the war effort and perpetuating cultural isolation. Skelton pointed out in an article in Queen’s Quarterly that this was demonstrated by the liberal Catholic Olivar Asselin, who had formed a battalion while Bourassa was vociferously supported only by selfish ultramontanes. This situation was undeniably harmful to national unity and the wider war effort.
Many intellectuals and activists portrayed Unionism as the greatest manifestation of the progressive desire for an end to corrupt, inefficient partisan politics. Part of this discourse was the belief that the Catholic Church represented the ultimate sectional interest in Canada. Again, English does not discuss the prominence of Protestantism or anti-Catholicism in the progressivism that was present in the Unionist government in any detail despite the often-vitriolic denunciations of the Catholic Church by members and supporters of the government. As previously discussed, Kirkconnell was adamant that Union government meant the trumping of the harmful influence that the Catholic Church had on politics and the nation; he even urged his mother and sister to take advantage of the WEA to vote in the upcoming election “against Frenchmen, Catholicism, and the abandonment of all national honour.”

S.D. Chown, general superintendent of the Methodist Church, counseled his followers in an open letter to vote Union in order to transcend partyism, preventing Quebec from dominating the nation and allowing the “grave danger” of “one type of religion … obtain[ing] a preponderating influence in the counsels of the Government of Canada.”

According to Michael Bliss, Chown was also concerned with the future character of a nation depleted of its vital stock of young Protestant men, asking K. Kingston in a letter “‘[i]s it fair to leave the province of Quebec to retain its strength in numbers … ready for any political or military aggression in the future, while our Protestants go forth to slaughter and decimation?’”

The Sentinel, the organ of the Orange Lodge in Canada, unsurprisingly agreed that the Union win was a resounding triumph over the hierarchy and its minions in Quebec. The Sentinel was euphoric about the Union victory, plastering its entire front page with an article.
promulgating the belief that a united Protestantism had finally fulfilled its true mission of quelling the reactionary forces of Rome in Canada, manifested in Laurier’s Liberal party. Protestantism and thus British liberty were triumphant in the election as Protestants were awakened to the threats Catholicism posed to Canada’s future. Borden himself, as English notes, even instructed some of the members of his government to link Catholic nationaliste Bourassa and Laurier during the election in December 1917 in order to expose them as traitors. Some within the Unionist government did not envision Catholics as part of their vision for the nation, a vision that proclaimed to be inclusive yet restricted the franchise from thousands of continental European immigrants on the Prairies and believed French Canada to be too limited and parochial in its attitudes to be consulted. French Canada did not fit into the ideology of service that English discusses which necessitated that true Canadians serve the war effort through enlistment, involvement in pro-war organizations or helping the government through supporting Union. The Church was simply an obstruction in the way of the simultaneous and noble goal of winning the war and constructing a new, progressive state.

Robert Sellar used a study of George Brown, written at the height of the conscription crisis, as an excuse to rail against the influence of the Church. For Sellar the sinister influence of the Church had manifested itself most clearly in the cowardly refusal of French Catholics to go to war at the behest of their priests, allowing good English Protestants to die in a just cause. Sellar, along with an editorialist from the Globe, believed that the Catholic Church wanted to extend control over Canadian politics, but that it was challenged by the British nature of Canadian society which promoted liberty.
French Catholics cared nothing for the higher principles of liberty and freedom, but only wanted to further their own interests no matter how harmful or sectarian. To Sellar, even Confederation was the result of “good Canadians” having to compromise with self-serving politicians in Quebec who were slavishly controlled by the hierarchy. The strong central government envisioned by the Fathers had been sacrificed due to the sectarian efforts of the priests in Quebec who controlled the docile masses of the province and only looked after their own interests. Sellar believed that the major issue in Canada was the same that confronted the United States in its brutal Civil War: can equal citizenship coexist with slavery? The answer of course was no and the US learned this when its federal solution of allowing slavery in some states failed; the Fathers of Confederation did not realize, according to Sellar, that this same principle applied to allowing a harmful state church to remain in total power in Quebec. Sellar ridiculed the bonne entente group who wanted to promote mutual understanding in Canada, believing that there were two governments in Canada, a papal one in Quebec and a democratic one for the rest of Canada. He concluded with a statement supporting the liberal foundations of the nation, focusing on the separation of church and state:

Is it not a degrading thought, that the future of this great country should be menaced by a priesthood? Is there not patriotism enough among us to rise above all petty issues and devote our political efforts to bringing about complete separation of Church and State—that Canada shall be ruled by and in the interests of her people, and not by and for the advantage of any church? For Sellar the continued influence of the Church in Canada, whether it was in the legislature or in education, was a “virus that had poisoned the system of government from the hour a legislature had been organized.”
One of the most significant anti-Catholic events of the war in Canada was the so-called Guelph Raid which occurred in 1918 at the St. Stanislaus Jesuit Novitiate, just outside of Guelph, Ontario. There had been rumours circulating concerning the novices of this institution for weeks, and an inquiry by the authorities occurred to investigate whether there were men in the novitiate avoiding enlistment. Avoidance of service was already a common charge against many French Canadians and Catholics, as demonstrated by Kirkconnell’s earlier statements and a report claiming that more French Canadians were hiding in forests to avoid conscription than were serving, with as much as two years’ provisions to sustain them. One of the three men initially arrested, on charges that were eventually revealed to be specious, was the son of the federal Justice Minister and only Catholic in the Borden cabinet, Charles Doherty, which lent greater significance to the event. As Brian Hogan has described, this raid took place in a particularly tense atmosphere, as Orange politicians had mistaken a recent protest by Montreal students as having been perpetrated by Catholic seminarians. Influential and angry Orangemen had subsequently convinced Borden to drop divinity students from the exclusion clause in the Military Service Act (MSA). Doherty realized that this would inflame Catholic passions further against the Act and convinced Borden to again make some concessions. However, ironically these partial concessions allowed for Catholic seminarians to be exempted, as they received tonsure after only a few months, while Protestant divinity students were not considered ministers until graduation and were thus not exempted, a situation that Doherty had wanted to avoid in the first place and which further provoked Orange wrath. When Marcus Doherty was arrested, he was allowed to phone his father, who in
consultation with other officials concluded that Captain Macaulay, the arresting officer, and the Assistant Provost Marshall did not adequately understand the exemption clause.\textsuperscript{108} The elder Doherty and Minister of Militia and Defence General S.C. Mewburn, who had sent the initial message to the Provost Marshall that the novitiate needed to be “cleaned out” of deserters, agreed that a press ban needed to be enforced to prevent religious and even racial tensions from exploding to a national level.\textsuperscript{109}

The perceived need for a press ban is revealing, as anti-Catholic sentiment was at a fever pitch due to the recent Unionist election and the battles over conscription. Underlying all of these issues was the belief that Catholics were disloyal, particularly French Canadian Catholics, and that they were avoiding their duty in a war to protect British values. According to the rumours circulating in Guelph, they were actively opposing the war effort in pursuit of their own selfish interests; yet St. Stanislaus was not a French Canadian institution nor did it involve a majority of French Canadian Catholics. It was simply a symbol of alleged Catholic power, influence and, most ominously, secrecy.\textsuperscript{110} The discourse surrounding the event after the press ban was broken was fierce and demonstrated many anti-Catholic tropes.\textsuperscript{111} Rev. H.G. Christie of Guelph accused Justice Minister Doherty of deviously crafting the MSA in order to prevent Catholic students from being conscripted.\textsuperscript{112} Rev. W.D. Spence, the president of the Guelph Ministerial Association (GMA), the organization which had for a long time suspected the novitiate of wrongdoing, told the \textit{Star} that the MSA should apply to Catholics and Protestants equally and thus tonsure should be completely dismissed as a valid sign of membership.\textsuperscript{113} Spence went further refuting a Protestant’s ability to believe anything a
Jesuit said, as they were taught to lie to defend their Church in any situation. Another revealing example of stereotypical attitudes towards Jesuits and Catholic orders in general occurred when one of the policemen from the raid was quoted by a witness at the novitiate as asking where the chains were for manacleing the residents. This resembles the lurid and popular nineteenth century tales of Maria Monk and Rebecca Reed, in which escaped nuns told of convents brimming with Gothic horrors and abuses. One particularly obstreperous individual was another member of the GMA, Rev. Kennedy Palmer, dubbed “a minister of the Gospel—of hate and bigotry” by the Catholic Unity League of Canada. In a sermon to his congregation at St. Paul’s Presbyterian Church in Guelph, Palmer repeated that the reason for his interest in the novitiate was his commitment to the men fighting overseas. Palmer outlined the danger in having Doherty, a Catholic, framing laws that were so flagrantly benefitting the Church. He concluded conspiratorially that the novitiate and other Catholic institutions had been planning a significant expansion in Canada; since the war had broken out Catholic colleges apparently filled with students while Protestant colleges were almost empty. Without explicitly stating it, Palmer was repeating a charge of disloyalty, an insidious attempt at Catholic expansion at the expense of Protestant young men in an otherwise loyal, British nation. In the subsequent Royal Commission that investigated the raid, which Palmer was instrumental in instigating, he and his representation even attempted to argue that the Jesuits were not a legal religious order in Ontario at all.

The Toronto Telegram remained unconvinced by the exonerating conclusions of the Commission. The author of a particularly vicious article dubbed the events “Jesuit
Night at Ottawa” and that the exemption of the Jesuits and the maligning of Captain Macaulay’s name was part of the “Curse of Rome.” The transformation of the event into a national issue was due to “panic-stricken cowards” in Ottawa who were unwilling to support the “legal” search by the military police of an institution suspected of harbouring deserters. The fear of the political influence of Catholicism and its authoritarian tendencies is most evident in the author’s warnings that the Borden government was being manipulated by a “state church” determined to protect itself, violating the principles of non-partisanship so valued by many Unionists. The press censorship was viewed as an expression of “clerical arrogance” along with the need for Minister Doherty to hide his complicity in the sordid affair. In a poem opening the article any collaboration with the Church resulted in misfortune and dominance; the “Curse of Rome” was now apparent upon the head of Macaulay and upon the unfortunate, now cowardly government of Canada. Rev. Spence himself vigorously denied that the GMA was propagating intolerance. For Spence, he and his colleagues were doing nothing less than protecting the British Empire against the yoke of Rome. According to this logic, the Vatican had become a political force by preventing the efficient prosecution of the war effort in Canada and in Ireland, where the hierarchy was alleged to be openly excommunicating Irish enlisters. Spence asked a rhetorical question that summarizes the perception discussed thus far of Catholics during this tense period: “Are the Roman Catholics with us in this war? … I would regret very much to think that the Church of Rome was against us. Still, what do we see?” The Catholic Church was viewed as hurting the war effort through its machinations and the Jesuits were seen as exercising an undue influence over
the creation of the MSA since a Catholic, Doherty, wrote it. Indeed this was not evidence of intolerance or illiberality, but to these southwestern Ontario Protestants it was the defence of the British war effort; in Palmer’s words, “I am … fight[ing] for the boys at home and [to] see that justice is done in this whole question.” They were convinced that what they were fighting for was the British principle of fair play and equality embodied in conscription and bemoaned the perverse exemptions that were being easily bestowed upon the Catholic community. The official proclamations of even the distant Calgary chapter of the Royal Black Preceptory echoed this sentiment; it claimed solidarity with the GMA and its pursuit of “Equal Rights for all, special privileges for none.”

When placed into the wider context of Canadian intellectual and cultural anti-Catholicism, the Guelph Raid operates as a case study in an important period, instead of the ephemeral expression of bigotry that it has been characterized as in the historiography. Robert Rutherdale goes so far as to dismiss religious sectarianism as an important, sustained issue in Canada at this time, believing that a desire for the moderating influences of “normalcy and order” triumphed over the irrationality of anti-Catholicism. Anti-Catholic sentiment cannot be isolated episodically but instead necessitates extensive research and analysis in order to determine its consistency in themes and rhetoric and also to understand its variety of manifestations in different historical periods and regions of Canada. As John Wolffe has brilliantly written, anti-Catholicism was “the granite that underlies the peat moors of Southwest Scotland but breaks through in isolated places to form stark formations of weathered rock.”
addition, historians such as English have perceived the Unionist election of December 1917 and Borden and Meighen’s beleaguered Unionist governments as the last major expression of fierce English Canadian nationalism, often perceived as crass imperialism by its enemies, that had been percolating since the Boer War. In this interpretation the autonomist liberal nationalism obsessed with national unity of Skelton, King and even Bourassa replaced this type of nationalism.¹²⁸ This sharp distinction is oversimplified when applied to Canada’s wider intellectual and cultural environment. Anti-French sentiment has never faded completely in Canada, but anti-Catholicism also remained an important and prominent aspect of not only the Canadian political scene but amongst its intellectuals, church figures and “liberal progressives.” Despite the claims of Jose Igartua regarding the postwar era, there is no easy divide between a liberal civic nationalism based on universal values, political institutions and an active citizenry and the assumed regressive conservatism of ethnic nationalism and this is true also of the nationalism promoted in this period.¹²⁹ Often these categories overlapped, buttressing each groups’ view of Catholicism. While English Canadian nationalism may have become slightly less fervently Anglophile than it was during the Great War, the Catholic Church and its non-British adherents were still perceived as obstacles to overcome, a machinating anachronism interfering with the progress of the Canadian nation.

It was through this conception of the world and the influence of British Protestantism that mainstream intellectuals and political figures were able to vilify the Catholic Church internationally and in Canada (particularly in Quebec) by promoting universal civic values. Skelton, for example, in his famous biography of Laurier was
convinced that it was only after Laurier was exposed to the seminal teachings of English liberalism that he was able to venture beyond the narrow, nationalist and ultramontane Catholicism of his home province, instead embracing a liberal Catholicism that was able to “reconcile faith and freedom.” Skelton perceived Laurier as Canada’s most valiant foe of the “ecclesiastical terror” of ultramontanism, which had arisen in the nineteenth century according to Skelton due to the emergence of “the softer lights of romanticism” allowing “faiths [to] revive … which had wilted under the harsh noonday glare of rationalism.” This patronizing view of Catholicism is repeated by Skelton in describing Laurier’s integral speech on political liberalism, as it allowed an entire segment of French Canadian Catholics to follow “the path of moderation and progress,” refusing to be dominated by the clergy any further and asserting their rights as “free men.” In essence this type of discourse was a process of “normalizing” Protestantism, or at the very least promoting a “protestantized” Catholicism, as synonymous with liberal nationalism, to the extent that Protestantism no longer had to be explicitly mentioned. Unreformed Catholicism, conversely, was constructed as a problem always in tension with liberal civic values and in need of constant surveillance if it was to continue to exist in the nation. Skelton was indeed a proponent of an “unhyphenated Canadianism” that did not adhere to strict racial, religious and ethnic identities but which embraced all citizens under a broad banner of national unity; yet this intellectual worldview was not inherently inclusive and it did preclude forms and practices of Catholicism that he believed were detrimental to his vision. Conservative Catholicism for Skelton was a threat to the liberty of the individual and the state itself, it was a disturbing factor in
Canadian politics and Laurier’s central role in fighting this challenge was to liberate his “countrymen” in Quebec.\textsuperscript{134}

It was not only Catholic Quebec that threatened the unity and progress of Canada, but also immigrants, particularly Old World Catholics. Woodworth’s other popular textbook of the time, \textit{My Neighbour: A Study of City Conditions, A Plea for Social Service}, was also funded by the head of the Young People’s Forward Movement for Missions’ F.C. Stephenson and commissioned to provide specifically Canadian sources about important issues in the Western world.\textsuperscript{135} While mostly focused on the need to help those living in urban areas through social service and reform, the conceptual thread of Catholic immigrants being unable to help themselves and thus threatening the fundamental fabric of the nation remained throughout. For Woodsworth, the bedrock of the nation consisted of self-realized citizens who had internalized the British traditions of freedom and liberty. Woodsworth expressed concern over the poor ghettos of “foreigners” which emerged due to the rapid shift of the population from the countryside to the cities. While in his opinion, along with many other reformers in this period, the city was a site of spiritual alienation,\textsuperscript{136} for the immigrant it was even more severe because the only churches in these areas were often English-speaking Protestant denominations who did not understand the new arrivals. As a solution Woodsworth advocated Protestant missions which would further their understanding of these people and their traditions, which included Catholics, Jews and other Protestants.\textsuperscript{137}

Woodsworth’s prejudices were not far from the surface of his concerns however, as while the Lutherans, Reformed Churches and even the Mennonites were assimilating
into Canadian society, the Catholic Church remained obstinate and jealously guarded its influence over an ignorant people. These people, in Woodsworth’s opinion, secretly resented and hated their Church:

The Church has a strong hold on the immigrant peoples as they arrive in this country. They fear it and they love it. Its power has been almost absolute in the lands from which they come. It, more than anything else, unites them with the old land and all that they once held dear. The church is a home, a meeting-place, an entrance into the larger world of music and art and emotion. But as time goes on better education and frequent intercourse with English-speaking Protestants and the prevailing spirit of the new world tend inevitably to weaken the power of the church. The men especially refuse to be guided by those whom they regard as their exploiters. In their revolt against the church they are called and call themselves Atheists and Socialists – which simply means that they are against the established order as they know it.\(^{138}\)

Historians have noted that the Roman Catholic Church in Canada in this period, although often split along linguistic lines, was dedicated to not only strengthening its hold over its followers as immigration increased but also spreading its influence throughout Western Canada, even attempting to subsume “rival” forms of Catholicism, such as the Ukrainian Church, into the Latin rite, causing resentment.\(^{139}\) Terence Fay, in his survey of Canadian Catholicism, characterizes this aggressive policy as a “messianic myth” in which God had chosen Catholicism over a materialistic Protestantism as the true faith for the nation.\(^{140}\) Woodsworth was thus expressing this genuine fear amongst Anglo-Protestant Canadians of the decline of the importance of Protestantism when challenged by a Catholic Church pursuing control of Canada’s immigrant population at any cost, even if it meant losing frustrated adherents along the way. It is in Woodsworth’s language, couched in vast oversimplifications of a shallow Church dedicated only to its numbers and power and influenced by what Kenneth McNaught details as Woodsworth’s hatred of dogma of any form (whether Marxist or Catholic), that his anti-Catholicism is apparent.\(^ {141}\) The Church inherently fomented harmful sentiments, according to Woodsworth, encouraging the loss
of faith amongst immigrant men in particular. Among the women the Church maintained its influence, but even then only superficially; it used its associations to cynically perpetuate the immigrants’ native languages, customs and to prevent assimilation and maintain control. In Woodsworth’s opinion “the Church often retains its hold upon the people long after it has ceased to nourish them.”^142 It could not fulfill the true needs of the people.

For Woodsworth this situation meant that the Protestant churches had an opportunity and responsibility to preach and spread the true word of God to these peoples. Woodsworth quoted S.W. Dean, Superintendent of the Toronto City and Fred Victor Mission, from a document entitled “The Needs and Nature of our Mission Ministries” when he referred to the fact that most of “these people” had never learned the Gospel as Britons had. In explicitly evangelical language Dean denied that these groups had ever understood Christianity as a personal experience with God. This, according to Woodworth and Dean, was the job of urban Protestants in modern Canadian cities.^143 In Woodsworth’s mind this literal mission was even more important than spreading Protestant Christianity to the foreign masses; it was the realization of the historical development of Christianity itself. In the past the Church had controlled the state, education and art, but in our modern era these areas were independent of ecclesiastical influence. Christianity had progressed beyond this need for control and Christians were to actively address the larger social problems, such as poverty and illiteracy. This was what true Christianity represented and true Christians needed to extricate themselves from the stultifying Christianity of the past.^144 It is clear that Woodsworth was referring to
Catholicism, which is reiterated when Woodsworth concluded this section by stating that foreign missions and converting foreigners living in Canadian cities to the Gospel was an integral part of the “re-christianizing of the church.”\textsuperscript{145} The slow eradication of the influence and importance of an ossified Catholicism was central to the revitalization of Christianity, identified as a socially active and engaged Protestantism. Woodsworth asked rhetorically, “[m]ay we not be on the eve of a great social and religious reformation?”\textsuperscript{146} C.E. Amaron also expressed a sense of duty for Protestant Canadians to help their regressive Catholic brethren. In his aforementioned lecture, Amaron discussed recent immigrants, comparing their state to the British arriving in Canada to “civilize” the French:

\begin{quote}
Can we leave them as they are? Would it be Christian on our part, would it be patriotic? Where is the Christian, where is the patriot, who could sleep at peace on an easy pillow, whilst leaving alone a problem such as Roman Catholic teaching and neglect of instruction have created for us? The fruits of Romanism have been the same the wide world over. . . . [T]hese multitudes who are deprived of the blessings of a pure Gospel, and are falling into the abyss of irreligion, anarchy and immorality. . . . We cannot close our eyes to the fact that Romanism is not conducive to the intellectual and moral life of a nation.\textsuperscript{147}
\end{quote}

It was not just Quebec that concerned Protestant Canadians, but Canada as a whole, as Protestants were concerned over the influence of “heathen” religions.\textsuperscript{148} The West was of particular interest to many Protestants and English Canadian nationalism manifested itself in a variety of ways. The West in general was seen to embody the optimism for a prosperous future, beyond the crass politics, scandals and recessions of the late nineteenth century. Yet some Anglo-Protestant settlers perceived their rightful place as holding a monopoly on civic life and maintaining social order in the face of mass, and diverse, immigration, which could signal the decline of Protestantism. As journalist James Gray stated in his reminiscence of his childhood in Western Canada:
“To be British and Anglo-Saxon and Protestant on the western prairies at the onset of the 1920s was not only the best thing. To be British and Anglo-Saxon and Protestant was the only thing.” The anti-Catholic discourse of the West also further problematizes the divide between ethnic and civic nationalism. The immigrant groups settling in this region were portrayed as being both undesirable foreigners for this important region of the nation and unable to understand the liberal institutions of British Canada due to their history under a domineering and archaic church. They were therefore seen as the ethnic “other” (Ruthenian, Galician, even if these ethnic groups were not Catholic but Orthodox) unable to adapt to Canadian civic culture. The Protestant churches viewed the polyglot masses of the Prairie Provinces and the increasingly depopulated and impoverished rural areas with a mixture of optimism and dread. Figures such as Woodsworth and R.W. Murtchie believed that by becoming active in these areas and engaging in social scientific analysis of the issues, the “cultural prestige” of Protestantism could be amplified. If the West was where Canada would achieve its greatness materially, than in the minds of many it had to be intellectually and spiritually pure, the population espousing an ideology of development and assimilated into the modern, Anglo-Saxon Protestant value of progress. The Reverend Charles Gordon proclaimed at the Presbyterian Pre-Assembly Congress for 1913, which was discussing the level of need for Protestant evangelization in the West, that “Yes, even in population we are making steady progress, and the only concern for us is whether we are going to be able to take all those people and make of them true and loyal Canadians, with Canadian hearts, Canadian aspirations, Canadian ideals, and with Canadian … fear of God.” For Gordon, and perhaps his audience, it
was clear that a Canadian conception of the “fear of God” and Canadian ideals were tied inextricably to Protestantism, as he continued that “I am not going to discuss the Roman Catholic problem. It is a problem for us all, but first for Roman Catholics. … They have to face the problem of what they are going to do with all these millions they claim as their own, a claim that many of us are not prepared to acknowledge or to accept[.].”

Demographer and professor of political economy W. Burton Hurd was a proponent of instituting a quota system to limit the immigration of certain nationalities to prevent the overwhelming of Canada’s British and, importantly, French civic traditions. Hurd’s early work in the late 1920s is not explicitly anti-Catholic, couched as it is in heavy social scientific language and demonstrated by his tacit acceptance of the reality of French traditions in Canada, but his view of those nurtured outside of Protestantism and within Roman Catholicism specifically is patronizing, perpetuating the “normalized” Protestantism mentioned earlier. Hurd used social scientific techniques and language to convey an aura of objectivity and expertise; yet he used this methodology to calculate how easily certain populations could be assimilated to Canadian values, a national unity which he viewed as essential to the proper functioning of a modern society. In his study of the 1921 census, prepared and commissioned by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Hurd echoed the sentiment of many that Northern European, French and British immigrants were the most desirable as they were the easiest to assimilate. This was due to their high literacy rates and willingness to intermarry within the mainstream of Canadian society. Southern, Eastern and Central Europeans on the other hand refused to intermarry into Canadian society, leading him to intimate that there might be a “group hereditary”
factor behind illiteracy. Hurd made it clear that he did not want to engage in an analysis of culture, as social scientific methods alone could prove the necessity of encouraging a restrictive Northern European and Anglo immigration. He did, however, identify religion as a key factor in the refusal of these groups to intermarry and thus participate fully in Canadian society, based on what he castigated as the foolish fear of their religion disappearing. He also believed that their seemingly inborn illiteracy and inability to respect authority and law caused these immigrants to overpopulate the prisons and not attend schools, demonstrated in cold statistics from penitentiaries and reformatories. Hurd verified scientifically, expressed in a measured tone, what other participants in the debate expressed emotionally and caustically. Hurd openly discredited a religious basis for exclusion of immigrants, believing this to be “un-British, and has already done much to discredit the quota in the eyes of many fair-minded citizens.” Instead he stressed the need to limit the amount of immigration in general and to focus this immigration on stocks that would be an “easy fit” in Canada to prevent Southeastern and Central Europeans, who were mostly Catholic or Orthodox, from becoming “one-half to two-third of our total immigration[.]” Canada as a nation could not become a haven for nationalities that he proved statistically to be criminals, illiterate and who refused to assimilate through intermarriage. Underlying Hurd’s statistics and analysis was hostility towards these nationalities for refusing to conform to Hurd’s definition of a modern, scientific and progressive nation.

Hurd was throughout his career concerned about the low fertility of Anglo-Saxons and the threat this posed to “their” role on the nation. A major negative characteristic of
Catholic immigrants was their prodigious fertility according to Hurd, as they multiplied at an enormous rate in comparison to the “desirable stocks.” Hurd shared the common fear that people of Southeastern and Central European origin would soon overrun the Prairies. This would be disastrous in his mind because his ultimate goal, and what he believed the goal of the entire nation should be, was a culturally homogenous nation. “[I]t is found,” Hurd elaborated, “that the North-western European races generally are possessed of characteristics favourable to assimilation by intermarriage,” unlike the Catholic and Orthodox groups from Southeastern and Central European.\textsuperscript{159} While ostensibly he did not accept religion as a basis for exclusion, Hurd did view aspects of Catholicism as hindering national unity. Hurd dismissed those who painted a positive portrait of immigration in the West. In an unfinished review of an unidentified book, Hurd fumed against the author’s claim that intermarriage was actually common in Western Canadian communities. This could only happen, in Hurd’s expert opinion, if cultural and religious barriers were removed and this was proceeding, if at all, at an alarmingly slow rate. He dismissed the idea as part of the misguided philosophy of the entire immigration structure in Canada thus far.\textsuperscript{160} The quota system was the only alternative as religion remained as an influential and problematic aspect of certain immigrant communities. Immigration from these areas needed to be halted immediately to stem the tide of an illiterate, criminal and exceptionally fertile people who refused to assimilate due to a culture dominated by religion. The future of the nation itself was at stake in the West.

Saskatchewan was of particular concern to many Protestants worried about Catholic and Orthodox religious communities forming in the West. Saskatchewan grew
from approximately 100,000 people nestled in the southeast corner of the province in 1910 to containing 648,000 by 1916, spread out across the province and made up of an enormous variety of ethnicities, religious groups and other migrants. One of the most influential of the figures who focused on the province and the West in general was Dr. J.T.M. Anderson, educator and one-time controversial Conservative premier of the province. The story of Anderson’s 1929 electoral victory, his premiership and the prominence of the viciously anti-Catholic Ku Klux Klan and other anti-Catholics in his government has been detailed elsewhere. Anderson contributed his own perspective on the Catholic Church and its influence amongst immigrants to Western Canada before he became the leader of the provincial Conservatives. Anderson was originally from Ontario but became heavily involved in the Manitoba educational system, which is when he wrote *The Education of the New Canadian: A Treatise on Canada’s Greatest Education Problem* before he was transferred to Saskatoon and became involved with the dormant provincial Tories. In this 1918 book Anderson expressed his fear of and indignation at immigrant communities in isolated “bloc settlements” with their own parochial newspapers, churches and culture. According to Anderson the only bulwark against this isolation, made worse by the presence of radicals, nationalists and an obstinate clergy, was the public school, which was designed to inculcate Canadian, Anglo-Saxon values. It was not the Scandinavian immigrant that Anderson was concerned with; these people were hardy, thrifty, intelligent and Protestant. Instead Anderson feared immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe, where settlers had been exposed to tyranny their entire life and did not understand the obligations of a democratic, enlightened nation. He
used the example of the Czechs, who attempted to escape from Catholic tyranny to Protestant liberty through the Hussite movement, but was tragically quelled: “The history of their church is the history of their nation, for on the one hand was Protestantism and independence, on the other Catholicism and political subjection.”

The parochial school was controlled by this aggressive hierarchy and prevented the creation of the progressive Canada through unification and assimilation that Anderson, along with so many others discussed thus far, envisioned. Religious schools, if they continued to exist, needed to be rigorously monitored by the government as they were remnants of the “ancient reign of ecclesiastical despotism” and prevented the formation of a democratic citizenry.

While Anderson claimed that he did not want religious dogma taught in schools, he did support the teaching of Christian values as necessary for a modern society. Anderson was simply opposed to institutions, particularly the Roman Catholic Church, which he perceived to be standing in the way of the Canada he imagined. He specifically mentioned the betterment of the chaotic Slavic settlements in Northern Alberta that had received and accepted the hard evangelizing work of the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches; these churches allowed Slavs to escape from their history of oppression and subjugation at the hands of the Church hierarchy. For Anderson, the seriousness of these issues could not be underestimated and he attacked contemporary politicians for their crass political opportunism: “If our provincial statesmen do not deal with the problem from a lofty, national point of view; if they cater to the vote of the foreigner from purely partisan motives,” Anderson charged, continuing hyperbolically, “if they prostitute our Canadian ideals of citizenship in order to gain temporary political advantage; if they
do not insist upon the child of the foreigner receiving a proper elementary education in the English language, they are endangering our national existence” while “at the same time making us the laughing-stock of all enlightened peoples.”

Anderson was convinced that decisive action was necessary to prevent the dominance of irrationality and the sacrifice of Canadian unity at the hands of a foreign master.

Anderson was also instrumental in a 1929 survey focused mostly on northern Saskatchewan compiled by Robert England. England was an Ulsterman who had fought in the Canadian forces at Vimy Ridge; he returned injured, preventing him from farming so he decided to become involved in education and was heavily influenced by Anderson’s book. In fact Anderson convinced England and his wife Amy to takeover a school in a Ukrainian district to help integrate immigrant populations. At the time of the report he was the Continental Superintendent of the Canadian National Railways’ Colonization Department and future member of the wartime Committee on Cooperation in Canadian Citizenship (CCCC) with such academics and influential public intellectuals as Kirkconnell, S.D. Clark and John Murray Gibbon. This survey was funded by a Masonic scholarship designed to aid in understanding the core issues of immigrant communities in order to further assimilation and Anderson was the representative from the Provincial Department of Education in Saskatchewan. The resulting report, entitled *The Central European Immigrant in Canada*, reflected the input of a number of teachers across the province that were given surveys designed to reveal the nature of immigrant communities. Each survey focused on a particular aspect of the community, such as agriculture. Despite genuine concern for the agricultural and economic customs being
practiced, it was the implications for the health of the nation that concerned the surveyors. In the section “General Topics” of Report II, for example, the teacher was asked “Are the traditions, habits, customs and temperaments of non-English settlers in your district such as to conduce to the stability of democratic government and to make Canada a virile nation?”

England viewed the Slav and other Central European immigrants, referred to as dominated by their religion whether Catholic, Orthodox or part of the small Uniate community, as being trapped in a medieval world of superstitions, ignorance and unbridled passion. England is clear that these indisputable facts should have compelled the government to limit the immigration of Slavs. Single Slavic men in particular were uncontrollable in their passion, as those already present in Canada needed to be properly acclimated to a modern democratic nation if they were not already in prisons or asylums. The survey questions were also couched in a language concerning the ability of ignorant non-Protestants to adapt; Question 1 of Psychological Topics, for example, asked “To what extent does superstition govern the lives of the people?”

England and Anderson saw education as central to the assimilation of these immigrants, believing that in the areas most heavily “Ruthenian” or any non-Protestant immigrant group it was the “teacher’s heavy task … [to] moderniz[e] … medieval communities.”

*The Central European Immigrant in Canada* was informed not only by anti-Catholicism but by an essentialist, evolutionary idea of race and represents the often close connections in this discourse between racist attitudes towards ethnic minorities and prejudicial opinions of religion. Indeed, often these sentiments cannot be separated from each other as they were part of a matrix of discriminatory thought. While anti-
Catholicism cannot be, and should not be, conflated with racism, a series of stereotypes and tropes regarding Catholicism was central to the intellectual framework of some Protestant English Canadians who were convinced of the inability of Catholic European immigrants to “fit” into a democratic society. Climate controlled evolution in England’s mind, as the races of Europe could be generally divided into the Nordic, the Alpine and the Mediterranean races, the latter reaching sexual maturity earlier due to their exposure to warm weather, which explained their hyper-emotional culture. Region A of immigration to Canada came from the “North German Plain” and Scandinavia, as Nordic people were easily assimilable, while Region B contained Croats, Magyars and Slovaks. Revealing the intersections between anti-Catholicism and racism, the latter groups were more difficult to assimilate due to their minimal exposure to the Protestant Reformation. Thus the Reformation was the singular historical event in England’s mind which discerned the character of entire peoples. This Protestant way of imagining the historical place of the Reformation was common; Michael Gauvreau has described how many evangelicals saw the Reformation as the beginning of the “universal struggle between truth and error,” a struggle in which the “true faith” would have to triumph to ensure social progress. According to England the Germanic people were able to resist the centuries of Roman ecclesiasticism due to their evolutionary superiority, as the Romanization of these peoples was only superficial and formal, while in the other people of Europe the dominance of Rome and its stifling medievalism was almost absolute. For England this was the explanation behind the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century and the liberation of the individual. It was also a sentiment that could be found
numerous times in Bingham’s intensely fundamentalist anti-Catholic journal, who positioned the Catholic Church as the historical enemy of the Reformation and therefore engaging in the work of Satan himself. In more moderate language, England used the Ulster-Scot as a worthy model for Canadian values, as they were scrupulous, thrifty and were firmly opposed to indolence. He did not mention the role of the Ulster-Scot in the Orange Order in Canada but that these Anglo-Protestant values needed to be inculcated into the Central European immigrant to prevent the spread of crime in Canada. England concluded his work by directly linking Protestant Christianity with the ubiquitous desire for measured progress: “Canada has a great opportunity, as the residuary legatee of British ideals of tolerance and fair play on the North American continent, to be the interpreter and reconciler of a new world. … If we fumble with our message in the world, what science calls Progress and the theological God, will find another messenger.”

Anderson, who contributed to the operation of this project, would have agreed.

As alluded to earlier, the Klan was prominent in the election of 1929 when Anderson’s Tories in an alliance with provincial Progressives decided to unite in order to defeat the provincial Liberal machine of Premier Jimmy Gardiner. Patrick Kyba has noted that emotionalism characterized this election and the years immediately preceding it, especially in the fervency of anti-Catholic rhetoric. Two of the major figures espousing anti-Catholic vitriol in the province were J.J. Maloney, who helped to bring the Klan to Saskatchewan and strengthened it for the 1929 election (and will be discussed later), and the Anglican Bishop of Saskatchewan George Exton Lloyd. Lloyd, referred to as a “professional Anglo-Saxon” by James Gray, founded the National Association of Canada
in order to limit immigration and protect the Anglo-Saxon values he cherished. William Katerberg has identified Lloyd as the embodiment of a strain of racialist thinking in Canada in the early-to-mid twentieth century termed “Anglo-Saxonism.” This perspective linked many Canadian Protestants’ concerns regarding immigration, nationalism and an intense pride in British traditions and institutions which otherwise may have seemed contradictory. Lloyd, who was a member of a British emigrant party dedicated to spreading British values to Western Canada, participated in the founding of Lloydminster, Alberta in 1903. After the failure of the initial leader of the Barr Colony, Anglican minister Rev. Isaac Barr, Lloyd was charged with leading the settlement and was quite successful by 1910, gaining notoriety and respect from many Canadians as he successfully entrenched British settlers and traditions in the West; the Barr Colony was a unique example of a concerted British bloc settlement. When he recruited for the excursion, Lloyd made sure to ask for Anglicans to ensure that those who came were English Canadians of the appropriate stock. In a recent republishing of Lloyd’s account of the founding of the Barr Colony the editor provides a biographical sketch in which he notes that Lloyd was dedicated throughout his life to spreading English values throughout the world, founding the Maple Leaf Fellowship during World War I in order to recruit Britons to come to Western Canada and prevent subversion by “foreigners.”

In a speech to the Grand Orange Lodge in Edmonton in 1928, Lloyd was frank about why he formed the National Association of Canada. At a meeting of representatives from the Masons, the Orangemen and the Sons of England, Lloyd had decided that one single organization was needed to pool resources to stop “the foreignization [sic] of
Canada and the increasing aggression of the Church of Rome” and to preserve “the supremacy of British language, law, traditions, blood, characteristics and loyalty to the crown as the king pin of the British Empire.” British values were equated with Protestant values, and these were the values that needed to be protected and perpetuated if Canada was to prosper, something that was threatened by the “Mongrel nation” that would inevitably emerge from an open-door policy of immigration. These intruders into the nation from Southern, Central and Eastern Europe would not assimilate to the “normal” English Canadian framework, much like the troublesome French Canadian in Quebec, and destroyed any sense of unity of purpose and devotion to the British motherland.

Lloyd proposed the National Association of Canada as a means to maintain the English Canadian identity and way of life. In Objective 3 of the Association Lloyd ominously stressed the need to preserve “good blood” in Canada by preventing emigration of quality, as Canada was becoming weakened by Jews and Poles, encouraging the immigration of “Old Country Britons,” whom he viewed as a sturdy yeomanry dedicated to preserving Anglo-Protestant freedom in the West. Objective 8 of the Association’s platform, reminiscent of Hurd, promoted a quota on immigration from Central, Southern and Eastern Europe, but not from Scandinavia, as they were desirable Protestant immigrants who were inherently loyal. It was exclusively Protestants that Lloyd believed could be truly loyal and they needed to unite in opposition to Catholic immigration and aggression. Lloyd and Maloney, along with Anderson as a provincial premier, provide the historian with a revealing sample of anti-Catholicism. It was not
limited to the narrow and fiery bigotry of a Klansman such as Maloney, but also resided in outspoken Anglican clergymen such as Lloyd. Lloyd was not alone in his opinions as the General Synod of the Church of England in Canada passed a resolution in September 1927 asking the King government to prevent non-British immigration from ever reaching 50 percent of British immigration. Canon Walter Burd of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, in consultation with Lloyd, vigorously protested the employment of Catholic priests in the Immigration Department as giving unfair advantage to Catholics in the immigration process, a practice misrepresented and exaggerated by Hurd. The Liberal-Progressive Minister of Immigration, Robert Forke, later modestly defended it as being designed to attempt to repatriate French Canadians who had immigrated to New England. As Katerberg has cogently written, nativism and racialism were not the sole preserve of reactionary conservatives struggling with identity in a changing world, but was also part of progressive and liberal ideology of the early twentieth century. Through reform and restriction, these figures and activists postulated, immigration could be controlled and immigrants could be modified and assimilated properly into Canadian life. One of the major aspects of English Canadian identity and improving Canadian society was Protestantism and the liberties that it was assumed to entail. It is therefore unsurprising that when Anderson became Premier and Minister of Education in 1929 the initial main focus was regulating Catholics, foreigners and religious schools. Anderson immediately legislated against religious education, the presence of religious emblems of any kind and the teaching and speaking of French in schools.
While the Depression and Anderson’s single minded focus on winning an election no matter the cost ostensibly destroyed the Tories in Saskatchewan for decades to come, Patrick Kyba notes that Anderson fought passionately for those in Saskatchewan who believed the public school’s sole responsibility was the dissemination of Canadian values, particularly the English language, and should not be for the sectarian advantage of any group in society.\textsuperscript{195} Anderson’s own anti-Catholic beliefs, however, and his informal alliance with the Klan militate against a benign interpretation of his campaign and premiership. The Klan was protecting Canada against the organized machinations of the Catholic Church and believed all Protestants belonged “with an organized White Canadian Protestant movement, dedicated to the realization of a really vital service religion in Canada.” Protestantism and patriotism were equivalent, and Catholics were excluded completely from this formulation, as the “growth of the Ku Klux Klan means the steady stabilizing development of truly patriotic religion in the land.” The Klan viewed itself as “unafraid soldiers who dare to serve against all the secret, subtle enemies who strive to undermine the state.”\textsuperscript{196} This language was more than rhetoric, as several Klansmen were arrested for attempting to bomb St. Mary’s Catholic Church in Barrie, Ontario on June 10\textsuperscript{th}, 1926. An Irish immigrant, William Skelly, was arrested along with two other men claiming to be Klansmen and confessed to the crime of planting dynamite in the church; Skelly claimed that he was instructed to do so as a Klan initiation after attending several meetings.\textsuperscript{197} The case became even more sensational when the Klan denied all connection to the bombing, blaming them on Skelly’s intense hatred of Catholicism based on the apparent killing of his wife by Sinn Fein in Ireland. The various
branches of the Klan defended themselves as a law-abiding, patriotic organization. Indeed the Attorney-General of Ontario, W.F. Nickle, was convinced by a meeting he had with the “respectable” elements of the Klan, namely A.H. Lord, MPP in the New Brunswick legislature and Chief of Staff for the Fredericton Klan, and O.B. Neeley, Klan solicitor, that the Klan would punish any member engaged in these lawless affairs and would cooperate with the authorities. The Klan no longer refuted the membership of the three men; it simply upheld that the organization did not support the action and would “assure” that such actions would not happen in the future. The Klan was an organization not necessarily accepted within the mainstream of Canadian society, yet it did espouse rhetoric and values that closely resembled many Canadians’ own ideas regarding the centrality of Protestantism in Canadian identity and feared the overwhelming of this ideal through Catholic immigration and influence. Indeed the superintendent of the Protestant Home in Alberta as late as 1935 admitted in his “Protestant Home News Letter” that he had accepted donations from the Orange Order and the Klan to stay afloat. The Klan was not respectable, but contemporaries did not reject it as an outlaw American institution, although some historians have represented it as such outside of its Saskatchewan base, particularly when expounding a theme so entrenched in the public discourse as anti-Catholicism.

This focus on immigration, and Catholic immigration specifically, in Canada in this period may differentiate Canadian anti-Catholicism from American, as Nordstrom notes that one of the defining characteristic of Progressive Era American anti-Catholicism was a shift in focus from narrowly ethnic nationalism to the inherent disloyalty of
Catholics and their inability to function in civil society. In Canada the two issues were not easily disaggregated, and demonstrating this dual concern is one of Connor’s most famous, and referenced, fictional works, *The Foreigner: A Tale of Saskatchewan*, released in 1909. It is a tale of the immigrant communities of Western Canada and how the penetration of Canadian ideals such as democracy and liberty, themselves both underlain with Protestantism, were able to “save” some of the ignorant Catholic from a life of violence or nihilistic subversion imported from Russia. For example, Simon Ketzel, a character in the novel, is saved because his daughter Margaret teaches him English and provides him with Methodist literature. Thus the centrality of reaching the youth of these immigrants is sacralised in this character’s rebirth, a component that Woodsworth outlined in his work as integral to the edification of immigrants into truly Canadian values. Connor is exuberant in his detailing of the results of this conversion, believing “through little Margaret it was that the greatest of all Canadianising influences, the school and the mission, made their impact” continuing that “as time went on it came to pass that from the Ketzel home, clean, orderly, and Canadian, there went out into the foul waste about[.]” The result of rejecting the word of Protestant Christianity is also explicitly represented in the novel. When a dead “foreigner” is found by the doctor and Sergeant Cameron, the doctor expresses sadness for these “rough characters”: “[A]n ignorant and superstitious Church has kept them in fear of purgatory and hellfire for the next [life]. They have never had a chance[.]” The sergeant, an eminently harsh and practical man, refutes this, stating that all people need to be held responsible for their own actions. Yet Connor was convinced that Protestantism was the answer to the issues in
the West, and this is most clearly embodied by Connor’s Father Brown and Kalman Kalmar characters. Father Brown is the definition of the sturdy Western Protestant, unshakeable in the veracity and utility of his faith in shaping Canada. Brown expresses the difficulties he has encountered in his establishment of a Presbyterian mission because the foreigners are convinced that it is simply a scheme to extract their meager income. Brown understands this fear, as the only church they had ever known was constantly fleecing them. This fear also caused a secret hatred and resentment of churches in general, an even more prodigious crime resulting from Catholic greed. In addition, many of them were not even sure if it was a church at all because Brown refused to take money or to have candles and other ritualistic externalities present. Kalmar boldly denies another aspect of Catholicism, responding to a priest who wanted him to confess to him that “I make my confession to God.” The priest is shocked, accusing Kalmar of apostasy; Kalmar calmly responds that he is in fact the opposite, that he has been reading his Bible and has actually understood and found the word of Jesus.

“The West” in Connor’s fiction was the location of the polyglot immigrant communities that Connor desired to unify into a single, superior Canadian nationality embodying a common identity and common values. In the preface to The Foreigner Connor revealed his grandiose pretentions with regards to what this process would achieve, explicitly advocating the fusion of all of the races in Canada into one “for the honour of our name, for the good of mankind, and for the glory of Almighty God.” According to Kirk H. Layton, underlying all of Connor’s work, but particularly The Foreigner, “is a belief in a mythological Canada based on Protestant idealism.” Connor
sincerely believed, as noted earlier, that if these immigrants in the West could be helped to shed their reliance on this retrograde and absolutist Church, the nation would progress. However, “‘[t]he problem is, can we do anything to prevent the absorption by that church [sic] of these masses of people, and the use, by that church [sic] of these for its own political and religious ends.’”

Connor’s character Father Brown provides a single-sentence summation of Connor’s entire ideological framework present within this novel and other works he produced: Brown wanted to teach them English, domestic science, “in short, do anything to make them good Christians and good Canadians, which is the same thing.”

J. Lee Thompson and John H. Thompson make an interesting comparison of Connor’s portrayal of French Canadians and Catholics in general as simple-minded caricatures to William Henry Drummond’s theories concerning Catholics. Drummond, in his popular work *Natural Law and the Spiritual World*, compared Catholics to semi-parasitic organisms, such as hermit-crabs, in that Catholics were unable to achieve a relationship with God or even faith without the external existence of an elaborate hierarchy and the perverse doctrine of Papal Infallibility, which in Drummond’s mind prevented responsible faith. Catholics were unable to be self-sufficient, which is what God wanted, and instead grasped for the “molluscan shell” of authority represented by blind adherence to dogma, the Vatican and the pope; this was a “Parasitic Doctrine of Salvation.” Ian McKay, in his magisterial study of Canadian socialism, compares Drummond’s theory to Woodsworth’s proclamations in *Strangers within our Gates* that Catholics belonged to an inherently illiberal society. Catholicism was viewed as
hindering the development of good Canadian citizens. It was backward, medieval and authoritarian and needed to be transformed into a “responsible faith,” like Protestantism, in order to create and perpetuate an appropriate citizenry. The Catholic Church was a monolithic, international force which meant that its illiberal activities around the world needed to be analyzed by non-Catholics in North America where the Church tried to cloak itself in minority status.\textsuperscript{220}

What is also revealing however is the moderate concern in this period, unlike in the nineteenth century, amongst mainstream figures with English-speaking Catholics; French Canadians and immigrants were definitely the locus of concern. Even the Orange Order seemed less concerned with Irish Catholics and more focused on French Canada in the early twentieth century, even if Robert McLaughlin has recently drawn attention to the continuance of Orange fears of the creation of a republican, Papal Ireland and the disastrous effect this would have on the British Empire as a whole. Added to this is the alarming financial support Orange Canadians provided to the Ulster Unionist cause.\textsuperscript{221} In the wider Canadian society, however, McGowan’s claim that Irish Catholics were largely perceived as integrated into the mainstream of Protestant English Canada gains credence. There was a desire by Irish Catholics to be accepted and for McGowan they believed they could participate in Anglo-Protestant Canada without losing their “essential Catholicity.”\textsuperscript{222} Anti-Catholicism in early twentieth century Canada as an analytical category therefore demonstrates the similarities and differences of civic and ethnic nationalism in Canada. Ethnic nationalism promoted an exclusionary national vision of a British, Protestant Canada dedicated to promoting the specifically British concepts of
liberty and democracy and adhering to a view of the unquestioned superiority of the British people and their traditions. Civic nationalism, on the other hand, has often been touted as encompassing a nationalism based only on universal civic values, such as human rights, the liberty and equality of all and involvement in the socio-political fabric of the nation. The hostility towards continental European immigrants and French Canada based on religion, however, demonstrates that a progressive, liberal civic nationalism was also based on stereotypes, namely that Catholics were unable to properly participate in Canadian civil society or that they were inherently reactionary, easily malleable or conservative. As Borden stated when trying to coax Lomer Gouin and his Quebec Liberals to the Unionist fold after WWI, “Quebeckers were traditionalist by habit and training, and their representation in the Union Government would be a valuable stabilizing influence.” This constant slippage between civic and ethnic nationalism provides numerous examples of what Nordstrom concludes in his study, namely the exclusionary nature of both. ²²⁴

The importance of Protestantism for improving the nation was summarized in an address by H.A. Berlis, succinctly stating that “the fundamental thing underlying all else in the lives of these people is their religious attitude. Transform this attitude . . . and you will have righted and vitalized the stunted and seared and fettered and helpless man of yesterday.”²²⁵ Berlis and others concerned about the state of Western immigration reiterated Lindsey’s explicit fear of a vast Catholic conspiracy. Berlis perceived Catholic immigrants (and Orthodox, as these religious systems were often conflated) as being easily malleable in the hands of priests who would do anything to maintain them as “blind
adherents to Rome,” to be taken particular advantage of during election time. These immigrants were “religiously stunted . . . morally seared . . . intellectually fettered . . . [and] politically helpless[.].” Woodsworth stated several times that the national development of Canada could only be ensured if these peoples were converted to “pure Christianity,” as opposed to the “baptized Paganism” of Catholicism. A concerned citizen wrote to the Sentinel that priests and other representatives of Rome in the West were actually promoting communism amongst ignorant immigrants, thus identifying the true problem of radicalization as lying with the prominence of the Catholic Church. The author described how an organization, the Ukrainian Educational Society, was dedicated to eliminating the dual threat of Catholicism and communism by “redeem[ing] their people who have been in bondage to Rome” through education in order to promote loyalty to Canada and the British way of life. Woodsworth questioned Catholic immigrants’ ability to practice responsible citizenship as they were accustomed to the inherent “serfdom” of Catholicism; indeed he wanted to actually restrict the franchise for Catholic immigrants at the time in order to prevent the manipulation of Canadian politics by the Vatican and “priest-craft.” Woodsworth explicitly outlined that Protestantism was the necessary component for the creation of a truly informed and progressive people, capable of self-realization and able to enjoy the civic gifts of the nation and to guide Canada into the future: “Independence means that people are taught to think for themselves; . . . it means that the people ally themselves with the Protestants rather than the Catholics. Independence affords the opportunity for reformation.” The significance of the term “reformation” and its equation with independence and freedom is clear and
has been discussed earlier in this chapter. For those Protestants concerned with the
“Catholic menace” in the West, or in Quebec, or anywhere in Canada in the late
nineteenth and early twentieth century, it was the future of their very nation that was
being threatened. This conception of Canada and of Canadian nationalism was
inextricably tied to not only religion, but Protestantism specifically, and in this organizing
mental framework anti-Catholicism played a key role. Perhaps this is nowhere more
succinctly stated then in Woodsworth’s study: “Again, we claim that Rome is a national
peril. The Church of Rome is the sworn enemy of our liberties and our principles.”

While Kate Foster may have been more subtle in her language than Woodsworth
regarding Catholicism, her short work Our Canadian Mosaic offers another superficially
inclusive solution to the “immigrant problem” in Canada. Foster was perhaps the first
Canadian to use the mosaic metaphor to describe the nation’s contemporary and desired
make-up and was praised for this by John Murray Gibbon, author of the seminal
Canadian Mosaic: the Making of a Northern Nation. Foster engaged in a wide survey
of immigrants in Canada at the behest of the Dominion Council of the YWCA. According
to Gibbon the book was a guide for social workers. Foster wanted to promote a better
understanding between the peoples of Canada and, like Woodsworth, Connor and
Skelton preserve some aspects of the older culture of immigrants. Foster rhapsodized
optimistically that for “some minds, Canadianization is confused with a narrow
nationalism that necessitates a ruthless severing of all ties with the Old World and its
associations[.]” In direct reference to Woodsworth, Foster rebuked this as prejudicial,
suggesting instead that we should “concern ourselves with encouraging the ‘strangers
within our gates’ [sic] to help build up a Canada worthy to take her place side by side with the progressive nations of the world in discharging faithfully her duties in the World State of which she is a unit[.]”

Despite her optimistic liberalism she is clear in her desire for some types of immigrants over others. Foster agreed with the author of the foreword, president of the Royal Society of Canada James H. Coyne, that quality should be emphasized over quantity in immigration, defining quality as the ability of the ethnic group to assimilate into the traditions of Canada. Coyne and Foster feared the lack of British and Northern European immigrants arriving and the “swamping” of the nation with Eastern and Southern Europeans, who were enthusiastic to emigrate due to their universally destitute and oppressed lives. Foster characterized the Poles in particular as intensely Catholic, embodied clearly in superstitious Mariology. This was in contrast to the sturdy, hard-working and easily assimilable Protestants from Northern Europe. Coyne in fact explicitly stated that all immigration should be restricted only to Anglo-Saxons, Teutons and Scandinavians. Hurd’s sentiments were similar, as he rejected the crass nationalism of those who called for the legal definition of a Canadian race, viewing such a construct as an absurd fabrication that hindered national unity. Hurd’s primary reason for opposing this reform was that he feared it would discredit demographic studies of the racial composition of Canada. This was the key to the future of the nation in Hurd’s mind and the racial information gathered from censuses, in contrast to the desire for a “Canadian” section, was paramount to the formation of appropriate immigration policies and the protection of Canada from unassimilable groups. In Foster’s view Catholics were to be tolerated, but the public school and the church were to act as the major
institutions in the successful assimilation of foreign elements. This excluded any form of separate school, as this restricted children’s exposure to “Canadian” values, privileging the recently formed United Church as the ultimate expression of Christian “tolerance and friendliness.”

Foster shared this apprehension about children with many figures discussed so far, along with the active Orange Lodges in Western Canada. The County Master of Calgary advocated donating money to the Salvation Army as it took in orphaned children. This would prevent children from being forced to attend Catholic orphanages and homes, as “it is only fair to surmise that some of those refused admittance have since been placed in a Roman Catholic institution which is sparing no effort to secure itself the care and education of … such children[.]” Even the insurance department of the Orange Lodge reiterated this need for money in order to protect the children of the West against the machinations of the Catholic Church, wanting them to be “educated in Protestant Schools [sic] and kept under the care of their own mothers.”

Foster advocated the missions set up by the United Church to Italians in Hamilton and Montreal. These initiatives, along with the public school, were to be ensured success by the conversion of Eastern and Southern European Catholics (and Orthodox) to the “true” worship of Jesus, which, as demonstrated earlier, meant Protestantism. Foster did not advocate the complete assimilation of all aspects of immigrant culture, but wanted only the positive aspects, which did not include Catholicism. As Skelton concluded in his Laurier biography, Catholics in Canada needed to embrace a liberal, progressive view of the world in order
to dispel the authoritarianism of their past and to finally understand that “[t]hey were loyal sons of the Church, but they were also Canadiens, and free men.”

The equation of Canadian nationality with Protestantism is telling in a work that describes itself as promoting tolerance, as well as its title becoming a widely used metaphor for the multicultural nation. Canadian national identity in this era was viewed through a prism of British values, with one of the key components being Protestantism; any alternative to this was either unwelcome or at best to be tolerated but transformed into an appropriate value system for a citizen of a modern, progressive nation. This discourse would continue into the harsh years of the Depression. During this period anti-Catholicism continued to manifest itself in the expected places, such as the Orange Order and the depleted Ku Klux Klan. Yet this era was also characterized by new political ideals and parties challenging the status quo in Canada. Some of these left-wing intellectuals and activists inherited an ideological framework that included a vigorous distrust of Catholicism and the Church. Anti-Catholicism became an important aspect of much left-wing discourse in Canada in its generalized war against tyranny.
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Chapter 2

“Protagonists of democracy”: Fascism, Birth Control and Quebec, Canadian Anti-Catholicism during the Depression

In June 1938 a minor scandal erupted when the publication of reformist Anglican clergyman and staunch birth control advocate Alfred Henry Tyrer’s successful and controversial guidebook *Sex, Marriage and Birth Control: A Guide-book to Sex Health and a Satisfactory Sex Life in Marriage* was cancelled by Macmillan and Company. Tyrer was publicly furious and issued “To the Protestant Ministers of Canada,” an aptly titled open letter. In this letter Tyrer fulminated against the Catholic Church in Canada, which he blamed for influencing Macmillan and Company to cancel his book due to Macmillan’s extensive separate school textbook contract. Tyrer focused on the Catholic Church’s view of contraception and its “fascist” tendencies: “‘That Rome, by some sort of threat, actual or implied, of a boycott, should be able to do this should surely be sufficient evidence to all Protestants of what the future may soon bring forth—the early dominance of Roman Catholicism in Canada’” which would be achieved through “‘the extension to the rest of the country of such legislation as we see already in the ‘padlock’ laws in Quebec; an index … telling the people what they may read … ; a muzzling of the press and all free speech; the prohibition of free assembly; and the resuscitation, in a Fascist Canada, of the inquisitorial methods of the Dark Ages.’” Indeed, according to Tyrer “‘[n]o intelligent Protestant knowing anything of the history of Roman Catholicism can look on this menace with equanimity. No British Protestant is going to bow his neck to a French-Canadian Fascist[.]’” In an interview Tyrer gave at the time of the release of
this letter he was even more alarmist in his position on the suppression of birth control information by the Catholic Church and its implications for Canada as a nation: “‘The French nationalists and Roman Catholics … are increasing due to the suppression of birth control. Sooner or later they will be in the majority here. We’re headed for a civil war.’”¹

Contained within this vitriolic letter by a Protestant clergyman who self-identified as “progressive”² are many of the anti-Catholic themes that emerged during the Great Depression in Canada. In this period of widespread social unrest, shifting politics and international chaos, anti-Catholicism remained a central pillar upon which English Canadian national identity was built. While concern with the influence of French Canada and of Catholic immigration lingered, anti-Catholic discourse shifted to reflect the specific context of the Depression. French Canada was still viewed as backward and medieval; this rhetoric grew to include the fear of a growing fascist movement in the 1930s located in Quebec and drawing upon specifically Catholic ideology. This was represented in the eyes of many Anglo-Canadians not only by the extremist Adrien Arcand and his cadre of anti-Semitic bigots, but also by Catholic corporatist thought and the success of Montreal Mayor Camillien Houde, Cardinal Villeneuve and Maurice Duplessis. These men were perceived by many in English Canada, especially on the left, as promoters of a form of clerical-fascism, an ideological system which was presented as widely supported by Catholic French Canadians, not just a small segment of right-wing Catholics, due to their presumed totalitarian inclinations. There had been concern in Canada about intersections between Catholicism and Fascism with the rise of Mussolini in the 1920s,³ but the worsening international situation signaled by the rise of Hitler, the
Italian invasion of Ethiopia and especially the Spanish Civil War combined with the deteriorating socio-economic status of Canada bred a panic over Catholic totalitarianism distinct from earlier periods. There were very real fascist and Nazi threats in the world now, and Catholicism was viewed as conducive to these totalitarian ideologies, unlike an inherently democratic Protestantism, which formed the basis of all liberal nations.\(^4\) Quebec, therefore, could not be trusted to participate responsibly in the issues and concerns of the nation as it was embarrassingly devoted to promoting Catholic totalitarianism in an ideologically divided world.

Current scholars have analyzed the issue of fascism in Quebec and within Canadian Catholicism. Esther Delisle has controversially claimed that fascism was particularly prominent with certain elite Catholic nationaliste individuals and groups during this period, such as Groulx, André Laurendeau, the Bloc Populaire and the Duplessis government. Yet even Delisle admits that while anti-Semitism was widespread in Quebec society, fascism itself represented a minority ideological position.\(^5\) Other scholars have concluded that fascism did have more of an allure than Soviet Communism because of the prominence of fascism in other familiar Latin Catholic nations; the populace and the clergy as a whole, however, never embraced fascism as they instead held a devotion to the prevalent interwar isolationism. Social corporatism was indeed emphasized by some influential figures, but corporatists did not enthusiastically model their theories solely from Mussolini’s Italy, instead often looking to the teachings of the Vatican for inspiration. Fascism certainly did not have a monopoly on corporatist ideology.\(^6\) In fact, by the mid-1930s even Quebec’s bishops were becoming wary of the
extreme nationalism that was dominant in Italy, Portugal and Spain and the associations made between these nations and corporatism. Thus the Church began emphasizing the social and spiritual aspects of corporatism as opposed to the nationalist prerogatives of Groulx and his followers.⁷

Debates did occur between those Catholics dedicated to the “rechristianizing” of the population (the serious, academic study of social problems and hostility to fascist alternatives), such as Georges-Henri Lévesque and the great Catholic philosopher Jacques Maritain, and conservative Catholic nationalists such as Groulx who advocated the “refrancization” of Quebec and even radical separatism.⁸ Michael Gauvreau has detailed how historians and commentators have treated the Church in Quebec in the years before the Quiet Revolution as universally conservative and unrepentantly hostile to modernity by confusing a segment of the Catholic clergy, who was indeed fearful of a changing Quebec due to their perceived decline in prestige, the “Americanization” of French Canada and who saw Duplessis as the bulwark against these processes, with French Catholicism in its entirety.⁹ Instead Gauvreau locates the origins of Quebec’s vaunted Quiet Revolution in the Catholic Action movement and personalist philosophy of 1930s French Canada, which critiqued the dominance of official Catholic practice and doctrine by the clergy. In fact personalism was explicit about its determination to stop the spread of Fascism and Marxism through the regeneration of Catholicism. These lay groups and alternative philosophical tack emphasized accountability of the clergy to the laity, the integrity of every person and the formation of strong community ties to democratize social relations and create a more vibrant Catholicism set within modernity.¹⁰ While it is
true that anti-communism was prominent in Quebec in this period, this was also true of English Canada as evidenced by the deportation of thousands of suspected “foreign radicals.” Catholicism in Quebec was a complex aspect of French Canadian identity in this period, not monolithic in proclamation or philosophy, which cannot be reduced to simple ideological labels such as fascism or corporatism.

Fascism in French Canada was an important component of anti-Catholicism, but immigration and the “foreign” (non-Anglo) population of Canada was certainly still a concern during the Depression, as noted by Michiel Horn, particularly with regards to the foreign proclivity for radicalism in Western Canada. Added to this was the fear of the Protestant Anglo-Saxon element of Canada being out-bred. Unlike in the 1910s and 1920s, birth control and the perceived monolithic Catholic hostility to contraception became the central issue in the ongoing debate over “the revenge of the cradles” in Canada. This focus on the salvific nature of contraception, including eugenics, by many public figures and intellectuals clearly delineates Depression era anti-Catholicism from that of the 1910s and 1920s, even amongst those progressives of that era who strove to reform society. A birth control and eugenics movement did exist in Canada previous to this period. The curtailment, however, of much immigration during the Depression, while alleviating some fears over the nation’s increasingly polyglot nature, caused many Protestant public figures to express anxiety over the Protestant inability to combat a prodigious Catholic birth rate by replenishing Anglo-Saxon “stock.” Catholicism was often presented as a foil for the feared “de-vitalization” of Canadian Protestantism and its potential shift from the centre of Canadian identity, a concern that carried into the post
WWII era. The stakes were also perceived as higher, as the debate was no longer just about the proper development of the nation but about the survival of democracy. This could only be achieved through a “fit” population. The Depression saw major debates, and one major trial, concerning birth control and its availability. While the history of birth control in Canada has been detailed elsewhere in the excellent work of Angus and Arlene Tigar McLaren, what has not been analyzed in detail is the prominence of anti-Catholicism in birth control debates. The Catholic Church was seen by many as opposing contraception solely to enhance its position in the world through numbers and, by thus keeping its people in poverty and ignorance through this policy, maintaining a slavishly devoted following. The discourse concerning birth control, immigration and the fear of fascism in French Canada were all interrelated and created a unique brew of Canadian anti-Catholicism during the “dirty thirties.”

What also differentiates the 1930s from the previous era, and perhaps the wartime and postwar era, is the prominence of a group of self-consciously progressive and even left wing intellectuals, churchmen and public figures that participated and perpetuated this concept of the Catholic Church. This chapter will thus analyze not only the resort to anti-Catholic bigotry by the Ontario Tories in the heavily Orange riding of East Hastings in a 1936 by-election, but also the negative characterization of the Church by such CCF and LSR luminaries as Eugene Forsey and F.R. Scott. Tyrer and C.E. Silcox, the latter a United Churchman, also symbolize ministers who described themselves as progressive, perhaps even radical in Tyrer’s case, who protested against the power of an archaic and reactionary institution like the Catholic Church. Yet these figures simultaneously denied
they were anti-Catholic or bigoted while perpetuating anti-Catholic stereotypes. This paradoxical attitude reflects what John Wolffe has outlined in his study of nineteenth century British evangelical anti-Catholicism. Wolffe concluded that the figures and organizations he studied did not perceive hostility towards Catholicism as illiberal, but in fact the exact opposite. Anti-Catholicism was viewed as a defence against intolerance, not as intolerance. These Depression era leftists often consciously strove to avoid propagating prejudice or stereotypes against the Catholic Church or other racial, religious and cultural groups, but they could not accept the influence and “inherently” intolerant nature of this particular institution. As demonstrated earlier, anti-Catholicism was not the sole preserve of Klansmen and Ontario Tories. Instead anti-Catholicism served as a means to elaborate one’s identity, especially in a period of great disorder like the Depression, and provided an existing rhetorical and ideological tradition through which to communicate this identity. Anti-Catholicism remained central to this discourse in the 1930s, despite many claims to be leaving behind the crass politics, disunity and strife that had allegedly hindered Canada in the past.

Anti-Catholicism has been almost completely ignored in the historiography of the 1930s in English Canada. The major focus of scholarship of the Depression in Canada has been on the shift in politics, changing conceptions of the state within political parties and the intellectual community and the general socio-economic climate of the period and the multitude of reactions to it. Even the literature specifically discussing religion in this decade omits mention of hostility towards Catholicism, focusing instead on topics such as the debates within progressive and conservative elements in Protestantism or the
central role the Protestant churches played in organizing and influencing social reform to alleviate the suffering of the Depression. The little of anti-Catholicism that is mentioned has often been brief asides from the major focus of larger political or socio-economic trends referring to prominent nativist groups, such as the Ku Klux Klan in the West, and even this discussion is contextualized as signifying a clear decline in the respectability of nativist sentiment or, at minimum, public expressions of anti-Catholicism. Recently, however, Lara Campbell has discussed the role conceptions of Britishness had in shaping reactions to the Depression in Ontario, along with the demands they made upon the state. According to Campbell, despite elite attempts to construct a Canadian identity based on North America the British connection was extremely strong amongst the population of Ontario. This self-identification as a British subject allowed Anglo-Celtic individuals and groups to position not only those who were not ethnically and/or racially British as “others,” but also those who did not profess as fervent a loyalty to the intrinsic greatness of the British Empire and a “sense of duty” to it as outsiders and radicals, undeserving of the largesse of the state or the benefits of citizenship in a British country. Britishness, in Campbell’s mind, was a signifier of respectability and belonging, representing for many an organic link to Canada’s past when the Loyalists had “tamed” the wilderness populated only by Aboriginals and French Canadians. While Campbell does not explicitly mention Catholics or anti-Catholicism, in addition to the fact that she is positioning Britishness as a means for working-class Ontarians to make demands upon the state and thus returning to the politico-socio-economic focus of previous studies, her analysis of Britishness is cogent and applicable to this current study. Catholics were
portrayed by some in this period as not only undeserving of the trappings of Canadian citizenship due to their regressive and authoritarian nature, but also unworthy of even truly belonging in a democratic nation. While the discourse varied in this period in that there were moderate attempts at understanding and rapprochement by some Protestant progressive intellectuals, Catholicism was still positioned firmly on the margins of respectability and belonging in English Canada.

The alleged influence of the Catholic Church in wider Canadian society remained a major concern for Protestant Canadians during the Depression, as evidenced by Tyrer’s aforementioned case. J.V. McAree, editorialist for the Globe and Mail, was vociferously supportive of Tyrer in his protestations against the influence of Catholicism. McAree based his argument on the importance of self-realization and free choice and that the suppression of any information, especially with regards to such an important issue as birth control, was unconscionable and violated not only the law of Canada but the natural rights of people. McAree also made the problematic and arrogant assertion that the “birth control debate” had been won through the effort of Protestantism, with the only institution preventing its assumption into respectable society and the law being the Catholic Church. According to McAree this case was vital as the banning of this book impeded the progress of Canada, which was already accepted by Protestants because it prevented all from engaging with a useful guide on this central component of modern life. “It is an invasion of our liberties which cannot go unchallenged,” said McAree angrily, and if upheld would set a dangerous precedent for a Catholic Church always poised to exercise its political influence. According to McAree, even the free distribution of the
Bible was illegal in Quebec; McAree’s distaste for the role of the Catholic Church in Quebec was palpable when he reassured his reader that “news of the Gospels does manage to seep down into the minds of the French-Canadians,” repeating the common charge that the typical French Canadian was passive and subservient to the elites, only rarely shattering this mold. This public denunciation of Macmillan forced Hugh Eayrs, the president of the company, to publish a retort denying that the Catholic hierarchy was involved in the cancelling of Tyrer’s publishing contract. Eayrs instead blamed Tyrer’s violation of the original publishing contract, which made explicit mention of the sensitive nature of the material and that due to this distribution needed to be calculated and slow. Tyrer continually demanded the spread of his book into all areas of society and this is what Eayrs claimed motivated him to legally cancel Tyrer’s publishing contract. McAree never admitted that Tyrer was wrong, but later responded that while he had no problem with Catholicism as a religion, he still could not countenance the prevention of “lighten[ing] their [Catholics’] ignorance” with regards to birth control.

Another minor scandal involved Rev. Morris Zeidman, the host of the Protestant Radio League’s controversial Sunday broadcasts in the 1930s, and a central figure in the short-lived Canadian Protestant Association (CPA), which was formed to oppose Ontario Premier Mitchell Hepburn’s divisive separate school legislation. Zeidman was no stranger to controversy, claiming to have been fired from station CFRB in March, 1936 through the influence of the Catholic Church, as it was hostile to his thoroughly Protestant message. A year later Zeidman was again prevented from giving a broadcast on CFRB concerning birth control; Zeidman stated publicly that the CBC had told Harry
Sedgwick, managing director of CFRB, to ban Zeidman, while the CBC and Sedgwick officially denied this stating that they told Zeidman that his broadcast was inflammatory and violated the CBC’s policy promoting religious liberty. Sedgwick publicly stated that he had pointed this out to Zeidman and he cooperated by writing and presenting an alternative broadcast. Zeidman vehemently denied this, insisting that he was presenting the Protestant position on women’s rights to contraception, not attacking a religion or an institution. In addition to this, Zeidman mentioned the ongoing Dorothea Palmer trial, to be discussed in detail later, and therefore his broadcast was seen by many to be sub judice. Zeidman again defended himself by stating that birth control itself was not on trial so that his references were perfectly acceptable, despite the fact that Zeidman himself was a witness for the defence in the trial making his public discussion of it even more inappropriate. Future Toronto mayor Leslie Saunders of the Orange Order, and editor of the militant periodical Protestant Action, immediately sent a protest to Prime Minister King, Leader of the Opposition R.B. Bennett and Gladstone Murray of the CBC decrying that “‘[t]he hand of Rome is clearly seen in this unfair treatment, and we declare that such a condition should not be allowed to obtain in a free country.’” Saunders concluded conspiratorially that these censorship problems had only emerged since one Rev. Father Vachon had joined the CBC Radio Commission.

The Globe and Mail provided extracts from Zeidman’s proposed broadcast demonstrating his position on the Catholic Church and birth control in general. Zeidman referred to the ongoing problem of intermarriage, which in Canada was only a problem because of “‘the two widely divergent faiths, namely, Protestantism and Catholicism.’” It
was “‘[m]eddling ecclesiastics’” that were preventing happiness amongst couples and preventing women from using birth control. Indeed in Zeidman’s mind, science had progressed to such a level in Canada, in the form of effective contraceptives and eugenical procedures, that any woman that did not “‘avail herself of the[se] opportunities … sins against her own body and against her own children, who are entitled to all the love, care and upbringing which are a child’s birthright; and she sins against the nation, which expects quality rather than quantity.’” This view was shared by A.R. Kaufman, rubber manufacturer, birth control activist and Palmer’s employer at the Parents’ Information Bureau (PIB), who lobbied for eugenics in Canada, praised Nazi sterilization laws in the early 1930s and condemned Catholic opposition to contraception as being motivated by an anti-modern worldview and a desire to “swamp” the Canadian population with Catholics. Kaufman used his PIB to spread the gospel of eugenics in Canada, even explicitly comparing eugenics to Christianity, as both were about bettering the community. Modern eugenics was a science for the preservation of the quality of the race, not the castration of the pagan era, which Kaufman noted was still practiced in twentieth century Rome to produce soprano singers. In one particularly vicious statement Kaufman asked “I wonder how the R.C. Church (who are [sic] so opposed to ‘murder’ [referring to their opposition to abortion]) justifies the wholesale slaughter of the Ethiopians by Mussolini.” This rhetorical strategy thus linked two of the major anti-Catholic themes of this period: Catholic support for an aggressive fascism and the Church’s hostility to contraception. Kaufman’s disdain for Catholics was even clearer in another pamphlet in which he concluded that the attitude of the Catholic clergy revealed
“the fanatical and bigoted attitude of those who oppose birth control, the cruelty of condemning an innocent child to life for the sake of a religious doctrine.” For Zeidman, who was a witness in a trial concerning these very matters, the Catholic Church’s opposition to all forms of birth control was thus preventing Canada from being “a modern, civilized and Christian community.”

Modern population science, from contraception to the field of demography (as will be demonstrated later), was therefore identified with Protestantism in the minds of many progressive Canadians. Catholicism was inherently opposed to the advances that could be gained through the “objective” scientific study, limitation and “betterment” of the population because this process threatened the Church’s influence and power in society. Only Protestantism allowed for the freedom of thought and individual initiative that was necessary to engage scientifically with the difficult issues of population that faced a Depression-wrecked world; Protestantism was not a selfish institution or doctrine trapped in an ossified medievalism unalterably hostile to progress. As Matthew Connelly has demonstrated, modern population science, however, was never a neutral field but was in fact rooted in fear, a fear of the degeneration of the race through the profligacy of inferior populations along with “hordes” of lesser peoples migrating to largely white, Protestant nations, such as Canada, the US or Australia. While demography may have distanced itself from earlier population analysts by using scientific methods and language (replacing “hordes” with “populations”) and eschewing the crude colour-coded racial maps of the world of authors such as Lothrop Stoddard, it nevertheless reflected the values of a group concerned with the future of their idealized vision of the world.
vision necessitated, particularly in periods of great social unrest like the Depression, vigilance, strict population controls and activism.

Claris Edwin Silcox became involved in this controversy when Zeidman visited, regaling him with stories of CBC censorship. Silcox was a leading United Church public figure, former general secretary of the Social Service Council of Canada (SSCC) and onetime editor of *Social Welfare* and *Food for Thought*. He had also been a major figure in sincere ecumenical efforts to promote understanding between Catholics, Protestants and Jews in North America.44 Zeidman indeed continued to have problems with censorship when the CBC demanded that he had to have specific denominational backing for his Protestant Radio League Sunday broadcasts. When he refused he was banned for weeks from the air, causing Rev. William E. Long of the Evangel Temple in Toronto to give an advertised sermon provocatively entitled “Will Protestants Awaken?” stressing Zeidman’s right to have equal broadcast time as the Catholic Church.45 All of this impelled Silcox to write a letter to CBC General Manager Gladstone Murray. Contained within this letter is a savage indictment of the broadcaster bowing to the pressure of the Catholic Church as well as a clear elucidation of Silcox’s conception of Catholicism in this period. Silcox condemned Murray and the CBC for trying to force Protestants to only present the positive aspects of their faith “for Protestantism is, in its very nature, a protest against certain assumptions made by the Roman Catholic Church, and to state what Protestants deny may be essential to the clarification of what they affirm.”46 Silcox affirmed the British character of Canada’s constitution as well, which was synonymous with being thoroughly Protestant, referring to the prohibition of Catholics from exercising
regal power by the Oath of Supremacy and the privileging of certain aspects of Anglicanism in the British tradition. While placing Canada within this British Protestant context, he warned against the inevitable political aspirations and internationalist nature of the Catholic Church, particularly since the fascist Mussolini had restored the Vatican to its temporal power with the Lateran Accords. Silcox positioned these two camps, British democracy and Latin fascism, as binaries between which Canadians and indeed all people needed to choose. Silcox explicitly listed for Gladstone in this extraordinary document the three antecedents for modern democracy, including even socialism, perhaps reflecting the times: “(i) The Protestant Reformation with its insistence on private judgement; (ii) The enlightenment which led to the French Revolution; (iii) Modern socialism (not Marxism) which is the child of liberalism.” Catholicism, especially the reactionary and even totalitarian form of Catholicism that was believed to exist throughout the world and that had seemingly allied itself with fascism, did not fit into this worldview or historical narrative. Catholicism was an undemocratic doctrine truly alien to the British, Protestant nature of Canada. Silcox viewed this censorship by the Church as “subversive of the foundations of our democracy or however repugnant to the Protestant faith which is an integral part of the common law of England.” He summarized his beliefs forcefully, identifying the major locus of this reactionary Catholicism as the province of Quebec: “The issue raised by the censorship is one therefore that concerns not alone Protestants as Protestants but Protestants as protagonists of democracy, and hence the decision of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is being watched by all Protestant bodies with great interest and concern, intensified by the present efforts to stifle freedom of discussion.
The entire controversy in particular went beyond strong words, becoming violent according to the *Globe and Mail*. Following Long’s sermon Evangel Temple was partially burned, fulfilling threats that “it would be next” after the burning of T.T. Shields’ Jarvis Street Baptist Church.49

Tensions were also high in the “fortress” of Catholicism in Canada, Quebec. F.R. Scott and others on the left were very concerned with the movement of Quebec to the far right.50 Under the pseudonym “S,” Scott contributed an article to the American periodical *Foreign Affairs* entitled “Embryo Fascism in Quebec” in 1938 describing the rise of Duplessis, the Union Nationale (UN) and the centrality of the influence of the reactionary Catholic Church. Scott saw Quebec as the hub of fascism in Canada. In Scott’s estimation, the infamous Padlock Law was passed without protest because of the overwhelming sanction of the clergy, a clergy dedicated to preaching the fascist philosophy of corporatism in their schools as the only solution to modern social problems.51 Scott was unequivocal in his blame for the repressive legislation, fascist movements and anti-Semitic violence he witnessed in Quebec at the time, stating that the term Fascist may have been unrepresentative since none of the members of the Quebec legislature identified themselves as Fascists. Instead, “[t]he great majority were simply obedient Catholics carrying out the request of their spiritual leaders.” It was these respected luminaries of Church and state, not open Fascists, who encouraged the “denunciations of Communism and of freedom of speech, the expressions of congratulation and approval to the young men who demonstrated on the streets [breaking Jews’ windows] of Montreal[.]”52 This statement exemplifies the common anti-Catholic
motif of the “obedient Catholic,” in a more literal sense here, simply blindly following the dictates of their authoritarian, enrobed masters. Scott goes even further in this article, warning that the hierarchy in Quebec was advocating that some people break the law, as they no longer needed to obey secular law, but instead “natural law,” which in Catholicism was interpreted to mean Canon Law. The clergy, therefore, were exploiting their mindless followers and directing them to attack individuals and groups they did not agree with, paving the way for the introduction of pure fascism. “As in all primitive societies,” Scott added disdainfully, “the ‘outlaw’ has no rights. In such an atmosphere Fascism takes ready root, and the practice of democratic toleration appears definitely sinful.” As in Silcox’s letter, Catholicism and the Catholic were unable to exist within the democratic tradition.

This is not to suggest that there were no elements within the Catholic Church in Quebec or in Canada, or amongst devout Catholics, that were anti-Semitic or sympathetic to fascism. A historic Catholic anti-Semitism was apparent in Quebec during the Depression, as in previous years, and proclamations of Catholic French Canadian nationalism could be xenophobic. Some figures, such as Paul Bouchard, Arcand and Montreal Italian-Canadian priests Father Manfriani and Maltempi, closely identified Catholicism with Fascism and even National Socialism. These concerns, therefore, with anti-Semitism, violence and authoritarian politics from segments of the population were not entirely baseless. Scott’s perspective, however, along with others detailed in this chapter, simply reiterated a monolithic view of the Catholic Church in Canada when in reality there were important debates occurring within Catholicism itself, even in
“reactionary Quebec.” The Church’s very nature and history were perceived to be antithetical to freedom and progress.

Sandra Djwa, Scott’s admiring biographer, believes that Scott’s 1930s articles about Quebec and its alleged predilections towards fascism simply represent the “double bind” of being a liberal in Quebec in this period, as he was highly critical of the extreme, repressive actions of the Catholic Church but was completely dedicated to the freedom of religion. Anti-Catholic sentiment, however, is not restricted to individuals or groups advocating the denial of Catholic religious freedom or legal sanctions against Catholics, as in Northern Ireland or pre-Emancipation Britain. Scott, while often courageous in denouncing fascist violence, restrictions against religious minorities (such as the Jehovah’s Witnesses) and the repressive Padlock Law of the Duplessis government, nevertheless portrayed a “priest-ridden” province full of obedient Catholics unable to attain individual self-realization. In Quebec, according to Scott, the Church had aligned itself with the nationalist movement creating a synonymy between *la survivance* and Catholicism. In reality, however, it was selfishly guarding its own power and maintaining its absolute control over the French Canadian populace, constantly opposing any potentially beneficial influences throughout the years, such as Laurier Liberalism, modern secular France or the radicalism of Papineau. Catholic control of education instead promoted obscurantist theories such as Thomism, preventing French Canadians from becoming fully integrated into the modern economy and society of North America; French Canadians constantly complained about not receiving equal treatment in Canada, but for Scott “boys and girls who are taught always to obey their superiors without...
question are likely to find themselves in this position.”\textsuperscript{56} Near the end of this liberal article, Scott savaged the Catholic Church for inculcating “a degree of backwardness, judged by modern social standards” which continued to result in a high infant mortality rate, great poverty, ignorance and enormous families unable to support themselves.\textsuperscript{57} For Scott, the Catholic Church and Catholicism was an anachronism supporting a crumbling society in Quebec and unable to understand its need to integrate into the modern world. Instead the province was retreating into the dangerous world of fascism, dictated by the absolute control of a totalitarian clergy.

This was not Scott’s first foray into criticizing the reactionary activities of the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec. In the April 1934 issue of \textit{Canadian Forum} Scott, under another pseudonym, J.K. Keith, contributed “The Fascist Province,” a title even he would refute as alarmist when this article was republished decades later.\textsuperscript{58} In this article Scott positioned the people of Quebec as being ruled by the iron fist of a “theo-pluto-bureaucracy” with the four tortuous years of depression illustrating the harmony of the “three persons in the provincial trinity: the Liberal Party machine, the Roman Church, and St. James Street.” This trinity was most clearly demonstrated in the recent widespread condemnations of the CCF in the Quebec press, with each component of the trinity denouncing it as a socialist or communist conspiracy. The archbishop of Montreal, Georges Gauthier, had recently officially condemned the CCF and all forms of socialism, stating categorically that it was impossible for a true Catholic to belong to or support any socialist party, a development the leadership of the CCF hurried to counter.\textsuperscript{59} Scott, through his anonymous pen, was not moderate, believing that the “totalitarian state could
hardly be more united” preventing the alleviation of the social and economic crisis in that province and outside of it.\textsuperscript{60} It was only through radicalism that Quebec could escape from this situation, something that was impossible under the repressive hand of the trinity, preventing any literature condemning capitalism or Catholicism from being circulated. Scott even compared the Catholic Church in Quebec and its ferocious suppression of information to the fanatics in the Orange Order in Ontario, because both organizations were dedicated to the indoctrination of the individual, preventing his or her freedom of thought and choice.\textsuperscript{61} Scott thus positioned the Orange Order as a “vulgar” anti-Catholic organization representing the worst of English Canada, directly comparing it to what he believed was the worst aspect of French Canada, i.e. the totalitarian tendencies within the Catholic Church.

It is this seemingly paradoxical attitude, perpetuating anti-Catholicism for the sake of tolerance and progress, which characterized so much of the progressive and left wing worldview of Depression era Canada. Indeed this masking of hostility to Catholicism in benign, “objective” language was a defining aspect of leftist anti-Catholicism in Canada. These figures certainly did not perceive themselves as bigots or even as anti-Catholics; they simply could not accept the declarations and influence of a medieval, totalitarian organization in “their” nation. Anti-Catholic imagery and rhetoric was so ingrained within the culture and traditions of Canada, as it was throughout much of the North Atlantic Triangle, that savage criticisms of Catholicism were viewed as commonsensical even amongst those that self-identified as protecting the marginalized from prejudice. As stated earlier, Wolffè has described how anti-Catholicism in nineteenth century Britain was not
viewed as illiberal. For Protestants opposition to Catholicism was a form of “moral paternalism,” initiating the spread of holiness. The major distinction in Depression era Canadian anti-Catholicism for many leftists was that they actually acknowledged with disdain the existence of anti-Catholicism yet simultaneously perpetuated many of its tropes in the name of progress. They saw in the potential population shift, favouring Catholics due to a lack of Anglo-Saxon immigration, a threat to the ability for progressive political causes to make headway in Canada to properly stem the Depression. This was evidenced by the social, economic and political conservatism of Quebec, reaching its apotheosis with the election of the reactionary Catholic demagogue, Duplessis. These intellectuals were therefore not being intolerant, but were crusading against a major (perhaps even the major) progenitor of intolerance in Canadian society, the Roman Catholic Church.

Scott was indeed self-conscious of being “falsely” portrayed as a bigot. As noted, Djwa believed that Scott found himself in a difficult “double-bind” as a liberal in Quebec. Horn echoes this sentiment when introducing a Scott article in Canadian Forum, this time from the March and May 1937 issues entitled “French Canadian Nationalism.” Horn states that Scott was raised in the Anglo-Catholic tradition, his father being an Anglo-Catholic Anglican Canon, and Scott therefore believed himself to be very sympathetic to Catholicism. He did not want to be dismissed as “‘just another anti-Catholic’” by French Canadians and the wider nation while writing these articles so he adopted another pseudonym, this one was, significantly, “Quebecer.” In Scott’s mind, he could not accept the often-reactionary influence of the Catholic Church in Quebec politics and society,
which he believed was holding back the entire province.\(^6\)\(^3\) Admittedly it was not Catholicism as a whole that was the problem, but rather the fascist and totalitarian sympathies many leading figures allegedly held, which seemed to trickle down to the docile, obedient Catholic masses of Quebec. Scott was afraid of the nationalist and even separatist comments made by such prominent figures as Paul Gouin of the Action libérale nationale and Cardinal Villeneuve in the 1920s and 1930s, interpreting them to mean a widespread desire amongst the elite in the Church to construct a medieval and corporatist French republic in North America.

Scott suggested that these nationalist dreams needed to be met with understanding and discussion, not the crass bigotry of the Orange Order, as French Canadians had legitimate grievances with the Canadian state. It was the dislocation of the Depression, however, that had exacerbated the socio-economic situation to the point where the separatist and fascist musings of men like Groulx were gaining in influence. For Scott these figures were dangerous as they were obsessed with preventing the spread of Communism and materialism into an already declining Catholic society; this was the underlying reason behind their desire for a feudal French state in Canada, not sincere nationalism.\(^6\)\(^4\) As stated before, this was harmful to the province and the wider nation as Scott was convinced that only radicalism, in the form of the democratic socialism of the CCF no doubt, could alleviate the ravages of the Depression and that the Church in Quebec was acting as the major barrier to achieving this for the benefit of Canada. Scott was unequivocal in his allocation of blame for the reactionary nationalist anger brewing in Quebec, as
these nationalists fail to see ... that one principal reason why French Canadians have seldom advanced to positions of general importance in the economic life of Quebec is not due to the fact that they are constitutionally incapable of adapting themselves to modern industry, nor is it due simply to English unwillingness to give them jobs; it is due in great part to the fact that their schools and colleges, every one of which is in the grip of the Church, are giving them an education that is totally inadequate to the needs of today. It may train them to become good Catholics, but it certainly does not train them to become good scientists or businessmen.  

It was thus specifically Catholicism that prevented French Canada from progressing and becoming part of the modern economy and society of Canada, rather than the racial characteristics of the French Canadian or the narrow, prejudicial practices of the Anglo elite in Montreal.

Scott was again stating that the only real solution to the divide in Canada, exacerbated by the activities of the Catholic Church, was cultural and racial understanding, not the Anglo-imperialism of Orange Ontario. He even advocated national bilingualism and expanded support for separate schools teaching the French language, placing him in a much different camp than many other commentators on the Catholic Church in Canada. He accepted the Catholic Church as an important institution in the lives of many Canadians, particularly in the province of Quebec; he also seemed to differentiate between various “branches” of the Church at various times and admitted that Catholics had been subject to prejudice throughout Canadian history, a fact that had to be redressed if the nation was to unite. Yet his belief in tolerance, progress and national dualism had its limits and he concluded his article with an apt summary of his view of the Quebec Catholic Church: “But a feudal Catholicism is not the only nor the best Catholicism. . . . The trouble is that the Quebec branch of the Catholic Church has become inbred and unprogressive. Its reactionary outlook exceeds the bounds of what the faith requires.”  

Despite the fact that he is limiting his analysis here to the Church in
Quebec and he significantly leaves room for the potential for the Church to change, this statement is nevertheless steeped in the anti-Catholic stereotype of a feudal anachronism.

One of the most volatile events that took place in Quebec in this period occurred in 1938 when a delegation from Republican Spain came to Canada to drum up support for their cause in the ongoing and ideologically polarizing Spanish Civil War. Within Canada Catholics tended to support the Nationalists under Franco, hearing stories of grotesque massacres of clergy by the Loyalists, and they viewed the Civil War as a contest between materialism and Christian civilization. The non-Catholic Anglo community in Canada on the other hand mostly sympathized with the Loyalists, despite their Communist allies, viewing the Civil War as a battle between liberal democracy and the totalitarianism of Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany. The delegation was sponsored in their trip across Canada by various left-wing groups; in Montreal this was the Committee for Medical Aid for Spain, chaired by Scott himself. Hundreds of Université de Montreal students opposed their visit and lectures, occupying City Hall and pressuring the local authorities to prevent the delegation from giving their speeches. Police director Fernand Dufresne, who had promised Scott that the municipal authorities would protect the official delegation from any disruption, actually told Scott that Montreal was a thoroughly Catholic city, and that he and his cohort were wrong to hold any meeting of liberals, communists and other materialists there. Later in the week a rally of 100,000 was organized in Montreal protesting Communism and the Loyalist side in the Civil War, making the ideological proclivities of the city clear to all, highlighted by a fiercely anti-Communist speech by the fiery Archbishop Gauthier of Montreal. Scott was sickened...
by this display and the collusion of the francophone authorities, especially the openly conservative nationalist and Catholic Duplessis government.

Two years later Scott maintained this position, stating in a review prepared for the British Commonwealth Relations Conference and under the auspices of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs that the Catholic Church in Canada supported the Nationalists in the War and the Italian invasion of Ethiopia because Rome, and not France who was neutral in the War, maintained a strong influence in Quebec: “The Catholic Church … has interests in North America far wider than the aspirations of French-Canadian nationalism. … Because of the Vatican influence in Canada, the influence of Italy is also, at the moment, considerable. French Canada approves the Italian policy in Spain[.].”71 The “authoritarian character of the Catholic Church makes it more lenient to the doctrine of fascism than the Protestant churches would be, and is teaching a form of ‘corporatism’ in Quebec, based on Papal encyclicals, as a remedy for social and economic ills.” Yet Scott stated that since “66 per cent of the Catholics in Canada are French Canadian, the Church tends to be isolationist in foreign policy and is inclined to be distrustful of the League of Nations.”72 The Catholic Church in this framework was therefore both supporting the militarily aggressive powers in the world and inculcating an intense isolationism in Quebec in particular, making them doubly harmful to a democratic, British nation faced with totalitarian postures.

Protestant intellectuals such as Scott, however, viewed corporatism and the periodic outbursts of fascist sympathy and suspension of civil rights in Quebec as an endemic problem within Quebec Catholicism, and Catholicism in general, an institution
and ideological system foreign to Canada. In a refutation of Scott’s article, “Is Quebec Going Fascist?” Dr. Rosaire Cauchon critiqued Scott for his simplistic understanding of not only corporatism at an intellectual level but also for exaggerating its popularity in Quebec, particularly amongst the Catholic hierarchy. H.F. Quinn also denied the specter of fascism in Quebec as ludicrous, as, outside of Arcand who was marginal already, there was no movement in Quebec or political party that desired the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship. Duplessis was merely another machine politician beholden to the same factions and interests common throughout Quebec history. “A Non-Fascist” was even more hostile to those charging Quebec with being overrun with fascism. This anonymous author pointed to the lack of truly fascist practices in Canada even amongst the Catholic Church in Quebec, coyly referring to the persecution of the Church in Nazi Germany and the inspiration for the Padlock Law coming from the intense anti-Communism within Ontario; it was not the sole invention of French Canadian Catholics and was not limited to Quebec. Scott nevertheless was convinced of the popularity of fascism and corporatism’s prominence within the reactionary clergy, and he invoked not only the threat to democracy but to the integrity of a British nation such as Canada in his official response to the activities of the Quebec populace and authorities when protesting the Spanish delegation: “‘Canadian democracy is in a precarious condition if a sane and considered statement for a lawful Government is prevented from being given in a British country by the threats of violence from irresponsible elements.’”

This event was also important to another Anglophone progressive in Quebec, Eugene Forsey. Frank Milligan, in his excellent intellectual biography of Forsey, believes
that this event caused Forsey to become actively involved in the newly formed Canadian Civil Liberties Union, as he was angry at the violations of civil rights and the inability of the CCF to act in fear of alienating a province in which it already had almost no support. Forsey, the banning of the Spaniards reminded him of the Nazi tactics that he had witnessed in a trip to Berlin in 1932, right before Hitler took power; Forsey warned several correspondents that this violation of the right of freedom of speech in Canada would lead to “the lamentable story of Italy, Germany and Austria, where the forces of freedom listened to counsels of ‘prudence’ until it was too late[.]” Forsey was also adamant in a letter to the Hon. C.H. Cahan that “[t]his is not a question of ‘French’ versus ‘English’, Catholic versus Protestant. God forbid! It is a simple issue of freedom and justice and opinions.” These proclamations of understanding and neutrality towards racial and religious issues were characteristic of many figures expressing anti-Catholic sentiment in this era. While these sentiments may have been sincere when professed, they were often quickly undermined by generalizations concerning the nature of the Catholic Church in Canada and by the perpetuation of anti-Catholic stereotypes, such as the blindly obedient Catholic. As a hallmark rhetorical strategy of the mainstream Canadian left in this period it also served to further legitimize anti-Catholicism as a valid and, importantly, progressive intellectual framework.

Forsey and Scott were convinced that a form of “racial fascism” was emerging in Quebec in part motivated by the Catholic Church. Forsey began to work his legendarily prolific pen in public protests against the abuses of the Catholic Church and the Padlock Law, much like Scott, in the pages of his friend Graham Spry’s *Canadian Forum*. 
Forsey framed the protest against the Spanish delegation as sullying the legacy of the Patriots of 1837 who in his mind had tried to spread liberty and democracy. The Québécois were celebrating this centennial by destroying those very same values. For Forsey, these events were all pre-planned by the reactionary forces of Montreal. Quebec was on the “Road to Fascism” due to the collusion of the pillars of the Quebec state, the Duplessis regime and the Catholic Church. Forsey constantly returned to the comparison of the Padlock Law to the worst aspects of the Fascists and Nazis in Europe, believing that the Canadian government by not disallowing the legislation was tacitly endorsing this type of governance. Forsey believed that the federal government demonstrated cowardice in its refusal to use its power of disallowance for the Padlock Law, the topic Forsey himself wrote his dissertation on, but did use it in preventing Alberta’s Social Credit-influenced banking laws, demonstrating the insidious power in Canada of the business elite and the Catholic Church.

While Forsey, Scott and other progressive activists in Quebec had many legitimate grievances against the Duplessis government and the nationalist speeches and articles of figures like Groulx, many of which did descend into anti-Semitism, Forsey’s articles also perpetuated old anti-Catholic stereotypes. Blair Neatby has perceptively suggested that the Padlock Law in Quebec gained support partially because of the Anglophone business community. English Canadians, however, have often attributed this law and its seeming popularity to the Catholicism of Quebec and its assumed antipathy to civil liberties. Neatby concludes that this discursive strain reveals more about English-Protestant prejudices than about the nature of Catholicism and the Duplessis government in
Quebec. Michiel Horn and Sean Mills have also noted that the radicalism present within the LSR and CCF circles was definitely based on the Social Christianity present in the previous few decades in the English-speaking world and their social democratic ideology caused them to be arch-centralizers, something which angered many nationalists. These figures, such as King Gordon, Scott, Forsey and Graham Spry, thus had little sympathy and understanding for most aspects of traditional French Canadian society, especially the influence and anti-socialism of the powerful Catholic Church.

Forsey certainly had little sympathy for the Catholic Church or Catholicism generally and this vehement opposition is clear in his Depression era articles. In the provocatively titled “Clerical Fascism in Quebec,” Forsey described a long-standing, secret plot to transform Quebec into a “clerical-fascist state” based on the doctrines of corporatism. The Vatican itself was directing this plot, according to Forsey. Reflecting Forsey’s left-wing political inclinations, he believed the major avenue of creating this new state was through the Catholic domination of the labour movement, as Catholic unions were preventing the introduction of “real” labour unions dedicated to the interests of the workers, not the Church. Indeed the Pope himself guided these unions, instructing them to cooperate with their employers, oppose materialism and slowly work towards organizing society along corporatist lines. Forsey even outlined this structure, taking the presence of corporatist rhetoric in public life at face value, where a hierarchy of committee, directors and centurions, which were each composed of 100 families, would be the new structure of Quebec society. Therefore in Forsey’s mind the fight for
international unionism in Quebec was paramount as it would determine the survival or
death of democracy in this Catholic province.\textsuperscript{89}

Cardinal Villeneuve, a prominent and popular conservative Catholic figure in
Quebec, was a major villain for Forsey and Scott.\textsuperscript{90} Some of Villeneuve’s statements in
the 1920s were quite provocative in their open support of Groulx’s vision of a Catholic
and French state being founded along the St. Lawrence and in the 1930s he was often
strident in his criticism of liberalism and especially communism.\textsuperscript{91} Despite this, even
Delisle, who is extraordinarily critical of French Canadian nationalists for their fascist
leanings in this era, notes that contemporaries saw him as ultimately loyal to the
Commonwealth and Britain but unable to control the lower clergy. It seems that while
Villeneuve did support Duplessis’ more radical legislation such as the Padlock Act in the
face of a Liberal regime viewed as corrupt and anti-clerical in Quebec, after he went
through several promotions in the hierarchy he tempered his views and attempted to
control the more rambunctious (and sometimes anti-Semitic) nationaliste youth
movements in Quebec in the 1930s and 1940s.\textsuperscript{92} Forsey saw Villeneuve as the real power
behind the throne of Duplessis, and that his dominance in the provincial legislature was
the defining component of Quebec’s move towards fascism. Forsey stated dramatically in
his article “Quebec on the Road to Fascism” that “[i]t seems likely, therefore that we are
indeed only at the beginning of a reign of terror in which everyone who happens to incur
the displeasure of M. Duplessis or his august Superior [Villeneuve] may expect to have
his home or office ransacked and perhaps padlocked in the approved Nazi manner,”
adding that “Sinclair Lewis had better come to Quebec and write a new version of ‘It
Can’t Happen Here” referring to that author’s famous book warning of the importation of fascism to the United States. Forsey concluded ominously that French Catholics needed to be careful, as Canada was still a country ruled by Protestants and that the more they pushed their clerical-fascism in Quebec, the more likely an Orange reaction in Ontario would be restricting the rights of the Catholic Church and the French language in that province. As with their lower socio-economic position, French Canadians would only have themselves to blame.

Historian Arthur Lower embraced this view of a backward and ignorant French Catholic population, although moderating it with a condescending admiration of the Catholic predisposition for rejecting modern industrialism and materialism, which Lower loathed. Lower was part of the intellectual elite which emerged in the Depression, an elite dedicated to social and economic reform and who had garnered an increased social prestige due to the failure of the traditional pillars of respectable society to alleviate the suffering. Lower presented French Canadians as having missed all of the great European intellectual progress over the centuries, such as the Renaissance, the Reformation, the Enlightenment due to the violence and anti-clericalism of the French Revolution, and, perhaps most importantly, the English revolutions of the seventeenth century which resulted in parliamentary supremacy and the Puritan by-product of English industrialism. This reflected what Joan Coutu has termed the “mainstream version of Canada” of the interwar period which positioned the French as having discovered Canada but with civilization only really arriving with the British Conquest and the preservation of Canada against the Americans by the British. The title alone of Lower’s article, “In
Unknown Quebec,” demonstrates perfectly the view of Catholic Quebec as a mysterious land outside of the progress of human history. Lower conceived of the French Canadian as static and inherently simplistic, forced since the Conquest to reside “with a people superior to him in initiate and energy, … the French Canadian for a century and three-quarters has had to face the spectre of dominations and exploitation.” The simple habitant was still content, never making money but enjoying his life dominated by large families, the priest and the industrialist.\(^9\) Lower, however, was mostly concerned in this article with the recent emergence of an intense and often clerically based French Canadian nationalism, although he denied that it was a fascist movement.\(^9\) It is in his attempt to convey an understanding of this nationalism, a goal to which Lower believed he had dedicated his life, that he continued to reveal his stereotyped opinion of French Canada. Lower admitted that much of the inferior socio-economic position of the French Canadian was due to misunderstanding and prejudice from the English; but much of it was also due to the ahistoricism and “Catholic pietism” of the habitant, “for [they are] still living in the middle ages.” English Canada had thrown off the final shackles of Puritanism in WWI, but this still controlled the vast majority of French Canada.\(^10\)

Indeed it was Quebec Catholicism that refused to make any compromise with the rest of Canada and the modern world, a compromise Lower believed had been necessary for all great civilizations and cultures based on Catholicism.\(^11\) English Canadians in the past had denied French Canada a full place in the workings of Confederation, and indeed events such as the Riel Rebellion, the vicious debate over bilingualism and conscription in WWI had tainted the French opinion of the English, a taint which Lower was dedicated
to eliminating. Yet he concluded his article by asking “Is the shell of medievalism cracking?” For Lower it was only through the compromise of an authoritarian, ahistorical Catholicism with aspects of the modern world that Confederation could be saved. Indeed the Anglo community in Quebec had become complacent and hyper-materialistic in the lack of challenge from the docile French Canadian, a situation that for Lower would eventually change due to the Anglo focus on “accumulation not reproduction” and the abnormally high birth rate of the French Catholic. Lower, as will be discussed in more detail later, saw the rampant materialism and acceptance of modernity within Protestantism as resulting in a shallow faith, a shallow society and the potential eclipse of Protestantism and its concomitant values (democracy and individualism) as an important component of Canadian identity. This process had been largely resisted by Catholicism for which Lower had a grudging admiration. In the Depression, however, if a sincere solution to Canada’s problems through discussion and compromise was to be achieved, as opposed to the simple out-breeding of Protestant English Canada, Quebec Catholicism had to modernize with Anglo-Protestantism concomitantly moderating its materialism.

This admission of fault within the Anglo-Protestant community and sincere acknowledgement of French Canadian grievances is where Lower differed in his evaluation of the influence of Catholicism in Canada. Despite this he could never escape his anti-Catholic sentiment, portraying the Catholic Church throughout much of his career as an instrument for hindering the development of modern Canada. Particularly revealing is his conclusion to “In Unknown Quebec” which is worth quoting at length:

Is this extraordinary structure of racialism, religion, piety, scholasticism, paternalism, and authoritarianism, this simple peasant life, this golden age of urbane, though old-fashioned culture,
of priestly predominance, domestic propriety, and large families, this cloistered existence which has let the world roll by, this virtual theocracy—is all this on the move? … Time alone can tell, but it seems against history to believe that there can exist forever in this quickly contracting globe of ours, ‘a land where all things always seem the same.’

Lower was dedicated to furthering understanding between the peoples of Canada, yet this was inflected with a narrow, caricatured view of the Catholic Church. The limitations of tolerance and cooperation between Protestants and Catholics in Canada, based on an Anglo-Protestant identity suspicious of the underlying political machinations of an antiquated Catholicism, also manifested itself quite clearly in the ongoing debate on religious education in Ontario.

Premier Mitch Hepburn’s attempt to reform the funding system for separate schools in 1936-37 elicited a violent response from many Protestants and organizations in Ontario, becoming the defining issue in a vicious provincial by-election in 1937. During this period Catholic lobbyists convinced Hepburn and members of his government of the need to reform the educational system, something that Hepburn had promised Catholic voters earlier. He proposed redressing the limitations on corporations choosing to pay rates for separate schools and the fact that public schools at this time received all revenue from public utilities, along with having a much larger residential tax base. After lengthy stalling, Hepburn finally outlined legislation similar to the Quebec educational system in February 1936 at caucus, calling for the language of the law to be altered so that corporations “shall,” not “may,” contribute taxes to separate schools in proportion to the amount of Catholic shareholders, leaving public utilities still entirely in public school coffers. The modest proposal was received with total condemnation from organized Protestantism and Protestants, as the Ontario political scene once again become inflamed.
with sectarianism. The Toronto Board of Education had recently denied the right to freely
distribute textbooks to separate school children on relief, despite the ravages of the
Depression, and had immediately organized a meeting after the legislation was announced
voting 15 to 0 to hold a provincial referendum on the matter. Martin Quinn, head of the
influential Catholic Taxpayer’s Association, also made matters worse by his overly
aggressive and very public pro-Hepburn campaign in the by-election and Hepburn’s 1937
re-election, fulfilling every militant Protestants nightmare of Catholic dominance of
politics. The short-lived CPA seemed to be concerned almost solely with the issue of
separate schools, meeting at Toronto’s Cooke’s Presbyterian Church on March 3rd, 1936,
allegedly attended by 1500 people. Rev. J.B. Thomson of Dufferin Presbyterian Church
was quoted as warning against giving Catholics too much power in Ontario, as one only
needed to read history to know what happened when Catholics were given the “upper
hand” in society, directly referring to the martyring of early Protestants who challenged
the Church’s authority: “We are going to be worthy of those who shed their blood for us
and we are going to tell the Roman Catholic Church that we are going to stand to the last
man and maintain the freedom that is ours.” Another representative thanked God for the
religious liberty guaranteed by the Union Jack, a concept that Catholics could not
understand as there “is no liberty where the papal flag flares.” Morris Zeidman
continued his advocacy for the Protestant Radio League, again blaming the Catholic
Church for his constant censorship, even visiting his church to protest him; this was due
to the fact that his League stood adamantly for the thoroughly British principles of “one
Faith, one Flag, one Empire, one Language, one School and one King.” The article
concluded with United Churchman Rev. W.L.L. Lawrence promising that if the separate school issue, which was not just a local or national problem but a truly global problem in the battle for religious liberty, could not be solved through provincial legislation, it “would be carried to the foot of the throne” itself.  

When Tory MPP of East Hastings James Hill died in October, 1936, Hepburn decided against the advice of his inner circle to quickly hold a by-election to test his school legislation amendment, confident that despite the intensely Protestant and Orange nature of this riding he could convince the majority that his school policy made economic and moral sense. This, coupled with Earl Rowe’s recent victory as Tory leader and his concomitant desire to immediately oppose Hepburn’s amendment, transformed a routine by-election into a religiously charged battle between Hepburn, Rowe, anti-Catholic agitator T.T. Shields and Rowe’s main challenger for the leadership and now adviser, George Drew. Shields invoked the imagery of the Reformation, a common trope within anti-Catholic discourse, stating that he would oppose the intersection of religion and politics allegedly caused by Hepburn’s attempt to amend separate school legislation if he had to “die at the stake.” This violation of the principles of the English Reformation would inevitably cause Protestants in Canada to unite against a government controlled by the Catholic clergy. Shields increased his vitriol for an open debate about the school issue with Liberal Deputy Speaker Major J.H. Clark, where Clark defended the much-maligned influence of Catholic Liberal Senator Frank O’Connor and castigated the Tories and Shields for degenerating into religious bigotry. Shields responded angrily, alluding to the fact that George McCullagh, a wealthy and staunch Hepburn supporter, had recently
purchased the *Globe* and the former *Mail and Empire*, attempting to silence any protest against Hepburn’s machinations by creating a mouthpiece for the Liberal party and the Catholic Church that controlled it in the *Globe and Mail*: “‘The *Globe and Mail* have been killed and their blood-stained garments found in the possession of the protagonists of Hepburn, O’Connor and the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Calling the *Globe and Mail* an independent paper is the acme of journalistic hypocrisy.’” This was a charge made in the Tory campaign literature as well, with one such document comparing the opinion of the *Globe* before its purchase by “millionaire interests” being more concerned with the province and nation in general and not serving sectarian interests (read: Catholicism). The Conservative and Orange *Toronto Telegram* retorted McCullagh’s charge that the Tory campaign had thus far been shameful in its religious bigotry by claiming that the only shameful aspect of the by-election thus far was McCullagh and Hepburn’s silencing of alternative voices by the purchase of the *Mail and Empire* knowing that Hepburn was going to make the separate school amendment the central focus in East Hastings. This issue became serious enough that McCullagh felt the need to defend himself stating in an editorial that he did not plan on silencing the *Mail and Empire*, assuring his readers that the purchasers were both Protestants and that no separate school supporters were involved at all with the transaction. McCullagh thus framed his answer in terms that would prove his objectivity and Protestant credentials, while pointing to divisive Tory tactics, most importantly Drew’s infamous statements concerning French Canadians as a “defeated race.”
This statement haunted George Drew for his entire career, confirming for many that he represented the bigoted Anglophone wing of the Tories. John Saywell has characterized the young journalist who reported this statement in the Toronto Star in November, 1936 at a meeting in Plainfield, Ontario, as taking liberties with the facts, but it is clear that Drew spoke about the Conquest as a historical event at this meeting. Farley Faulkner corroborated the Star story in the Kingston Whig-Standard as he was at the meeting in Plainfield, reporting that Drew said “‘It is not unfair to remind the French that they are a defeated race and that their rights are rights only because of the tolerance of the English majority, who with all respects to the minority must be regarded as the dominant race’” and needed to stop denying it publicly. Drew continued to vehemently deny that he explicitly referred to the French as a “defeated race,” feebly responding to the Liberal’s charges that “‘[e]very school child, French and English alike, was taught the question of British domination of Canada, he said, and of how racial and religious characteristics had been continued through the tolerance and friendship of the victorious race, the British.’” In this same speech where he was denying that he was prejudiced against French Catholics, Drew was reiterating an Anglo-centric conception of Canadian history composed of a beneficent British imperialism permitting diversity to exist. He also accused Hepburn of reaching a “secret agreement” with elements of the Catholic hierarchy to maintain and expand separate schools, institutions which in Drew’s mind existed nowhere else in the entire Empire. He concluded his defence by noting that separate schools and the Hepburn government’s favouritism of the Catholic Church
seemed to violate the Canadian Constitution and the British principles the nation was built upon.\textsuperscript{119}

Drew’s actions were not limited to this one speech and the aftermath. Drew was extremely active in this by-election as an organizer, giving numerous speeches which often referred to religious issues and making the separate school question the central issue despite Hepburn’s attempts to shift the election to economic concerns.\textsuperscript{120} Drew utilized fascism and Mussolini himself as images for Hepburn and his allegedly Catholic-influenced government, exploiting the connection in many Protestants’ minds between Catholicism and authoritarianism discussed earlier. Drew charged in a speech in Bancroft that Hepburn was violating British principles by attempting to institute the separate school amendment since he was circumventing the system of courts, a strange charge since it was the Ontario Court of Appeal that ruled in January 1937 that no corporation with headquarters in Ontario could distribute taxes to separate schools, a shattering blow to Hepburn’s beleaguered legislation.\textsuperscript{121} “‘This week Frank O’Connor’s puppet Mussolini [Hepburn] announced that he proposes to override the normal function of our courts and assume the role of a dictator,’” once again invoking the prominent Catholic Senator. Drew became almost hysterical in his denunciations of the “‘Hepburn-O’Connor dictatorship’” portraying Hepburn as “‘a traitor to the British flag and all it stands for. He has no right to continue as premier of this province[.] … We may have been slow in seeing the growth of a form of lawless Fascism in our own province, but the voters of East Hastings will show’” that they would not be manipulated any further.\textsuperscript{122} Drew’s vitriol is astounding, particularly for a political figure who would one day be premier of
Ontario, inaugurating 42 consecutive years of Tory rule in that province and eventually becoming an unsuccessful federal leader of the PCs in the late 1940s and 1950s. At this same meeting Drew stated that if Catholics were telling Protestants that they would be mixing religion and politics then “‘[t]he war is on.’”

Drew warned the citizens of East Hastings that if they did not stop Hepburn and his cronies in this by-election then a truly Fascist government with fasces for its symbol would emerge in Toronto, destroying all traditions of British liberty. After linking Hepburn to Tim Buck, leader of the Canadian Communist Party, in their disrespect for British institutions, Drew concluded:

Let us say to our Roman Catholic friends; we do want to live with them in utmost harmony so long as they recognize that Roman Catholicism is a branch of Christianity and not a form of politics. There is not a country in the world where Roman Catholicism has become a political unit where the Catholic Church has not got into difficulties. In country after country there has been bloodshed resulting from its attempt to rule by political action. We will support the right of Roman Catholics to worship as they please without interference from us of any kind, but we as Protestants do not recognize their right to organize on a political basis and say to a government, ‘You do this or out you go.’

Drew painted the Hepburn government as representing the Protestant fear of a politically involved and dominant organization essentially controlling Ontario despite its minority status. This “fact” demonstrated that Catholics were not part of the Protestant British tradition that Ontarians cherished.

The Tories won this by-election by an enormous margin, hurting Hepburn’s belief that through his own personal charisma and drawing attention to the damage of the Depression he could transcend religious sectarianism; in the case of East Hastings, he was wrong. Commentators looking back at the legacy of Shields saw him and his anti-Catholic diatribes as central to the defeat of Hepburn’s candidate and his school plan in this by-election. Beyond the anti-Catholic rhetoric of Shields, Drew and other Tories
wild accusations were also circulated during the by-election and shortly after, such as a report that the Pope himself was planning on coming to Ontario and take up residence in Casa Loma if the Liberals won, replacing the Crown on all highway signs with crucifixes. While Saywell believes that rumours such as these siphoned the respectability from the anti-separate school movement, Hepburn’s amendment did fail. This was to the great embarrassment of his government. The legislation failed partially because of the impracticality of having every widely owned corporation deciding which percentage of its taxes would be allocated to separate or public schools and partially because of the vehement campaign by separate school opponents and professional anti-Catholics like Shields. These events demonstrate that separate schools were an issue that still evoked passions at least in Ontario in the Depression, and when it was debated the surrounding anti-Catholic language was not only present but also was ubiquitous. Catholic schools were seen as harmful to national unity and violating British principles, perhaps even opening the door for Catholic rule of the province and the nation. In addition, despite Saywell believing that the anti-separate school agitation had lost its respectability, the issue was not again fully addressed until the early 1950s, after Drew had convened a much-maligned Royal Commission to investigate the reform of the system, which concluded that separate schools needed to be limited, not aided. Clearly Catholic education remained for many years a contentious subject for Protestants in Canada.

The East Hastings by-election reflects another aspect of anti-Catholicism in this period, specifically the idea that a burgeoning Catholic birth rate, which had always been
viewed as an issue, would allow further Catholic dominance of the nation. Numerous times in the election reference was made to the adoption of the famous Dionne Quintuplets as wards of the state by the Hepburn government, with Drew dubbing the “Liberal elite” of the province “O’Connor’s Quints,” linking once again the Catholic Senator to Hepburn, and with the large, Catholic Franco-Ontarian Dionne family.¹³² As soon as these five babies were born and it was clear they were all going to live, the *Globe* advocated state aid to the family, but felt the need to state “True, these latest arrivals will arouse fresh apprehensions regarding French-Canadian ascendancy in Northern Ontario” but by ensuring the health of the quintuplets Canada would have “an exhibit which no other country in the world can equal.”¹³³ Present here is a certain tension regarding the quintuplets: they were sure to be a commodity in a world ravaged by the Depression but they also represented the great fear of the Catholic “revenge of the cradles.” This sentiment was present in Silcox’s article “Eastview and the Public Good” regarding his involvement in the Eastview birth control trial in 1936-37. In this article Silcox noted that in the trial the issue of the prolific breeding of French Canadians, as Eastview was a poor, French Catholic backwater, was important and there was specific mention of this being the “race” of the famous Dionne quintuplets, a “race” dedicated to “la revanche de nos berceaux” to counter the conquest of the English.¹³⁴

Silcox had addressed this earlier at a meeting of the Institute of Human Relations in Williamstown, Massachusetts in August 1935. Silcox, who at the time was the secretary of the SSCC, gave a presentation on the general relations between English-Protestants and French-Catholics in Canada. Silcox concluded in his talk that issues of
language and race were of more import than religion, and that the Dionne Quintuplets represented “to many English-speaking Canadians, the ‘symbol of a great fear.’”

“‘Behind and a part of the whole problem,’” Silcox continued, “‘is the extraordinary fecundity of the French-Canadian and the suspicion that the French are deliberately trying to outbreed the English, even though in doing so it may involve the lowering of the standard of wages and living and all that depends upon such standard.’”

Silcox was convinced that the Catholic Church as an institution, particularly in Quebec, was purposely obfuscating the policies of the federal government and instead promoting mass population growth in order to protect and expand its own influence over the Catholic population, opposing any measure that would seemingly infringe on its territory. Silcox, like Scott, made it clear that he was not a “vulgar” anti-Catholic bigot and that openly discussing the harm the Catholic Church was doing to the nation was not an easy task, but that he had to do it out of concern for the future of Canada. For Silcox “the French Canadians are a very loveable people – simple, contented, frugal,” repeating a common stereotype of the time, but the provincialism and authoritarian control of the Church had prevented Quebec from becoming integrated into modern Canada and halted French Canadians from being a useful intellectual force in the nation. The Dionne Quintuplets thus represented far more than a sweet story or even a commercial opportunity. Pierre Berton noted in his book about the quintuplets that racial tension was always present in the coverage and handling of the Dionne saga, with public opinion initially being split between those pitying Elzire Dionne for being “forced” into birthing so many babies, presumably by the clergy, and contempt for the Dionnes’ ingratitude at the government.
when they protested the provincial administration’s assigned doctors as being dedicated to Anglicizing the children.\textsuperscript{137} Elzire herself feared the backlash against her for having too many babies, which she knew was not easily accepted by the Anglophone population during the Depression.\textsuperscript{138} For many the quintuplets were a symbol of the guiding hand of the Catholic clergy encouraging their docile flock to out-breed Protestant English Canada and gain control of the levers of power. This older anti-Catholic perspective intersected with what Horn has characterized as the central characteristic of the Depression in Canada, namely fear, which manifested itself in various guises, such as militant hostility to Bolshevism, a fear of losing one’s hard-earned gains, a fear of the collapse of society itself, and, in the case of the persistence of anti-Catholicism, the fear of the numerical and political domination of a “foreign” religion.\textsuperscript{139}

All of the components of anti-Catholicism in this period came together in “The Great Birth Control Trial”\textsuperscript{140} of Dorothea Palmer in 1936-1937. The 1930s saw the initial stages of a concerted political lobby to make birth control not only respectable but even legal. It was illegal under the section of the criminal code dealing with obscenity until 1969, with the significant and vague caveat that dissemination and advertising of birth control was acceptable if it promoted the “public good.”\textsuperscript{141} Kauffman started the PIB, located in Kitchener, Ontario, as a national organization designed to not only raise awareness of the importance of birth control but also to distribute birth control information along with reduced price contraceptives and a sterilization referral service.\textsuperscript{142} When one of Kaufman’s nurses, Dorothea Palmer who was in actuality not a trained nurse but a social worker, was arrested for distributing birth control information in
Eastview, Ontario, a small French Catholic town located near Ottawa, Kaufman decided he wanted to test the “public good” clause of the law. He paid Palmer’s bail and refused to allow the police to drop the charges after they found out she belonged to Kaufman’s organization. Indeed in the subsequent trial Palmer herself became subsumed in the larger debate, carried out mostly among male experts, concerning the socio-economic necessity of contraception in Canada. Palmer never testified for the defence and was fired by Kaufman after the trial, essentially ostracized by the organization that she had worked for and brought into the public eye. Nevertheless the trial was widely reported and very significant for a birth control movement reflective of wider middle class fears in Canada of the fertility of the lower classes, particularly Catholics. Contraception, including sterilization, was envisioned as a means to alleviate the social and economic chaos of the Depression and to better balance the racial tensions within Canada. The racial and especially religious aspects of this trial were present in an American report by Eric Mastner where he compared the trial to the Scopes Monkey Trial, in that it was taking place in a small, provincial town and, revealingly, was between science and religious fundamentalism, although in this specific case fundamentalism was French Canadian Catholicism.

Early in the trial the defence, which was led by Francis Wegenast, a lawyer and registered member of the Eugenics Society of Canada (ESC), was able to gain a ruling expanding the number and type of witnesses they could present to the court, allowing them to assemble a battery of experts on the subject of contraception. Present within this large group were Zeidman, Silcox, psychiatric activist G. Brock Chisholm and
staunch supporter of eugenics and committed anti-Catholic W.L. Hutton. Hutton was the president of the ESC and the medical officer of health in Brantford, Ontario who provided a standard eugenic argument at the trial, claiming that the “socially unfit” reproduced at a much higher rate than the “socially fit” which necessitated eugenic solutions to better the quality, not just the quantity, of the Canadian population. Earlier in the decade Hutton had tried to convince the Ontario Medical Association to lobby the Ontario government to pass official legislation for sterilization, as in British Columbia (1933) and Alberta (1928), an effort that eventually failed. Hutton concluded that the failure of widespread sterilization in Canada was due on one hand to the rise of Nazism, which soured the public to biological solutions to population problems, but mostly to the efforts of the Catholic Church. “We ran up against one of the hard facts of Canadian politics – the steadily increasing dominance of the Catholic Church in Canadian affairs,” Hutton wrote to a supporter, continuing, ironically, that a major reason behind this dominance was population: “Forty-eight per cent of the Canadian populace gives adherence to the Catholic faith.” As McLaren has suggested Hutton believed in a Catholic conspiracy designed to prevent the influence of eugenics to circulate within academia and the higher echelons of politics and was not alone. Supporters of eugenics and less serious forms of contraception often portrayed themselves as battling an archaic institution supporting a medieval conception of society and devoted to only expanding its own power.

According to the various scholarly studies of the trial itself, Wegenast and the defence used these experts and the “public good clause” to construct an argument which
accused the prosecution and legal authorities in Eastview of attempting to legislate Catholic doctrine, not law based on the good of the community as a whole. Mastner certainly believed this, noting the admission of some of the Catholic doctors who testified that contraception was not absolutely negative medically, as it aided women in controlling the size of their families, but that religious principles prevented them from accepting it as a legitimate option. Mastner concluded that this conflict between Canon law and scientific opinion was readily apparent in the trial, repeating once again the claim of many that in such cases “the Catholic physician has no choice but to obey his Church.” The Toronto Evening Telegram, an Orange paper that was unsurprisingly supportive of the defence, reported that Wegenast had convincingly argued that a conviction of Palmer would be a victory for those supporting Canon law over the courts, something that could not be tolerated in a nation such as Canada. In the end Palmer’s acquittal was a triumph for “liberal ideas” over “doctrinal forces.” W.A. Beament added to this conceptualization of the trial by arguing for the defence that Canada’s birth control law stood alone in the Anglo-Saxon world, suggesting that Canada did not fit into the wider British Empire. This discursive strain is suggestive, not just for its success in the legal decision, but by demonstrating that since Catholicism/Canonical law was the reason for the deficiency in Canada’s birth control legislation and its repressive prevention of women’s free access to contraception, and that this fact caused Canada to lose a sense of belonging in the widely admired British Empire, clearly Catholicism was the alien force in the nation.
Silcox provided an argument as an expert witness that added the issue of Depression era Canadian racial-religious tension to the already combustible subject matter. After describing his sociological credentials Silcox outlined what he believed every professional sociologist and social worker was dedicated to, namely aiding in “social relations, the improvement of the race and the creation of a more adequate social order.”\textsuperscript{157} Silcox quickly shifted his subject matter to conspiratorial territory, referring to how progressive action in a democracy was often hindered by a “well-organized minority,” in this case the Catholic Church. He immediately linked the Church with “those people in Canada who are flirting with the idea of a fascist state,” which was a common trope in this period, reminding them that Catholic hostility to sterilization and contraception in general may become impossible if fascism does overthrow the government in Canada, as in Nazi Germany compulsory sterilization had been implemented.\textsuperscript{158} Silcox noted, as did Tyrer and McAree earlier, that Protestants had already accepted the necessity for birth control in an industrializing and depressed world economy to prevent further socio-economic depredations along with the “over-breeding” of the lower classes and the ignorant. Silcox concluded apocalyptically that if Canadians did not accept contraception due to the whims of the Catholic Church as a central instrument in the bettering of society the only two options would be the drastic increase of taxation for relief rolls, or, perhaps reflecting Silcox’s growing conservatism, “the development of a socialist or communist state where all wealth is increasingly owned and managed cooperatively. Without birth control, those are the alternatives.”\textsuperscript{159}
Silcox was adamant in his support for birth control but careful in his language regarding the “revenge of the cradles.” He is quoted in his testimony as having referred to the fear of a growing French population in Canada as a “disturbing influence in Canadian national life” quickly adding that “he himself thought it might be a thing to be welcomed, rather than feared.” He was answering a question from Crown Prosecutor Raoul Mercier about the aforementioned speech Silcox gave in Williamstown where he mentioned the Dionne Quintuplets as representing “a great fear” for many Anglo-Saxons in Canada about French fecundity. Silcox simply replied that this fear existed, that while it may not have been a deliberate policy on the part of the French Catholic Church many in Canada even questioned the “empire’s security” if the French population overtook the English in Canada as French Canadians were not as loyal to Britain. Silcox believed that birth control, equally practiced by both peoples of Canada, could ease these fears and tensions through rational, scientific means. Of course Catholics would have to stop obeying their authoritarian clergy, accepting as freethinking Protestants such as himself that birth control was for the better of society as a whole. When Mercier further questioned Silcox about the cause of the fear of “the revenge of the cradles,” he revealingly answered that it was caused simply by “the facts.”

Silcox certainly did not see himself as an anti-Catholic or a bigot in any sense of the word. In an enlightening correspondence with Scott, Silcox refuted certain charges by Roger Ouimet related to him by Scott. Ouimet apparently charged Silcox with admitting in his testimony that his organization, the SSCC, had been disseminating contraception to French Catholics in order to maintain the Anglo character of Ontario. Silcox viewed all
of this as absurd, even guiding Scott to an issue of the militantly anti-Catholic Protestant Action from January 1937, which accused Silcox of being too admiring of French Catholics to prove that he was indeed friendly towards them. In another letter Silcox defended himself by pointing out that he was an objective sociologist and that the dominance of one race or another did not matter to him; in fact his first name, Claris, was French as was his mother’s maiden name, paradoxically attempting to demonstrate his francophone “credibility” while maintaining his vaunted objectivity. Instead Silcox was merely describing aspects of Canadian society that caused cultural friction, “and if he recognized the existence of a national stork derby” dedicated to having as many children as possible he had to elaborate upon this crisis. Scott clearly accepted Silcox’s explanation and the material he sent to him such as his Williamstown speech, writing to Silcox that his “guess is that the Roman Church uses this kind of argument as an additional reason to persuade people to oppose the practice.” This also motivated Scott to write to Ouimet correcting his interpretation of Silcox’s testimony and accusing him of irresponsibility by publicly stating false facts about an already flammable trial. Scott admitted that there were some English Canadians who certainly wanted to limit the French Canadian birth rate, and vice versa. The real cause of friction between the “two races” in Canada, however, was that the French “are content with a much lower standard of living,” adding that French communities paid very little attention to education, hygiene and social services in general “and therefore that when they form large groups in any province they tend to obstruct what the English Canadians believe to be progressive
developments.” Clearly Scott and Silcox, at least in their own minds, were only guilty of representing liberal and tolerant opinions concerning French Canadian Catholics.

After Palmer was acquitted, Silcox wrote an article for his magazine, *Social Welfare*, which reiterated the defence’s argument that the trial was at its core about whether Canon law should be paramount in Canada. Silcox also believed that the Catholic Church had proved itself the enemy of progress and science in this trial, as the “evidence brought out the attitude of the Roman Church with respect to the subordination of scientific thought to religious doctrine,” emphasizing the medieval nature of this worldview. After the trial, Kaufman stated in a letter to Wegenast that “I guess the Quebec priests will not dominate much longer.” Wegenast and Kaufman also gave a speech at an Orange Lodge enthusiastically praising their triumph over the Catholic Church, which along with the *Telegram* article discussed earlier furthered the religious divide over the trial. In this speech Wegenast told his audience that the trial “was an attempt on the part of those responsible for the prosecution to invoke the sanction of the Civil Courts by way of enforcing the Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church.” This issue was the same that confronted Laurier in his early days when he was forced to confront the political aspirations of the hierarchy along with what confronted the American people with the candidacy of Al Smith for president in 1928. Wegenast concluded by repeating the pattern so common in this period of claiming love and tolerance for Catholics while perpetuating anti-Catholicism. Wegenast called for increased understanding between English Protestants and French Catholics in Canada, but that to achieve this Protestants had to accept that “That the mind of a Roman Catholic
does not work as our minds do. The process is not the same."171 Catholics had been taught to accept only the dictates of their Church, which had resulted in a stunted mind steeped in medievalism and casuistry. The only solution to this problem was that Catholics themselves were finally beginning to realize their sordid situation, coming into the modern world finally. Those staunch Catholics who remained devoted to their Church, however, were hopeless according to Wegenast: “They simply don’t fit in, either in the rest of Canada or in the rest of the world.”172

For those involved in the trial the major issue was their fundamental belief that birth control was central to bettering society. Support for birth control was a sincere cause and birth control activism should not be reduced to only representing pro-eugenics arguments or prejudice against Catholics and immigrants. The official Church was opposed to contraception; activists did not invent this fact and it could understandably lead to tensions between these groups. However, the birth control movement as a historical subject should also not be examined uncritically. Underlying many of the arguments detailed here was a particular view of the Catholic Church nurtured in an anti-Catholic atmosphere, believing it to be helplessly regressive, anti-modern and harmful to the welfare of Canada as a progressive member of the British Empire. The continued societal position of Anglo Protestants was in question throughout these debates, as was the position and nature of Protestantism itself in the face of these rapidly increasing Catholic groups.

These professionals and intellectuals feared the consequences of Catholic dominance as much as “vulgar” anti-Catholics such as J.J. Maloney or the KKK. Maloney
was a former Catholic who became an anti-Catholic crusader and mouthpiece for the Klan at its apogee of influence in Saskatchewan during the late 1920s.\textsuperscript{173} He continued his Klan organizing into the Depression, moving to Alberta after becoming embittered by the Conservative government of Premier J.T.M. Anderson’s failure to recognize his contribution to their victory in 1929.\textsuperscript{174} Maloney actively campaigned against Mayor Jim Douglas of Edmonton, which he dubbed the “Rome of the West,” for being under the control of the hierarchy; this was a campaign which Martin Robin and Raymond J.A. Huel believe was decisive in causing his defeat.\textsuperscript{175} After instituting the Klan in Alberta,\textsuperscript{176} he released his biography, which shared a title with Charles Lindsey’s anti-Catholic book, \textit{Rome in Canada}. In his story Maloney reiterated the fear of Catholics overtaking Canada, especially through immigration to Western Canada and a high birth rate. He condemned the federal government for bowing to French Canada for the simple reason that “Quebec is French, and Quebec is Rome.”\textsuperscript{177} Maloney even advocated the radical measure of unifying the Western provinces, recognizing Winnipeg as the capital, in order to counter the all-encompassing influence of Catholicism and Quebec.\textsuperscript{178} Where Maloney differed was in his open support and membership in the Klan, an organization that often resorted to violence and intimidation in its anti-Catholic activities as opposed to academic essays and analysis. Maloney also denied the Christian nature of Catholicism, painting it as a “heathen” faith in the same vein as Islam or “Brahmanism [Hinduism].”\textsuperscript{179} While Maloney was certainly more aggressive, libelous and active in his anti-Catholicism, this sentiment was present throughout various areas of Canadian society.
Respected demographer and political economist William Burton Hurd of Brandon College and McMaster University couched these fears of Catholic dominance in more detached, academic language during the Depression, continuing his concern about the ethnic composition of the Prairies and of the nature of the Catholic Church in Quebec. Hurd and economists in general had gained prominence during the Depression, a phenomenon described by Doug Owram as reflecting the loss of confidence by the public in traditional figures of authority such as politicians or successful businessmen, dubbing these economists the “new millennialists.”

Hurd, along with Lower, Forsey and even dominion statistician R.H. Coats, believed in the “displacement theory” of immigration, which theorized that the large amount of immigration from foreign countries was forcing intelligent, native Canadians to immigrate to the United States in search for better opportunities. They presented this as objective fact in numerous articles despite the enormous reduction in immigration during the Depression in order to preserve existing jobs, along with the massive deportations of “foreigners” suspected of radicalism.

Hurd initiated the analysis of numerous censuses in Canada, viewing the high immigration years of 1901-1911 as distorting his data due to the preponderance of “high fertility peoples from Central and Eastern Europe.” In this same article Hurd presented his data describing how the Canadian birth rate had been declining steadily since the 1880s despite heavy immigration due to emigration of Canadians to the United States. He identified two causes, namely the delaying of marriage due to economic fluctuations and the rise of birth control in all provinces except for Quebec and New Brunswick, which contained large French Catholic populations and thus intensely prohibited
contraception. In an address before the Canadian Club in 1937 Hurd addressed the “Immigrant Problem.” He stated that Canada could have provided its own acceptable level of population without the immigration, especially to Western Canada, of the Laurier-Borden years that was continuing to this day. As mentioned earlier while he saw this as being the central reason behind large numbers of Canadians flowing into the US, the rise of economic nationalism and the closing of the Canada-US border due to the Depression had now caused an enormous population and labour problem in Canada forcing Canadians to rationally analyze the “absorptive capacity” for immigrants. To make matters worse, in Hurd’s opinion, the vast majority of these immigrants were trapped in the peasant agricultural stage of development of their repressed homelands, creating an enormous surplus of poor agricultural settlers in Canada who were not able to assimilate and were actually hindering the modern economy of Canada. “[A] peasant economy is inconsistent with the practice of democracy of the British sort,” Hurd continued, and “[i]t was no mere historical coincidence that in the Motherland the decline of peasant farming paralleled the extension of the franchise and the rise of constitutional government.” Hurd referenced the tense international situation as well, subtly suggesting that this form of agriculture and backwards immigration policy was harmful to the existence of democracy itself: “Nor is it a mere coincidence that where a peasant agriculture has survived to modern times we find it almost invariably associated with dictatorships of one kind or another. For these reasons, it seems to me, peasant agricultural settlement must be ruled out.” Hurd was clear about which immigrants would
be more valued, if any, by concluding that Britain, if conditions in the world remained steady, could provide Canada with all of its needed immigration.  

Hurd quickly altered his position on the efficacy of relying on British immigration to supplement the Canadian population during the Depression and expressed the centrality of religious barriers to Canadian progress in a particularly alarmist article in *Maclean’s* provocatively entitled “Decline of the Anglo-Saxon Canadian.” Hurd stated, according to his population data, that by the end of the calendar year the numerical superiority of Anglo-Saxons would be gone, by 1971 French Canadians would make up 40 percent of the Canadian population and by the end of the twentieth century Anglo-Saxons would be outnumbered two-to-one. The reasons behind this drastic change in population for Hurd were foreign immigration, emigration to the US and low fertility amongst Anglo-Saxons. Hurd focused mostly on the latter issue, theorizing that the only way for Anglo-Saxons to maintain numerical dominance in Canada would be for them to drastically increase their birth rate or the amount of immigration from Britain, which, countering his previous theory would prove impossible in this period. Hurd was pessimistic, refuting sentiments being expressed in Canada that after the Depression Canadians would return from the US or that in the future years of living together would produce a “Canadian race” out of the disparate elements of the country through intermarriage. Hurd used the example of English and French Canadians who had been living beside each other for centuries and yet apparently did not engage in cross-marriages. For Hurd this was a distinctly religious phenomenon, with Catholics marrying Catholics and Protestants thus being forced to only marry Protestants, as demonstrated by
the only statistically significant intermarrying amongst native Canadians and immigrant groups in Hurd’s studies occurring between English Protestant Canadians and Protestant Northern Europeans. In Hurd’s terms, however, Catholics were synonymous with “high fertility stocks” and they only married into other “high fertility stocks,” resulting in “[d]ifference in fertility and religion … tend[ing] to perpetuate themselves.”188 Thus Canada would be transformed both racially and religiously, particularly if large amounts of immigration from Catholic or Orthodox Central, Eastern and Southern Europe continued unabated, with the nation being 60 percent Catholic in a scant 35 years. Hurd did not limit himself only to dry statistical analysis, believing that these changes would have a negative effect on the ties of Confederation that had already been rent asunder over the decades. Canada was always in flux due to its racial and religious diversity and, of course, its varied rate of fecundity. In Hurd’s understanding Canada’s various populations were central to preserving the peace in Canada and formulating what truly united its citizens. Speaking in explicitly Anglophilic language,

If our young nation is to be welded into a unified whole, occasions for division must be avoided and attention focused on that which unifies. Probably the greatest unifying force in our national life is loyalty to the ideals of freedom, tolerance, and fair play, and to the democratic institutions and forms of government to which these ideals gave rise. Such being the case the measure of our national solidarity in the years to come will be determined, in a very large degree, by our success in applying those ideals toward using those institutions in solving the internal problems and making the inevitable readjustments with which we will be faced.189

Despite Hurd’s self-defined detached, scientific nature, he clearly believed that years of Catholic immigration, differing birth rates between Catholics and Protestants due to vigorous clerical prohibitions on birth control and the refusal to intermarry with “low fertility stocks,” was not only changing Canada but altering its integrity as a unified, modern nation.190 He felt the need, along with other commentators, to defend what he saw
as the inherently liberal, progressive and British nature of Canada and its institutions in the face of a feared “Catholicization,” which would seemingly entail the growth of institutions and traditions that did not resemble the superior ones of Britain.

Lower was also deeply concerned with the effect immigration was having on the composition and functioning of Canada in the Depression, beyond just the “displacement theory” he shared with Hurd. Lower did indeed view the constant flow of immigration into Canada and emigration of native Canadians, that is those of British and perhaps even French stock, into the United States as an “evil” as it placed a barrier against the foundation of a solid Canadian nationhood. According to Barry Ferguson, Lower and all of the other major commentators on immigration from 1900-1950 in Canada were dedicated to the goal of creating a united Canadian society but also recognizing that Canada was an ill-formed and amorphous nation with no strong cultural or political traits. These intellectuals therefore desired the quick assimilation of immigrants into nascent Canadian norms that were themselves being simultaneously formed in order to proceed to bridge the chasm of understandings between the French and English. These dual goals of assimilation and national formation and development were absolutely central in this discourse on immigration, and Catholic immigrants were a barrier to this formation. Lower subtly revealed his concern with the racial and religious composition of immigrants and of a future Canada through a series of articles and letters. One such article released in 1937 was aptly titled “Why Immigration Plans Fail.” In this article Lower reiterated his well-worn “displacement theory” arguing that mass immigration was harming the quality of the population in Canada as there was no longer any real ties to the
land through lengthy residency or a unified motherland to look to for inspiration, as there
was during the days of British immigration. Lower was pessimistic about the success of
plans to promote British immigration to Canada, but not just for the reasons Hurd
mentioned earlier. Instead Lower saw the problem as a philosophical matter, namely that
the English race had become too materialistic, desiring automobiles as opposed to the joy
of a baby.\textsuperscript{193} This for Lower represented the spiritual vacuity of the modern Anglo-
Protestant in Canada, a sentiment which he also expressed in a letter to Donna S.
Davidson, concluding that focusing only on materialism and not on the “amalgamation”
of immigrants and procreation would lead to the rise of “slavdom” in Western Canada in
particular.\textsuperscript{194}

While Lower stated that Canadians needed to be less condescending towards these
immigrants, he followed this liberal sentiment immediately in the letter by warning “[a]s
slavdom [sic] rises, civilization will decrease, the electorate will become more and more
corrupt and ultimately the Fascist leader will appear.”\textsuperscript{195} Present in this sentiment is the
caricatured portrayal of immigrants that was apparent in much of the debate amongst
Anglo intellectuals in Quebec, fearing the “Latin” tendency of Catholics (and perhaps in
this case Orthodox) to slavishly follow their political leaders and clergy. Lower was
convinced that crass materialism within the prosperous Anglophone community, despite
the ravages of the Depression, would allow new Canadians to outbreed the native stock at
an even higher rate than before.\textsuperscript{196} Lower expressed this concern to the minister of
immigration and veteran parliamentarian T.A. Crerar, stating that not only was he against
recent immigration but that the real fault lay with the irresponsible Laurier Liberals for
opening the gates of Canada before WWI; these immigrants, Lower believed, had caused “social and moral problems for us in the west [and were now] (… superseding us).”

Lower’s concern with the specifically Catholic nature of the changing Canadian population is demonstrated more explicitly in a document contained within his voluminous archival collection, detailing the shift in the religious and ethnic character of Canada from 1841 until 1931. This lengthy document described the simultaneously steady and rapid increase of Catholics within Canada, adding that “[t]he gains of Catholicism come in provinces outside Quebec! … The graphs of religions by decades shows [sic] very plainly that is has been the new continental immigration that has given the R.C.’s their heavy growth since 1901.”

Lower warned a correspondent about Wesley College promoting vague religiosity, ignoring the “sadly declining” Anglo-Canadian population of Western Canada. What was instead necessary was a powerful institution outside of the state to aid in assimilating these immigrants, such as a university or college. Lower also wrote to journalist J.A. Stevenson regarding an article he had contributed to the British periodical *Nineteenth Century and After* in which Stevenson warned about the coming demographic shift in Canada due to the complete halt of British immigration to Canada and the persistently high fertility of French Canadians. In Stevenson’s view the Depression and the foolish solutions proffered by the government actually encouraged the spread of French Canadian influence. The back-to-the-land movement was perceived to benefit simple, content habitants with enormous families willing to engage in hard agricultural labour in the northern communities of eastern Canada. Stevenson saw Northern Ontario becoming a French Canadian stronghold.
resembling the romantic, and patronizing, visions of rural Quebec presented in Maria Chapdelaine, unless British immigration was immediately encouraged. This portrayal of French Catholicism subsuming the nation through agricultural pursuits in a time of national distress and a Catholic hierarchy isolated in its support for the back-to-the-land movement is described by Michael Bliss and L.M. Grayson as one of the worst myths created in this era, fuelled by stereotypes and perpetuated in numerous scholarly textbooks.

Lower, however, agreed with Stevenson’s beliefs, particularly that there was a small chance the birth rate of the French and English Canadian could approximate one day, but strenuously denied the solution of increasing British immigration to achieve this, even if the French did “outbreed us.” “It is very possible we may be outnumbered – because we cannot compete on their level – but I do not see how we are to prevent it,” Lower elaborated glumly in the same letter to Stevenson. “I am pessimistic as to the future of our race. A Winnipeg angle makes one so. But if the day do [sic] come that we find ourselves in a minority and a tight place, may we not once more decide ‘to be English at the expense of remaining British?’” Lower linked the feared decline of the Anglo population in the face of Catholic fecundity to the enthusiasm for birth control amongst Anglo-Protestants, representing for him the obsession with materialism and a “high standard of living” that cursed all “commercial peoples.” He finished a letter to Saskatchewan barrister G.C. Neff by blaming the failure of assimilating immigrants in Western Canada on Anglo materialism, repeating that the only solution was a spiritual and moral revitalization within the Protestant world in Canada. Lower adamantly refuted
as cynical the desire from some that non-Anglos would adopt birth control methods at the same level as Protestants; this would not solve the overall problem and would perhaps hinder the spiritual development of the nation. For Lower, Protestants needed to truly understand the threat their core values were under in this population shift; they had to turn away from the materialism that had inculcated complacency and return to their belief in liberal democracy.

As mentioned briefly earlier, John Murray Gibbon released the seminal work addressing this emerging multicultural nature of Canada, *Canadian Mosaic: the Making of a Northern Nation* in 1938. This book was a collection of radio addresses made earlier in that year at the request of the CBC by Gibbon focusing on the folk music of the various cultures and “races” present in Canada. Gibbon was indeed an authority on folk music and musical traditions in Canada, organizing folk festivals and other tourist attractions working as the Director of Propaganda for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Ian McKay has referred to him as a “cultural entrepreneur” and a principal figure in the formation of an interwar sense of nationalism in Canada, having published numerous books and articles on the subject throughout the 1930s and continuing to do so afterwards. This book in particular, however, made great use of the mosaic metaphor, which has proven so influential ever since in Canadian parlance. Gibbon promoted the progressive idea of a greater understanding between the peoples of Canada, not the simple obliterating of cultural differences prominent amongst “Anglo-Saxonists” such as Lloyd and the Klan. Gibbon saw culture (especially music) and certain old world traditions providing “cement” for the mosaic, much like Kate Foster, Skelton, Woodsworth and Connor
before him. Janet McNaughton has noted that Gibbon represented the British adaptation of the national romantic school of folklore studies that emerged in the late nineteenth century and was heavily influenced by the internationalism of Fabian socialism. In this theoretical framework, folklore was viewed as not only promoting the unique national characteristics of ethnic groups but also had internationalist implications, emphasizing the mutuality of cultures and the understanding of the various peoples in the world through folk culture. McNaughton concludes that Gibbon represented a progressive, multicultural strain of thinking during the Depression, presaging the Canada of the 1960s and 1970s. Like these previously mentioned figures, however, Gibbon, as we shall see, presented a patronizing and caricatured view of ethnic groups and subscribed to racial theories that ascribed certain static characteristics to identifiable racial groups. As John Herd Thompson has stated, the mosaic metaphor of the 1920s and 1930s allowed for the inclusion of a diverse population within the British Empire, reflecting the so-called “Third British Empire” concept of a free association of various peoples. While space was made within the English Canadians “imagined community” for these various peoples, according to Thompson, the mosaic metaphor did not signify a strict “post-colonial liberal nationalism that gradually overshadowed many Canadians’ earlier identification with Britain” as Ian McKay has described it. Instead the superiority of the Empire and of this new Britishness was reinforced and legitimized through an acceptable amount of diversity, demonstrating its strength and adaptability in the modern world. This helps explain how progressive and liberal sentiments could be expressed alongside old stereotypes and intense pride in British traditions.
Gibbon himself reserved perhaps his most egregious stereotypes for Catholics in Canada, particularly French Canadians, Poles, Italians and even the Irish, who, as mentioned earlier, had largely escaped scrutiny from Protestants since WWI. Gibbon referred to the Irish as a “prolific breed,” immediately reaching astronomical rates of fecundity upon arrival in the New World. Gibbon’s focus on population, a continuing concern in this era, is also present in his description of Italians arriving in Canada; according to Gibbon the reason they began emigrating was the end of territorial wars and vendettas in mid-nineteenth century Italy, along with the “racial tendency of the Italians to have large families” which forced surplus population to find a new home. This, and of course the Italian proclivity for manual labour, brought them to Canada and made them good workers.

One fascinating tale told in the book has Gibbon attending a Polish dance routine at the New Canadian Folk-Song and Handicraft Festival in Winnipeg in 1928. Gibbon was confronted by many citizens who were angry that “these people” be allowed to keep their traditions which would prevent them from becoming true Canadians, citing Connor’s famous The Foreigner as evidence against the usefulness of maintaining old world traditions. Gibbon, who was friends with Connor, was greatly disturbed and called Connor asking him to attend the dance and talk with the Polish crowd afterwards, which he happily obliged. Connor admitted later that he was wrong in his earlier assessment and presentation of Poles as “dirty labourers” and asked Gibbon what he could do in penance. Gibbon of course suggested that Connor rally his friends to also attend these festivals, which were so fundamental to the inculcation of the ideal of the Canadian mosaic.
Connor concluded, to Gibbon’s satisfaction, that Poles were “as simple as they were charming.” This passage illustrates Gibbon’s shared belief with Connor that the ethnic “other” was not inevitably subversive, but simply needed the help and understanding of the hegemonic groups to improve themselves and achieve full acceptance. Yet according to Daniel Coleman the very presence of this “other” was necessary in order to demonstrate what Coleman has termed “White civility,” in other words the central values of the British, Protestant Canadian. Non-British Protestant peoples, such as French Canadians and Catholic immigrants, are thus not defined as beings in themselves, “or in order to inform readers about the circumstances of their lives, but as demonstrations of White British civility.” The clearest example of this in Gibbon’s book is his constant attempt to define ethnic groups in terms of British history and tradition, no matter how ludicrous or far-fetched his comparisons may seem. He states that Swedish and English are similar, contributing favourably to the easier assimilation of Swedes into Canada, continuing that since many Finns still speak Swedish after decades of political rule they by proxy have assimilated easily into Canada as well. Gibbon also accurately stressed the German heritage of the British monarch to which Canada maintained allegiance, yet bizarrely also tried to link the Greek community in Canada with the fact that the Greek translation of the Bible, not the Roman, was used by the dominant Protestant population in Canada, and thus Greeks were not overly foreign. What perhaps hindered the Greeks in Gibbon’s estimation, much like the Italians, was their racial inability to adapt to the harsh Canadian winters, unlike the Scandinavians.
Gibbon’s most revealing attempt to subsume ethnic and religious differences under the comforting umbrella of British liberty, values and traditions in Canada occurs in his discussion of the Czechs. Gibbon presents an argument common amongst Protestants critical of Catholicism and its historical role in Europe, namely that Jan Hus was the father of the Reformation, and he himself was directly influenced by the Englishman John Wycliffe, promoting liberty, tolerance and Christianity until he was crushed by the authoritarian forces of Catholicism. Gibbon was attempting to present to a Canadian audience a more acceptable and familiar face of a Catholic immigrant group, essentially stating that in their history there was a potential for the traditions of the Reformation, traditions that of course Canada was founded upon. Watson Kirkconnell, who served on the wartime CCCC with Gibbon, presented this argument clearly in his 1930 study *The European Heritage: A Synopsis of European Cultural Achievement*. Hus is presented by Kirkconnell as presaging Luther in his emphasizing of direct loyalty to Christ and speaking against the corruption of the Catholic Church of the time, owing much of his thought to Wycliffe. Bohemia is portrayed as fending off “the hordes” of Catholics for years and maintaining a vigorous Protestantism, only to be overthrown by the “tyranny of the nobles” and the eventual conquest by the Catholic Austrian Empire, portrayed by Kirkconnell as a continuing tyrannical force in European history. Kirkconnell described a teleological binary within European history where freedom and progress, represented by Protestantism, fought against medieval regression and authoritarianism, represented by Catholicism, especially the Habsburgs of Austria and eventually Spain. When describing the Spanish rule of the Low Countries, Catholic Belgium is portrayed as
contributing nothing to European culture until the late nineteenth century due to the crushing weight of Spanish rule.\textsuperscript{220} Kirkconnell goes further by portraying modern Spain as suffering for the sins of the Inquisition, imperial wars and violent conquest by becoming an international pariah state: “The insensate brutality of political and theological tyranny has made Spain a living corpse lingering dully just this side of dissolution.”\textsuperscript{221} Kirkconnell concluded this interpretation of the European tradition and its importance for the world by portraying the Anglo-Saxon Protestant, influenced by the eminent figures of Luther and Calvin, as furthering the progress of individual liberty, freedom, responsible government and pioneering industrial capitalism.

This perspective was not confined to those sincerely interested in analyzing the multicultural nature of Canada, such as Gibbon, Kirkconnell or Ian F. Mackinnon in the postwar era,\textsuperscript{222} but was also present in some conservative Protestant circles. In the 1920s Roland Bingham’s mouthpiece, \textit{The Evangelical Christian}, for example, often advertised and contained letters from the Scripture Gift Mission in Bohemia asking for donations to spread the true word of God originally spread in this land by Hus until Protestantism was permanently crushed at the Battle of White Mountain.\textsuperscript{223} In one article a Rev. Francis C. Brading describes a conception of history that is almost identical to that of reformers such as Kirkconnell and Gibbon. For Brading, Wycliffe and Hus were forever linked, as Hus was a true Protestant martyr; according to this author even the words he spoke before being burned alive were similar to that of a later British Protestant hero, Bishop Cranmer. Indeed Richard II married an enlightened Bohemian woman, a term often synonymous with “truly” understanding the Gospel, over an ignorant Catholic French princess and
their reign was characterized by great progress compared to narrow Catholic powers. The
Czechs once again had an opportunity to throw off the yoke of Catholic rule now that
they had won independence after WWI, and all that was necessary was for good
Christians in Canada and elsewhere to provide donations and missionaries to revive the
rightful Protestant tradition of Hus in order to “fight for truth against the forces of Satan
and his generals at the Vatican.”  

Anglican clergyman and staunch opponent of High
Church pretensions Dyson Hague wrote a book studying the life of Wycliffe. According
to William Katerberg, evangelicals in the Anglican Church, such as Hague, saw history as
their ally as it was proof of the supremacy and inevitable progress from the medieval
superstitions and ritualism of Rome to the purity of the Reformation, which was a revival
of the simple Christianity Jesus had proclaimed. In the preface to the second edition of
*The Life and Work of John Wycliffe* released in 1935 Hague reiterated Wycliffe’s
importance to the contemporary world, as he was one of the first in the world to draw
attention to the errors of Rome, an institution that had not truly changed since. For Hague
the ecclesiastical world in broad terms still resembled Wycliffe’s era as “Rome is just as
strong, just as aggressive, and its doctrine and teaching just as false and repugnant to the
Word of God as ever.” This was the force in the world that needed to be challenged to
fulfill the promise of brave Christians such as Wycliffe and Hus. Hus and Wycliffe thus
served as figures in this discourse as proof that Catholicism could be countered and
defeated in Catholic nations, making certain immigrants and religious groups more
acceptable to Protestant Canadian norms. Hus also represented in his death and Wycliffe
in the treatment of his body after death the dark consequences of unrestrained Catholic power in the European tradition and in the New World through mass immigration.

This historical understanding of the role of Catholicism and the Catholic Church in world history also influenced Gibbon’s characterization of French Canadians. The French Canadian was defined for Gibbon by their respect for tradition with “[t]he Church ... encourag[ing] him to be a believer in authority, and his instinct is to be conservative and thrifty.”227 The French Canadian is presented as being a humble, agriculturally inclined race that has undivided loyalty to their Church and thus has always rejected radicalism and the republicanism of the US. Gibbon repeats another common stereotype of French Catholics of this era, namely that the women served to birth huge families which aided in preserving their traditions dating back to Old France and their population. The French Canadian promoted the cultural arts such as music and singing, not the crass materialistic world that existed outside of Quebec, again serving the interests of the omnipresent Catholic Church. Gibbon concluded his section on the French Canadian happily believing that “Contentment with his lot, devotion to his job, friendliness to his neighbour, a high moral standard and a happy disposition made the French-Canadian the best kind of citizen that Canada could desire.”228 Thus Catholics were acceptable members of our society as long as they continued to fit into this romantic, patronizing ideal of the simple-minded Catholic habitant not interested in the serious business of politics and business in Canada.

As World War II approached anti-Catholicism remained a prominent issue. Kirkconnell provides the clearest transition from the Depression era concern with
Catholicism, focused mostly on demographics and the intrinsic totalitarian nature of Catholics, to the wartime which was quite similar but with an eschatological edge, dividing the world into Manichean solitudes of good and evil. Kirkconnell praised French Canada for dispelling its “Duplessis infection” by electing the Liberal provincial government of Adélard Godbout immediately upon the outbreak of WWII. While not mentioning the Catholic Church by name, Kirkconnell was still concerned about the slow progress of French Canadians to the obvious realization that Duplessis was a thug and their ignorance towards international affairs, signified most by French Canadian Catholic sympathy for Franco and Mussolini; this for Kirkconnell was due to the control of an active clergy and their static nature, remaining centuries behind the rest of the modern world. Kirkconnell concluded his study ominously, stating that the steadily declining Anglo birth rate put the British heritage of Canada in danger. If this war was to be fought properly, in Kirkconnell’s mind, “la revanche du berceau [sic] will speedily submerge us in both East and West – and that deservedly, when the potential mothers of our race mistake comfort for civilization.” This war was conceived by many to be a battle against totalitarianism and evil, but the nature and character of Canada itself needed to align with this goal to achieve it. As in the previous Great War, Roman Catholics and Catholicism in general were conceived as a distorting influence on the Canadian body politic in a time of crisis.
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Chapter 3

“[B]onusing [sic] families who have been unwilling to defend their country”: Anti-Catholicism and the Second World War in Canada

While visiting family in Cambridge in 1942 with his wife Harriet, Eugene Forsey penned a letter to his mother noting that a family friend’s child had told her that in their school the Irish children were openly supporting Hitler in the war. “It’s a pity they and the same type of French-Canadians couldn’t have a taste of Hitler’s rule,” Forsey commented, “they’d see then how much consideration their precious susceptibilities would get.” Forsey was unequivocal regarding where the responsibility lay for these traitorous attitudes: “Of course the Vatican is behind a good deal of this; and, in the case of the Irish there is the poor excuse that in aeons gone by the British government of Ireland was very oppressive,” perhaps forgetting that Irish independence was won only through the partition of the island and had been achieved a scant two decades earlier. Forsey finished his discussion of Catholics by referring to them as “goops” for not understanding “what century they’re living in.” This letter is characteristic of the attitude of prominent Protestant figures and intellectuals towards Catholicism and the Catholic Church during the Second World War in English Canada. The Catholic Church was viewed as an institution that was not fully supportive of the Allied war effort, a perception influenced by concerns during the Depression that the Vatican and certain elements in Quebec held fascist sympathies. These perceived sympathies were believed to be inevitably hindering the war effort and caused further questioning of the potential loyalty, and thus Canadianness, of Catholics.
The concerns about Catholicism during the Depression were heightened during wartime, as the world became engulfed in the most savage war yet witnessed, portrayed by many in Canada and elsewhere as a battle between freedom and democracy. This was compounded by the belief that Protestantism was a central and defining component of Canadian national identity, a view English Canadians believed they shared with Britain, a nation whose traditions were still perceived as fundamental to defining the Canadian “way of life.” Linda Colley posits that Protestantism remained central to British identity in times of crises, including WWII, as it bestowed a divine plan upon the nation to meet adversity. In this case the adversary was totalitarianism, represented not only by the Axis powers but also by the Catholic Church, an institution long viewed as alien to the fundamentally Protestant British values of freedom and democracy. As Colley explains, this Protestant world-view was so entrenched within the mentality of Britons, along with many Protestant Canadians, that it was influential irrespective of one’s level of explicit devotion. Yet S.J.D. Green has provided a critique of Colley’s more linear narrative of the relation between Protestantism and Britishness, instead describing a process of desacralization in British politics during the interwar period. This was caused, in Green’s opinion, by the excising of huge numbers of Irish Catholic MPs with the foundation of the Irish Free State, the collapse of the Liberal Party and its historic nonconformist conscience and finally the emergence of a religiously eclectic Labour Party which forced the Tories to shed its image as the party of the Church of England. While in Green’s mind religion has never disappeared from Britain, Britain did cease to become identified by its citizens as a “Protestant nation” between 1920 and 1960. In Canada, by contrast,
anti-Catholicism and a fervent Protestantism remained central to Canadian identity, particularly when opinion-makers invoked the “British” component of this identity. World War Two saw an increase in the fierceness of anti-Catholicism along with its politicization, becoming perpetuated publicly by the federal PC party. Canada was still identified as a Protestant nation by many despite the previous decades of platitudes towards French Canada and Catholic immigrants by public figures, efforts which, as has been described earlier, were themselves informed by a caricatured vision of Catholicism and an ingrained, subtle conception of Protestantism as inherently tolerant. The fervent Protestant identity of wartime served to reinforce a sense of authenticity; Canada was “truly” British, loyal and devoted to the values that even the imperial metropolis was no longer dedicated to. In this atmosphere, the Catholic Church and Catholicism were yet again viewed as inherently totalitarian, medieval and perhaps even a “fourth Axis power,” in the words of T.T. Shields. As Forsey makes clear in his letter, though, there was widespread suspicion of Catholicism outside of “extremists” such as Shields, which culminated fiercely in yet another controversy over conscription.

The Second World War has proven a popular subject within Canadian historiography. Yet many of the Canadian studies have focused on politics, overseas operations and the military, the formation of a nascent welfare state, propaganda or the overarching socio-economic issues of the time on the home front. Religion and its role in maintaining and forming national identity in this tense period has been almost completely ignored; even more glaringly absent is reference to anti-Catholicism during the war beyond the inflammatory statements of Shields and his Canadian Protestant
League (CPL) along with the increasingly anti-French PC party. This differentiates Canada from both its British and American cousins, as many historians have concluded that public declarations of intense anti-Catholicism faded in America during WWII, although they were revived quickly in the postwar era. The historiography of the Conservatives during the war has focused on its position on major issues such as conscription and the growing welfare state; however, these issues were subsets in a larger framework. A segment of Tories surrounding Ontario leader George Drew enthusiastically accepted its role as the political representative of the Protestant nation, embracing fully British, Protestant Canadian nationalism and framing its opposition to family allowances and support of conscription in explicitly anti-Catholic, anti-French contexts. The Tories became more “Protestant” in this period, not less as theorized in Britain, countering any teleological vision of the de-sacralization of Canadian politics. Patrick Joyce has noted that political language consists of a subtle interplay between those constructing the appeals (politicians, intellectuals, party hacks) and the lived reality of people. The resulting language is thus not necessarily an objective reflection of social experience but a process of definition and boundary-making; in fact the creation of “collective political subjects” is central to this process, with political language both appealing to and defining the objects, such as “the people,” or in this case, “Protestant Canada.” Evidence of support from many Canadians, along with the public pronouncements of influential members, including progressive figures like leader John Bracken, reveals that this was not simply a cynical ploy to gain votes but reflected a
tangible sentiment in Canada during the war that believed in the Britishness of the nation and which strove to “revive” it.

Brent Reilly has provided a rare analysis of organized anti-Catholicism during WWII, but he focuses solely on the activity of Baptists, specifically their involvement in the formation of the CPL and the ICC, concluding that the activities of the latter with regards to educational policy in Canada were quite justified, providing an uncritical examination of wartime anti-Catholicism.¹⁷ Nancy Christie touches on the importance of anti-Catholicism in the war in the formation of the intellectual position of postwar Protestant social critics. Christie argues that the introduction of family allowances by the King government in 1944 irrevocably shattered any chance of a Protestant-Catholic alliance amongst these intellectuals, as figures such as Arthur Lower and C.E. Silcox began to fuse their older anti-Catholicism, encompassing fears of Catholic demographic dominance, with hostility to the unregulated rise of the modern social welfare state.¹⁸ Reilly does elucidate an important point however when he articulates the major concern of the CPL and the ICC as the need for conscription and fears over the expansion of separate schools, both issues inextricably tied to the preservation of British liberty and the maintenance of the British connection this liberty relied upon.¹⁹ Christie’s analysis is concerned with more foundational elements of society, not just explicit political issues such as separate schools or conscription. The Catholic Church, according to Christie, was viewed by many concerned Canadians as being antipathetic towards traditional Protestant notions of the organization of society, namely the family as the very basis of social authority.²⁰
of life,” influenced greatly by an adherence to a vague Britishness, motivated many to protest against the perceived influence and dominance of Roman Catholicism in Canada.

Jonathan Vance and Ivana Caccia have recently contributed two more in-depth studies of Canadian identity during the Second World War. While much of Vance’s book *Maple Leaf Empire: Canada, Britain, and Two World Wars* is focused on the daily lives of Canadian servicemen living in Britain, he expands upon Carl Berger’s influential observation that for many English Canadians in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century imperialism acted as a form of nationalism. Vance believes that this sentiment continued to exist into WWII, and even afterwards into the present day, in a much less explicit form than that which Berger studied. Vance posits that English Canadians identified the values they prized most in this period—liberalism, religious tolerance and the parliamentary tradition—as lying in Britain and distinguishing them from their American cousins. This Britain, however, was an idealized form and many Canadians in WWII, especially those living in Britain, believed that it was their duty to re-establish these forgotten components of Britishness to a Mother Country that had lost its way. Vance concludes that Britishness in Canada was thus a “Canadian hybrid,” loyal to Britain but distinctly Canadian, in fact maintaining that Canada represented an “untarnished” version of Britain. I will build upon Vance’s work by emphasizing the place of Protestantism in this hybridized identity, particularly how an anti-Catholic strain within Protestantism helped inform the discourse of Canadian national identity by defining certain Canadian, and thus non-Catholic, values. I will also, as mentioned earlier, elaborate upon the continuing dominance of this anti-Catholic ideology in an influential
segment of the federal PCs. This represents both another distinguishing characteristic of
Canadian wartime anti-Catholicism and lends credence to Vance’s idea that Canadians
perceived themselves as “untarnished” Britons; these Protestant Canadians had not
forgotten the threat that Catholicism represented to a democratic nation.

Caccia dedicates her entire book to WWII and engages in a sophisticated analysis
of Canadian identity formation during the conflict. Caccia discusses how national
unification during crises such as WWII became the ultimate goal of state and non-state
actors, such as intellectuals, and they perpetuated a normalized representation of the
national/natural community. In Caccia’s opinion, this necessitates a presupposed
ideological form which acts as a mode of communication between individuals and social
groups; in a liberal democratic state this cannot simply be the suppression of all
differences, but instead the “relativizing” of them, subordinating these differences to the
overarching self. This is the continuing, fluctuating process of internalizing external
boundaries which can result in either these boundaries rigidifying and stressing difference
or in the “gradual displacement (deferral) of meanings of difference and the eventual
blurring and transgression of boundaries resulting in hybridization.”23 Caccia’s
framework is useful for the central concern of this discussion, specifically her articulation
of who was positioned as the objective other and whom, in her words, was to be included
in the “subjective ‘we’” of Canada.24 This study posits that anti-Catholicism was integral
to this process, a facet of wartime Canada which Caccia does not address in-depth.

Outside of professional anti-Catholics such as Shields, Catholicism and Catholics were
seen as an irrefutable fact of wartime Canada that had to be understood and dealt with,
particularly due to the presence of Quebec and French Canadians. This did not mean, however, that Catholicism was accepted fully as an equal component of “the nation,” of the Canadian “we”; instead it had to be monitored and critiqued, even opposed in its public activities. This is precisely the tack that Conservatives and other public figures and intellectuals took, constantly portraying Catholicism as containing alien elements that necessitated purging. Anti-Catholicism was fundamental to the normalization of Canadian identity during the war, just as it had been in the first part of the twentieth century as Catholicism and the Catholic Church were perceived to encompass a theological, political and social system that prevented Catholics from total inclusion in a liberal democratic society fighting for its very existence.

With so much at stake intellectuals, leading Protestant figures, various committees within the mainline denominations, Tory politicians and fundamentalist preachers all became aware of the threat of Catholicism to national unity. The clearest manifestation of anti-Catholicism came during the debates over conscription and the alleged disloyalty of the Catholic Québécois because they were perceived to have refused to enlist in acceptable numbers or to support compulsory service. Anti-Catholic rhetoric blamed this on the influence of the Catholic Church in Canada: for some the Church was the “special interest” that controlled a King government perceived as vacillating and weak. This sentiment was compounded by the common belief that the international Catholic Church, along with its counterpart in Quebec, was reactionary and supported the various fascist and Nazi regimes throughout Europe, as evidenced by the initial support some French Canadians expressed towards the Pétain regime in Vichy France. Debates over civil
liberties, and their very real suspension during the war under the controversial Defence of Canada Regulations (DCR), often contained references to the authoritarian nature of the Catholic Church and its expanding control over civil government leading to totalitarianism, which Canada was fighting overseas. Many of these concerns became entangled with the older issue of “the revenge of the cradles” when family allowances were passed by the King government in 1944. There was an outcry amongst many commentators who often accompanied their denouncements of family allowances as an encroachment on provincial and individual jurisdiction and as a “political bribe” to Quebec, i.e. a means of rewarding prolific Catholic families and leading inevitably to the “swamping” of the Anglo-Protestant population. By the end of the war these issues coalesced in a by-election in North Grey, Ontario where General Andrew McNaughton, the newly appointed Minister of Defence, attempted to gain a seat in Parliament, but was denied amidst vicious anti-Catholic rumours and the linked controversy of his support of King’s limited conscription policy. As Christie has noted, what emerged from WWII was a conviction amongst many Protestant Canadians of various ideological convictions that the Catholic Church was inherently incapable of existing within a democratic nation, a notion proved by the Church’s actions during WWII, a war for democracy itself.

Shields embodied anti-Catholicism in wartime Canada at its most bitter, and his constant attacks on Roman Catholicism have been noted as central to his fundamentalist crusade since the conscription crisis of WWI. Shields’ confrontational tone, taste for the sensational and the almost constant controversy swirling around him and his beloved Jarvis Street Baptist Church have caused him to be the subject of numerous studies.
During WWII Shields quickly moved from his early support of King in the election of 1940, explained later by his refusal to vote for Tory leader R.J. Manion, an Irish Catholic, to organizing the CPL as a protest against Catholic influence over the government. As Reilly has noted, the impetus for the CPL was largely based on a misunderstanding during the Week for National Reconsecration organized in September 1941 on Parliament Hill to raise national morale. Through a series of scheduling errors the joint Protestant-Catholic service was not held at the Peace Tower but instead the advertisements only mentioned a Catholic mass, although Protestant services were held later in the week. This seeming favouritism towards the Catholic Church angered many Protestants, motivating Shields to organize a meeting at Jarvis Street which resulted in the eventual formation of the CPL in late 1941, where he denounced the Catholic Church as “the enemy of the home, the enemy of the church, the enemy of all free men, and of all free institutions; that it is a totalitarian system which fastens upon its victims a yoke more deadly than that of Hitler, because it is a yoke which stretches beyond the bounds of time.” The CPL was never the influential organization Shields and his intimate supporters hoped it would be, remaining largely centred in Toronto, but the language it used to define itself is revealing of the linkages Shields and his supporters forged between anti-Catholicism and their British Canadian identity. This rhetoric was dedicated to the preservation of British civil and religious liberties in Canada, linking it to the doctrines of the Reformation and the need for Protestants to defend them constantly against the “supreme authority falsely claimed by the Roman Catholic Church.” In Shields’ worldview, the CPL was the protector of national unity while Roman Catholicism, which
was in essence Antichrist, was the prime disturber insidiously pursuing its own goal of international political and spiritual domination. Shields compared Catholicism to a tumour that needed to be cleansed from the body politic and tested against the pure Word of Scripture. In a characteristic appeal to the masculinity of his listeners, Shields concluded that the Reformation had made “real men” of the Christians of the sixteenth century, and that battling the errors of Rome now would stop the dominance of “molly-coddlers” in contemporary Protestantism and within politics. His CPL would stop the spread of Catholic Fifth Columnists in Canada and maintain its existence as a British nation.35

In a recent study of Shields’ political battles against Mackenzie King and Mitchell Hepburn, Doug Adams attributes Shields’ ubiquitous extremism to his militant fundamentalism. For Adams, Shields’ unwavering belief in the centrality of the Reformation as the formative event in world history and the heroic nature of all the major figures involved in reforming a sick Christianity explained his seemingly obsessive, paranoid fixation on Catholicism throughout the Depression and the War.36 His stature was perhaps never as nationally prominent as it was during WWII, however, when the House of Commons debated censuring his inflammatory periodical The Gospel Witness and Protestant Advocate37 and even possibly interning Shields himself.38 In another example of the tensions Shields was provoking, former Tory member from Gaspe, J. Sasseville Roy,39 called for a sub-amendment to Pierre Cardin’s recently proposed amendment to legislation concerning the conscription of National Resources Mobilization Act (NRMA) men for overseas service which would prevent the publication of “anti-
Catholic propaganda and prevent the circulation of some abusive publications conflicting with the purposes enunciated at the time of our war declarations.”[40] Roy’s sub-amendment demonstrates the connection some Catholics made between conscription and a hostile Anglophone nationalism. King responded that persecuting Shields would transform him into a martyr, particularly since the Minister of Justice was French (Louis St. Laurent), and suggested that Roy retract his amendment. King ended his response by expressing himself with uncharacteristic emotion: “as a member of a Protestant church, I wish to say that I have utter contempt for Mr. Shields and his unworthy utterances.”[41] Roy’s amendment was annihilated 194-8 with all of the yeas coming from Quebec.[42]

The response to this debate is also revealing of the temper in English Canada towards Shields and his grandiose claims against the influence the disloyal Catholic Church held over the King government. Shields was unsurprisingly incensed, responding at his pulpit on Jarvis Street that it was his right as a British subject to reject a system he believed was dangerous and false. For Shields Catholicism was anti-Christian and blasphemous, repudiating scholars that have claimed Shields was only concerned with political anti-Catholicism in this period,[43] and that while he vigorously opposed racism or hostility to individual Catholics, they were being controlled by this evil institution. It was a hindrance not only to national unity but also created a province of “slackers” in Quebec that were not assuming their responsibility in the war effort against the Axis powers.[44] Editorialist J.V. McAree of the Globe and Mail expressed tacit support of Shields. The Globe had earlier stated that the very mention of Shields in the House was a waste of precious parliamentary time,[45] to which Shields responded that the newspaper was under
the control of the Catholic hierarchy. McAree now called attention to the more pressing fact that French Canadians should be curtailing the spread of the sinister Order of Jacques Cartier, an extreme separatist movement that had allegedly infiltrated all of the major governmental and educational ranks of the province and which was dedicated to an independent Catholic state, “Laurentia.” In McAree’s perspective, this organization was much more significant than Shields and represented a concerted attempt to implant fascism in Canada; it was “the naked Hitler idea with a religious slick.” In a subsequent editorial McAree was even more supportive of Shields, stating that while he was not a member of Shields’ congregation, Shields had the right to make certain statements he believed were true about the Catholic Church as he was a minister of the Gospel. McAree claimed that most Protestants did not mention these beliefs “not because they ought not to be said, but because it does not happen to be our business to say them.” Shields had taken an oath to defend Protestantism against incursions from faiths he sincerely believed to be in error. McAree saw Shields as having the total right to freedom of religion and speech, and that the only major difference between King’s multitude of critics castigating him for relying entirely on the support of Quebec was that Shields traced this dependency directly to the Catholic Church, while others, presumably McAree himself, saw King manipulating simple French Canadians.

Although McAree does not comment on this aspect of his reasoning, in both cases the French Canadian people were portrayed as ignorant of the actual events and issues circulating around them, being controlled by some external force. For McAree, Shields simply represented “Fundamentalism,” which should not have been a stranger to French
Canada since “that is what Rome has always represented. It does not change with changing fashions or scientific discoveries.” McAree ended his editorial by admitting that while many Protestants did not believe that the Pope was Antichrist, as Shields did, in Toronto “which is supposed to be a very stronghold of Protestantism and Orange intolerance, Dr. Shields is about the only voice to uphold a faith that once all Protestant ministers proclaimed. He is left naked to his enemies.” It would seem through this rationale that Shields should have been applauded for courage due to his capability of fighting the fundamentalist enemy, Catholicism, with a fervent Protestantism.

Shields and his CPL were also often used as the metric against which Protestants measured their own level of tolerance for Catholicism. In his correspondence future ICC member Rev. H.H. Bingham, General Secretary of the Baptist Convention, was condemned by other Baptists for attending Shields’ founding meeting of the CPL and not making it explicit that he was attending solely as an individual, not as an official representative of the Convention. Bingham apologized but continually denied that the Catholic Church had any right to engage in mass on Parliament Hill as “the manner in which it was done was, intentionally or otherwise, an insult to the already too tolerant spirit of Canadian Protestantism.” Ian Galt had initiated this discourse by pleading with Bingham that no matter what merit Shields’ crusade contained, unity was crucial to the future of Canada. E.M. Whidden, on the other hand, of Acadia University acknowledged the “belligerency” of Shields but nevertheless commended him and Leslie Saunders, Toronto politician and editor of the shrill periodical Protestant Action, for their refusal to “appease” the Catholic Church in all of its demands. The Canadian Baptist’s
protest against Shields is revealing of the complexity of anti-Catholicism in this era. The editor labeled Shields a “pope,” a concept unknown within Baptist theology as it was based on a strict “spiritual democracy.” This article castigated Shields for dominating his congregation and not allowing democracy to flourish. In this language, Shields was to be opposed in the minds of many Baptists as his authoritarian/papal tendencies were to be guarded against as a threat to the very foundation of their faith: the mutual relationship between the preacher and the congregation. Christian unity was undeniably important for some Protestants in the face of this conflict, yet Catholicism was still viewed as a distorting and harmful element to the national fabric.

Social reformer, passionate birth control advocate and radical Anglican minister A.H. Tyrer was another figure who sought a united Christianity, albeit from a much different ideological perspective than conservative Baptists. Tyrer penned his autobiography in the midst of WWII, perceiving the conflict in apocalyptic terms. Tyrer’s worldview embodied a united Christianity shorn of reactionary and regressive elements. Anglicanism, the particular denomination to which he belonged, would remain distinct only as it helped lead this process against foolish principles within organized Christianity, such as apostolic succession. In this context, Tyrer viewed the Catholic Church, with its dogmatism and rigid hierarchy, as an institution keeping millions of people in perpetual ignorance. Tyrer ridiculed the concept of hell and mass conversion, claiming that only the poor “white and negroes” of the American South and “the less cultured Roman Catholics everywhere” still accepted these medieval traditions. The Catholic Church was essentially working a confidence trick on its adherents, fooling them into believing in
eternal damnation in order to control them through fear and to siphon funds into its coffers by promising them exclusive salvation. Tyrer could not conceive of a clergy sincerely preaching this theology; instead he concluded that they were doing so “tongue in cheek” to spread the Catholic Church and improve it financially. In this framework, the Catholic Church was a distortion of true Christianity, or in the words of United Church French Canadian evangelizer Claude de Mestral “a sad deformation of Biblical Christianity,” in need of total reformation or even confrontation. Tyrer concluded his autobiography by adding “Thank God [Canada] is still a Protestant country not yet dominated by the Italian Vatican. Why don’t we get together and do something?” In this phrase, Tyrer betrayed his vaunted ecumenism by tacitly admitting that his desire for a “new earth” under a revitalized Christianity had no space for an archaic and greedy institution full of backward adherents.

This statement also illustrates the suspicion common throughout the war that the Catholic Church was trying to dominate the country politically. An editorial from the United Church Observer casually made reference to such a fact when examining Louis St. Laurent’s recent 1943 speech on the redistribution of seats in the House. St. Laurent in fact opposed any motion to redistribute seats during the war, believing that it would create conflict because Quebec would be owed a greater proportion than the 65 seats it was guaranteed in the BNA Act. St. Laurent emotionally condemned those who charged that the French and Roman Catholic people of Canada were engaged in a “sinister plan … to get control of the government,” shirking their military duties and allowing English Canadians to die as the reason why redistribution should be postponed until after the war
when controversies could be dealt with easier. The *Observer* did not appreciate St. Laurent’s appeal to national unity or his confrontational tone towards English Protestants, who in the author’s opinion had been *too generous* towards Roman Catholicism and Quebec in Canada. Editor A.J. Wilson, the presumed author of the editorial, stated that English Protestants in Canada had in fact been extraordinarily tolerant of French Catholics despite their low enlistment numbers and periodic hostility to the war effort in general. St. Laurent was simply lying when he claimed that there was widespread French enlistment. In addition, it was common knowledge that Quebec was indeed dedicated and currently attempting to dominate the Canadian government, referring to William Burton Hurd’s widely referenced census predictions of the French outnumbering of Anglo-Saxons by 1971. Quoting a recent inflammatory article in the nationalist *Le Devoir*, Wilson warned that this represented not just the revenge but the “victory of the cradles.” In Wilson’s mind Protestant Canada had gone beyond tolerance and entered the territory of appeasement, a word loaded with meaning during WWII due to its association with Neville Chamberlain’s appeasing of Hitler in the infamous Munich Agreement. He referred to a recent message delivered to the Maritime Conference of the United Church by Dr. Whidden of Acadia University where Whidden denied that Catholics recognized the inherent rights of the appeasers, but instead cynically accepted appeasement while waiting until they had numerical and political dominance in order to facilitate their own intolerance of Protestants. Whidden’s tortured thinking regarding Catholics impressed Wilson, as he agreed that the Catholic Church was unable to cooperate in Canada.
concluding that St. Laurent, in his militant attitude, was in fact hurting national unity by provoking Protestants patiently tolerating an inherently aggressive Church.\textsuperscript{66}

Wilson’s attitude was not limited to only this editorial but was present throughout the war in the \textit{Observer}. As Donald Wicks has stated, Wilson included many articles hostile to Catholicism in this period and was supportive of Shields’s CPL, writing him in 1943 that “‘I am all for a united front against the present unprecedented Roman Catholic propaganda.’”\textsuperscript{67} In one article, detailing a speech George H. Knighton gave in Niagara Falls revealingly entitled “Theocratic Imperialism,” the speaker presented an opinion of the Catholic Church quite similar to Wilson’s editorial. Knighton was drawing attention to the fatal irony that the democracies, particularly those in the British Empire, were providing Rome and its totalitarian religion the liberty to carry out its subversive goal of dominating the world. He equated the Catholic Church with the regimes of Hitler and Mussolini, as it ruled through force. It was only in Ireland and Quebec that the Empire could not count on cooperation with the democratic Allied forces. Predicting the themes of anti-Catholicism in the postwar era, Knighton continued that it was the Church that was the real enemy, “‘for whatever victory the democratic forces may win in the present struggle, if they lose out here against theocratic imperialism, it will be but a partial victory, and the same old foe of human progress will still be in control[.]’”\textsuperscript{68} The presence of these articles and editorials in the organ of the largest Protestant church in Canada reveals a constant slippage between the “fanatical” anti-Catholicism of Shields and Saunders and the mainline denominations. While the \textit{Observer} and Wilson may not have descended to the alarmist and violent language of Shields, the presence of anti-Catholic
articles and editorials during the war, and particularly in the postwar period, suggest a widespread Protestant concern with Catholicism.

Another United Churchman, C.E. Silcox, joined in these wartime diatribes against Catholicism, although he was initially dedicated to promoting understanding and ecumenism to ensure victory and a peaceful postwar world. The stakes were high for Silcox, as he believed that if true unity between the major branches of Christendom could not be achieved then Christians throughout the world were playing into the hands of Hitler himself and the triumph of international materialism. In a letter from late 1941 Silcox expressed his happiness that Shields’ CPL was already waning financially, believing that his own public statements against the divisive policies of the “Battling Baptist” were responsible. In an incredibly optimistic letter to Father Maheux of the Quebec City Archives, dated July 8th, 1942, Silcox wrote that “You can count on me to do anything possible to bridge the gulf in Canada, short of denying my own fundamental convictions,” adding “I am convinced that in this war, Catholics and Protestants have to fight for something fundamental to both as Christians, as much as fundamental to both as Canadians. This is at the heart of all my thinking on the war.” Silcox was involved in the Canadian Conference of Christians and Jews, an organization explicitly dedicated to spiritual unity in the face of the true enemy, totalitarianism. Yet even within Silcox’s sincere calls for ecumenism there are signs of his anti-Catholicism, echoing his earlier sentiments expressed during the Depression. In a lecture to University College for the Democracy in Canada series Silcox spoke about “Religious Liberty,” specifically how democracy was a fundamentally spiritual concept that could not simply be molded by an
“omnicompetent [sic] state.” Indeed religion should only be related to the state by acting as its conscience, challenging “certain powerful religious organizations” throughout history that sought to “use their religious organization to subserve [sic] their ends of political control.”

This charge seems to refer to the political influence of the Catholic Church, which Silcox was concerned about in the thirties. In these clear cases Silcox advocated the state definitively excising the influence of this particular institution. In the historical exposition of this same lecture, Silcox referred to Champlain coming to Canada as a Huguenot; he eventually “reverted” to Catholicism, expressing a subtle conception of Catholicism as an archaic belief system.

Perhaps most significant in light of his transformation into a publicly vicious anti-Catholic by the end of the war, Silcox had penciled into his conclusion that “There are some who believe that the global war is only the prelude to a greater war of ideologies, the war between the dominance of the Protestant secular ethos and that of the Roman Catholic, clericalist, philosophy.”

If one document can be said to represent a significant change in his outlook, it is the pamphlet Must Canada Split?, written during the tense year of 1944 and focusing on the conscription crisis that had polarized public opinion in much of Canada. Silcox revealed his temperament at this time in a letter to George Drew, congratulating him on his August 9th broadcast condemning family allowances, which will be discussed in detail later. Silcox boldly proclaimed that “I believe that the time has come for a showdown with Quebec,” adding that if Quebec wanted to remain in Canada “they must play the game fairly; if they do not wish to play with us, they should go off by themselves. Any other solution along the lines suggested by Mr. King is fatal to both and to Canada.”
pursued this thought process into his pamphlet, questioning the idea that Canada needed to preserve unity at all costs, slyly referring to ethnic groups that had not pulled their weight militarily in the war effort. In this case of now irreconcilable differences, toleration was for Silcox not only impossible but was a sign of disloyalty. This pamphlet is Silcox at his most vitriolic, claiming that to preserve true freedom in the postwar world Canada needed true peace, and because Quebec did not support the war effort to its best ability, this peace could only be achieved by completely severing the province from Canada to prevent a full-fledged civil war. Silcox is clear that this was not a racial matter, as he viewed the French and British as quite close racially; instead, he specified that this was a matter of religion. For Silcox the Catholic Church was the cause of all of the conflicts in Canadian history, through its political machinations and identifying itself inextricably with the French race. It only promoted its own interests in Canada, as it had around the world and through the centuries, and it had created a theocracy in Quebec that resembled Bourbon France rather than the modern world. Most importantly for Silcox the Catholic Church was simply not adaptable to the modern world or a modern country such as Canada, which was fundamentally and necessarily based on the Protestant conception of freedom:

French-Canadian Catholicism, so far as it is corporatist and anti-democratic, is absolutely incompatible with Anglo-Canadian Protestantism, essentially democratic and insistent on the priesthood of the believer, on the direct and authentic appeal of the voice of God to the individual heart of man. … No, if the liberally-minded wish freedom of conscience and the liberal view of God and His will to prevail, they must be prepared to fight for it. They must organize themselves according to their underlying faith in freedom – religious and political; they must protect themselves against such open plotting and spiritual sabotage.

Silcox was thus convinced that Catholicism was by its very nature untenable for his vision of the future of the world and of Canada specifically, a country dedicated to
freedom and democracy, based on a true form of Christianity, which could not include Catholicism.

This is Silcox at his most extreme, as there is no evidence that he ever again openly supported the separation of Quebec from Canada. By the end of the war he became mostly concerned with the passing of family allowance legislation and the incursions of the “omnicompetent” welfare state into Canadian life. This did not, however, exclude discussions of Catholicism. In fact, Silcox’s critique of the managerial state was inextricable from his belief that “Catholic interests had overrun the government” as shown by King’s placation of Catholicism with the implementation of family allowances. As Christie has described, some Protestants saw in this legislation the invasion by Catholicism of that most sacred of institutions, the family itself. If the family was the model for authority in society, then the attempt by Catholicism to influence this institution was particularly insidious. For Silcox, the increasingly “Catholic” nature of the government was concomitant to the increasingly totalitarian nature of the state. Once again the Church was positioned as an institution hostile to individualism and freedom. In a letter to Major Gladstone Murray, whom Silcox had an earlier dispute with over the banning of Zeidman’s controversial Protestant Radio Hour when he was General Manager of the CBC, he described his interest in Friedrich Hayek’s recently released Road to Serfdom. Hayek’s book was a landmark refutation of the welfare state and the ubiquitous concept of planning that emerged in the mid-forties. Hayek feared, along with others including Silcox, the new statism as leading to the success of totalitarianism in Western nations akin to the Nazi nightmare of Germany.
Silcox agreed with Hayek in his denunciations of socialism and its attack on classical liberalism in Western society, but questioned why Hayek did not analyze the most consistent enemy of liberalism over the last century: the Vatican. Silcox concluded his letter by expressing his interest in understanding the different motives behind fascists, socialists and Catholics for attacking liberalism, rhetorically linking these totalitarian forces which were already linked in the minds of many Protestants. Murray, who had recently founded the anti-Communist Responsible Enterprise Movement, agreed with Silcox, particularly mentioning his reference to the anti-liberal agenda through the ages of the Vatican.

Unlike Silcox, United Churchman and prominent historian Arthur Lower’s public face was much different than the private concerns he expressed about Catholicism. This trend is clearly revealed in his private suggestions for revising the Ninth Draft of the Report of the Commission on the Church, Nation and World Order (CCNWO) compiled by the United Church in 1944. The CCNWO was advised by Silcox in preparation of the material and had amongst its executive R.B.Y. Scott, co-editor of the radical FCSO tome *Towards the Christian Revolution* and J.R. Mutchmor, who was an eventual member of the ICC. This draft of the report contained a savage criticism of the political ambitions of the Catholic Church and its primary role in causing disunity within the nation, as religion, nationalism and language were believed to have merged into a potent and inflammatory mix causing tensions between Catholics and Protestants. In other words, according to the report, tension in Canada was caused by Catholics due to their intransigent hypocrisy in demanding full freedom in Protestant nations but denying it to
Protestants in Catholic countries. The Church had “religio-political” ambitions, as it was the inheritor of the legacy of the Roman Empire striving to create an “ecclesiastical imperialism based on Latin tendencies … authoritarian in its nature, distrustful of democracy except when it exists in a democracy … determining its ‘politique’ less by the law of nature than by the ultimate ends of institutional power and aggrandizement and avid to use the power of censorship[.].”92 What was needed in the opinion of the report was a schism within Catholicism to prevent the conservative faction centred in French Canada from dominating, as this group “threatens the fabric of Canadian unity, and which may even destroy confederation unless the people of French Canada … themselves shake off the yoke of bondage and demand to the full, in church as well as in state, government of the people, by the people and for the people.”93 Only a truly catholic church, defined as one that was actually universal, could stand up to the “demonic forces” of the modern world.94

Lower counseled moderation when he read this report. Even though he saw the sections concerning the Catholic Church as important since they defined the position of one Christian Church to another, the language was essentially “declaring war on the Roman Catholic Church.”95 Revealingly, Lower stressed the need for discussion in the true Christian spirit of understanding, elaborating commonalities between the religions instead of divisions. Lower’s commitment to national unity trumped his anti-Catholicism as he admitted “[m]ost Protestants will agree only too heartily with everything that is said in [section] 153 [previously quoted], but the question is, is it politic to say it? The [United] church will have to make up its mind whether it wishes to open all the old sores
and carry on a religious quarrel[.].” In his mind the cause of unity in the postwar world was more important than anything else and was worth cooperating with even as distasteful an ally as the Catholic Church, as maintaining this language would allow the United Church to be denounced as fanatical by the Catholics: “If this slashing indictment of Roman Catholicism would get the cause anywhere, there might be something to be said for it, but of course it will not: it will only make feelings mutually more bitter.”

Lower was much more frank about his perception of Catholicism during WWII in a letter to M. Seraphin Marion, a representative of La Société Canadienne d’Histoire de l’Église Catholique. Lower responded angrily to prejudicial charges by Marion that Protestants were entirely materialistic because they had fully embraced modernity, admitting that while modernity had thoroughly infiltrated Protestant ranks, Protestantism would be able to defend itself against the total domination of the acquisitive spirit despite it not containing the “authoritarian” defences of the Catholic Church. Lower caustically questioned whether Catholics would be ready to prosecute the war effort in the face of the actual decline of Anglo-Saxons, answering this query in the negative: “Your people are still too parochial for that and even another century will hardly suffice for the training in initiative necessary to rule a continent.” Lower continued that he admired the Catholic focus on community, and that this was how they maintained their “biological urges” in order to perpetuate their culture through large families. Yet the Protestant ideal of the community did not eschew the burden of individual responsibility; this was one of the problems with Catholicism for Lower, for Catholic contentment resembled the “attribute of irresponsibility, as in children, whereas the very essence of Protestantism is
responsibility.” This attitude towards modern life is what prevented French Canadians from achieving their potential in Canadian society, not prejudice against them in employment or governmental positions. Catholic French Canadians themselves were to blame for their status, as they were unwilling and unable through a lack of proper development to become responsible members of Canadian society during this crisis.  

These comments demonstrate the acceptance of these attitudes towards the Catholic Church within some sectors of the largest Protestant denomination in Canada, along with a prominent self-confessedly liberal intellectual. It also reveals that these segments assumed that this was the view shared by many other Protestants, not simply the “lunatic fringe” of the Orange Order, the CPL, or more intransigent Tories. In a letter to Lower, Rev. Gordon Sisco, who was a founding executive member of the ICC and secretary of the CCNWO, agreed with Lower that all explicit mention of the Catholic Church in Canada should be eliminated from the final report due to the tensions they would create. Sisco concluded that they were not inaccurate, prejudicial, stereotyped or unrepresentative, but in fact the complete opposite, that if these statements are to be made, they should be made by all of the Protestant churches together. Indeed in the final document, presented to the 11th General Council of the United Church of Canada in 1944, all of the possibly offensive references to Roman Catholics have been excised much as Lower advised. Instead, the Report briefly addressed the positive aspects of the ecumenical movement, including the projected World Council of Churches (WCC).  

While ecumenism was officially supported in the face of materialism in the modern world, unsurprising due to the connections between the Canadian Council of Churches
(CCC) and the instigation of the Commission, the Ninth Draft of this Report, the membership of Commission members in the anti-Catholic ICC and the important involvement in the Commission of intellectuals such as Silcox and Lower reveal that this extension of an ecumenical olive branch was engaged in by a highly suspicious Protestantism.

The CCNWO produced another document which contained some subtle anti-Catholic rhetoric. Unsurprisingly the report was dedicated to “English-French Relations” in WWII, a volatile topic in Canada even in peacetime, but one which had been exacerbated by the perception of many Canadians that Francophones (and implicitly Catholics) were not carrying their share of the wartime burden. It was written by R.B.Y. Scott and Claude de Mestral. Rev. de Mestral was the minister at Bethanie Church in Montreal and a leading French Canadian Protestant evangelizer for the United Church. He was a problematic choice by the CCNWO since he was not reserved about his belief that Protestantism was making progress in Catholic Quebec due to the desire for freedom by French Canadians. De Mestral was convinced that the “Roman Church” needed to reform itself by actually recognizing Jesus at the only true leader of the faith. This “reformation” would only come if large numbers of Catholics, who were already tiring of the daily, dictatorial activities of the Catholic Church, found “Life” in the evangelical and reformed church. Thus for de Mestral the reforming of Catholicism would occur only if Catholics and the hierarchy eventually repudiated the entire counter-Reformation and embraced the brilliant tenets of the Reformation, finally achieving true Christianity by “Protestantizing” as opposed to “dictatorship and a reactionary power.” De Mestral’s
presence as an author in this document demonstrates the paucity of options, or lack of concern, of the CCNWO and the United Church with actual French Catholic opinion when analyzing a central issue in Canadian society during wartime.

De Mestral’s viewpoints certainly colour the aforementioned report, which sought to help mend the breach in the nation through understanding. The hostility to conscription demonstrated in WWI and King’s 1942 plebiscite in French Canada was coupled with the ubiquitous Anglo-Protestant concern surrounding the demographic shift. Once again the 1941 census was referenced warning that by 1971 the French Canadian would be numerically supreme, a fact that shocked many Canadians, exacerbated by the inflammatory, anti-British statements by some French Canadian Catholic leaders.\(^{107}\) The report admitted that one of the major issues dividing French from English in Canada was the fact that the minority Anglo-Protestants largely controlled the economy in Quebec; yet Scott and de Mestral blamed this directly on the poor educational system in the province, which focused on metaphysics and Catholic theology instead of science and business. This was a common charge against the French Canadian, blaming them for their own subjugated position in the Canadian economy. William Burton Hurd, for example, saw Quebec as relying almost entirely on subsistence farming, a factor in hindering the development of the rest of Canada since the future of the nation in the international context relied on the commercial development of land. Instead Quebec was preventing other Canadians from settling land, selfishly guarding it for French Canadians and their primitive farming techniques which were unfeasible in the modern world.\(^{108}\) Lower shared this conviction, positing that French Catholics were a static, agrarian people
unable to adapt to the world of accumulation and business unlike the dynamic English Protestant. The Catholic was too simplistic, inherently anti-materialistic and thus prone to support “corporatist” solutions instead of embracing the economic forces that had built the North American continent.\textsuperscript{109} Scott and de Mestral even provided a quotation from an unnamed English author defending the economic domination of the French Canadian as it was inconceivable that they would have been able to develop the industrial infrastructure that was now bringing the province into the twentieth century and which allowed the French Canadians themselves to thrive: “‘Who has created the French race in America?’ … I make bold to say that the English industrialist has created about three quarters of it.”\textsuperscript{110}

The report made plain that this struggle within Canada was at its core a religious struggle and that the English in Canada would not be as vigorous in their condemnations of French Canadian interests and nationalism in this war if it were not that the “Roman Catholic Church stands in the shadow behind the French, controlling and ultimately determining every move.”\textsuperscript{111} It was not the simple, local peasant priest that Protestants were worried about, but the powerful international Church composed of a wealthy, disciplined hierarchy that dominated such backward countries as Spain, Mexico and Poland. The Catholic Church for Scott and de Mestral threatened the basis of Canadian society, namely “British institutions,” which protected liberty and freedom for all citizens. It was an alien force that distorted the composition of the nation and threatened its stability, with the authors painting a nightmare scenario of a Catholic Canada:

What would this great Church, with its arrogant claims, and which imposes its strong will upon the minds and hearts of its people and allows so little place for freedom of thought or action—what
would it do if it should come to a place of dominant influence in Canada? Is it likely that this powerful institution, so definitely opposed in its structure, its methods and its philosophy to all that is truly free and democratic, so bitterly antagonistic to the great truths for which Protestantism has bravely struggled for four centuries,--is it to be expected that it, once having gained a controlling voice, would exert a different influence in Canada than it has in other countries under similar circumstances?\textsuperscript{112}

It was religious tension that characterized this Canadian conflict and it required a religious solution. This religious solution for national unity during an international crisis was for the promotion of the French Protestant churches as a mode of reaching those Catholics who wanted a new spiritual experience and to further the reformation of the Catholic Church, taking advantage of the emergence of real liberalizing influences within the Church itself.\textsuperscript{113} This solution is perhaps unsurprising given that de Mestral co-authored the work, yet it is characteristic of the type of understanding and ecumenism of wartime within much of Canadian Protestantism. The Catholic Church was to be tolerated, perhaps even engaged with at a practical level to achieve a victory over the forces of materialism and war, but it was not perceived as a truly Christian institution. Instead it was an authoritarian rival, a divisive force in Canadian national life.

“Democracy and the Roman Catholic Church, as it functions today, appear to be entirely incompatible,” they boldly proclaimed, adding ominously but without comment that the “Roman Catholic hierarchy has recently set up its national headquarters in Ottawa, the national capital.”\textsuperscript{114} Amidst this rhetoric the authors did acknowledge that influences hindering national unity were the Orange Order and staunch imperialists, but this was due to the extremity of these groups which fostered a more ardent French nationalism.\textsuperscript{115} Tolerance and understanding were necessary in order to counter the six major barriers to national unity: language, separate schools, divided loyalties—“the English to the
Motherland, the French to the Papacy”—the “political ambitions of the Roman Catholic Church,” racial snobbery and the low wages in Quebec.\textsuperscript{116} It is clear from this list which institution was to blame for Canadian problems in wartime.

The United Church was certainly not the only mainline Protestant denomination to profess anti-Catholic statements during the war. As Brent Reilly has stated, there were many prominent Baptists outside of the staunch fundamentalist orbit of Shields and his Union of Regular Baptists, such as editor of the \textit{Canadian Baptist} H.P. Whidden and public intellectual Watson Kirkconnell, who promulgated the idea that Protestantism as a force in Canadian life was declining in the face of both Catholic fecundity and Protestant apathy.\textsuperscript{117} In the evocately titled editorial “Protestantism Dying?” Whidden referred to the 1941 census report that calculated that Catholics had increased by 16 percent while the total Canadian population had only increased by 10.5 percent.\textsuperscript{118} While Whidden attempted to reassure his audience that Protestantism was not dying, he did advise Protestants to “take heed to this suggestive statistical warning, and with depth of conviction and earnestness of spirit address ourselves to the task of giving Canada the truth as it is in Jesus Christ.”\textsuperscript{119} It is this subtle insinuation that the growth of Catholicism would inexorably lead to the decline in the importance of Jesus’ word in Canada that inflects the worldview of so many of these Protestant figures. Whidden saw Protestantism as inextricable from modern democracy because “Modern democracy is largely the achievement of the Reformation, when the essential worth of the common man was rediscovered” adding “it is this Christian basis of democracy that bodes well for its survival.”\textsuperscript{120} For Whidden Christianity was synonymous with not only democracy but
Protestantism; this causal linking of these three concepts is fundamental to understanding anti-Catholicism in Canada, as it was a complex, teleological understanding of world history. Rev. Dr. Gordon Sisco, future chairman of the ICC and secretary of the general council of the United Church exemplified this when he gave an address to a McMaster chapel service. He saw history moving steadily forward, but always having to overcome hurdles. In Sisco’s mind, these hurdles were the Dark Ages after the civilization of Greece and Rome, the Thirty Years War which hindered the progress of the Reformation, the reinstatement of the Catholic Stuarts after Cromwell’s rule and the French Revolution which succeeded by the dictatorship of Napoleon. Catholicism is omnipresent in this conception of history, acting perpetually, if implicitly, as the force preventing the success of Jesus’ word manifesting itself in human achievements. Therefore the decline of Protestantism was not just about maintaining numbers, but was about preserving the political, cultural and spiritual basis of liberal democracy. Protestants needed to heed these “statistical warning[s]” and preserve their great heritage, not allowing their faith to decline and “de-vitalize.” This was thus central to the prominence of anti-Catholicism within a certain Protestant Canadian intellectual framework.

Kirkconnell voiced similar sentiments to Whidden in an earlier wartime article entitled “The Twilight of Canadian Protestantism,” in which he condemned Protestants in Canada for sacrificing their racial survival for material comforts and stressed the need for Anglo-Protestants, especially in Ontario, to relent in their constant belligerence toward those of different origins as they were quickly becoming a minority themselves. Kirkconnell was involved in the wartime CCCC and other wartime propaganda efforts.
such as the Nationalities Branch and its successor the Citizens’ Bureau. The CCCC, which also included John Murray Gibbon, was dedicated to preserving the distinct cultural traditions of the various groups in Canada, while still emphasizing the belief in the ultimate but future need for assimilation into a larger Canadian framework. Ivana Caccia phrases this unity but not uniformity. Kirkconnell’s position on Catholicism and ethnic minorities was not a simple promotion of multiculturalism in the face of prejudice, as some scholars have posited, but instead a belief in a unified nation built on a paternalistic understanding and acceptance of certain aspects of older folk cultures. In this article Kirkconnell singled out the Protestant clergy as being silent partners in “race suicide” by not addressing the issue and revising the Protestant conception of the family; he concluded by boldly stating that if there was to be any hope of Protestant recovery, a “wistful hope” at best, these facts needed to be directly faced. In essence Kirkconnell was arguing for a Canada where the various groups expressed understanding and tolerance towards each other, these being fundamentally British values, in order to preserve at least a modicum of the Anglo-Saxon presence Canada was built upon. Kirkconnell attributed the major problem as the “catastrophically low Anglo-Saxon birthdate [sic]” yet quickly amended this statement by pointing out that while the Protestant birthrate was dwindling, immigrant groups from traditionally Catholic countries were exploding in numbers, particularly on the Prairies. This demographic shift led to a Western frontier populated by empty former mission buildings and Baptist churches, because the Catholic Church had effectively inculcated in its followers a “virtually impregnable” shell against “the appeal of other creeds.” In spite of language
of mutual understanding and tolerance, this article is still an example of not only the wartime concern with Catholic dominance but of Protestant decline. Protestantism was democracy in this formulation and it had served for centuries as the basis of British identity; it could not be allowed to simply disappear. Also apparent in this article are the consistent anti-Catholic tropes of uncontrollable reproduction, unmatchable indoctrination and insatiable expansionism. Kirkconnell predicted gloomily that the “future trend is towards pronounced Catholic predominance. … Standing as we Protestant Anglo-Saxons do on a steep slope down into obscurity, we shall be wise to take to heart the lessons implicit in such a situation.”

Other commentators were also explicit about their concern over the spread of Catholics in Canada, much of it largely based on the seemingly inherently higher birth rate amongst them. The Calgary Albertan, for example, contained an editorial that expressed concern over the transferring of French Catholics from the East into Western Canada, devoted to creating a new French Canadian province in Northern Alberta. The editorial is rife with hostile language bred from the tensions of war: “We do not want them [regions of Northern Alberta] turned into a dumping ground for people who greedily appropriate the benefits which Canada offers but who will not defend their country in its hour of peril,” the editorial warned, concluding “One Quebec is enough for Canada.”

Also present is a subtle reference to the fear of “the East,” conceptualized in this case as a French Catholic “other,” echoing the earlier sentiments of C.E. Amaron who referred to French Canada as the “Eastern problem.” R.E. McKinney, in a letter to Drew, believed that he was attempting to protect Canada from the incursions of Quebec, referring to
French Quebec as “the sinister and insidious element pressing from the East” and threatening the Protestant English Canadian way of life.  

This language resembles what Edward Said has memorably dubbed Orientalism, in which a body of expert and popular knowledge infiltrates the culture and prevents any discussion of “the Orient,” or in this case “the East,” from existing outside of the discourse they have defined for it. Orientalists have thus both produced and managed the entire discussion with regards to the Orient. In Canada, Catholic Quebec and Catholic immigrants embodied this space, filtering into Protestant Anglo-Saxon Canada from different “Easts,” necessitating their management by experts and concerned citizens. Sheila Ramsay Macdonald, the sister of the British High Commissioner in Canada Malcolm Macdonald, took a trip through Western Canada in 1941 noting in her diary that a group of women told her that foreigners, Catholics and French Canadians were wholly unpatriotic in the current conflict, “rubbing their hands for the day they’ll be in the majority,” presumably to promulgate the control of the Catholic Church at the expense of beleaguered and helpless Protestants.  

Hurd provided a scholarly voice to this discussion at a panel devoted to immigration at the Women’s Canada Club in Montreal in 1944. Hurd outlined how the “Western white populations” had become demographically stagnant at the end of the last century but the populations of Central and Eastern Europe, largely Catholic or Orthodox, along with “Asians” had continued to grow at high rates. This unregulated population growth would naturally lead to demands for “living space,” an evocative phrase to utilize during WWII due to the Nazi theory of Lebensraum, and threatened the potential for
suitable immigration to Canada in the postwar era from “North-Western Europe and the United States.” Hurd foresaw a situation where peoples who focused more on a high standard of living by regulating their own reproduction would challenge the demands of those seemingly primitive peoples unable to control their instincts, content with poverty and disease. Canada thus needed to control the nature and number of her population in the postwar era to preserve peace and stability.¹³⁴

The Conservative *Ottawa Journal* used rumours that Lionel Chevrier, Liberal MP for Stormont, was being groomed as the new federal Minister of National Revenue, becoming the first Franco-Ontarian federal cabinet minister, to air apprehensions over the changing demographic character of Canada. The author referred to a recent article in the *London Free Press* which believed that if the Anglo birthrate collapsed in a democratic nation, Canadians would see more French representation in Ottawa. The French birthrate was inordinately high and unless Anglophone Canadians were willing to match this fecundity, or the government was willing to engage in a mass immigration scheme from the British Isles, Canada would soon be a “French-Canadian country.”¹³⁵ The *Journal* was unconvinced that British immigration would be substantial enough to prevent the dominance of French Canada, or that the government would stem the postwar tide of non-Anglo immigrant groups. For the editorialist the only solution for English Canada to maintain dominance, which was the unquestioned necessity for a successful postwar nation in this discourse, “are our cradles.”¹³⁶ In the United Baptist Yearbook of the Maritime Provinces of Canada, 1945 a resolution was passed regarding Post-War Immigration emphasizing the need for British immigration to protect the liberal
democratic values that the British connection ensured, a fact reinforced by the war effort.\textsuperscript{137} The Protestant nature of these values, and the inextricable relationship between liberty, democracy, Britishness and Protestantism for these commentators, is revealed in the Report of the Social Service Board in the yearbook of the previous year, which advocated, paramount to all other concerns, the preservation of religious liberty.\textsuperscript{138} This liberty was, however, the sole jurisdiction of Protestants, as the Russian Orthodox Church, controlled by Stalin’s Communist machine, and the Papacy had proved unable to adhere to Roosevelt’s foundational “Four Freedoms.”\textsuperscript{139}

E.M. Whidden, who would become central to the creation of an ecumenical committee to investigate Protestant-Catholic relations in the Maritimes, had postulated Catholic indifference and even hostility towards Roosevelt’s Four Freedoms in severe terms: “[W]e are pouring out our blood and treasure not only for national independence but to safeguard the free form of government,” an institution which the Catholic Church reacted to coldly, as it was concerned only with the prominence of its own Church within any society. This ideological and theological position meant that the Church believed religious freedom to be foolish, as the Catholic Church was the “one, true Church.” For Whidden, therefore, “the impotence of Catholicism in Protestant countries” prevented the total dominance of a Catholic Church dedicated to usurping the agreed-upon freedoms of the Allied nations.\textsuperscript{140} The Report of the Social Service Board of the United Baptists categorized the “Catholic problem” in Canada into four main points, claiming that the Catholic Church did not believe in religious freedom; pointing out that the Catholic Church was the largest church in Canada and upheld the link between state and church
which Baptists and true Protestants had discarded at the Reformation; the Church was in fact an established church in Quebec which provided the French-speaking hierarchy with a great amount of power which was difficult to estimate; and, finally, that the Catholic Church had learned over its centuries of existence to slowly, patiently manipulate nations by only causing annoyance, not open conflict, to achieve its overall goals of domination. The Report thus warned Baptists and Protestants everywhere in Canada that they should not panic, “but that we watch carefully the liberties wherewith Christ has set us free.”

These Christian liberties were not to be shared by the Catholic Church, as the Church was itself a barrier to the promulgation of liberty in a war torn world.

Lower was equally concerned about the loss of vitality within Protestantism, because he believed that it was the result of the necessary but problematic synonymy of Protestantism with individualism and liberalism. In a remarkable correspondence with Sisco, Lower was convinced that the excessive materialism of the current period was due to a possible ending of the cycle of increasing liberalism and individualism which began with the Renaissance, leading to the “rawest kind of selfishness” of modern society. Protestantism was “painlessly extinguish[ing] [it]self” through its low birth rate allowing the dynamic of Roman Catholicism, which Lower did “not profess to understand,” to continue unabated as it had for centuries. The Protestant notion of history becomes apparent when Lower warned that this Catholic dynamic was causing Catholics “at the moment [to] confidently look […] forward to the end at no great distance of time of the great Reformation heresy,” adding ominously that this would be disastrous for modern society, which was based upon Protestantism: “Unless we can discover a way of life for
our people that will be genuinely spiritual, as I suppose theirs is, they will have their hopes fulfilled.”¹⁴³ Sisco had expressed his fear of a world where “liberal Protestantism” was threatened from all sides by fascism and communism, with the separate phenomenon of “Catholic fascism taking us in the flank,”¹⁴⁴ perhaps referring to the perceived fascist sympathies of Catholic Quebec and its threat to the stability of Canada. Sisco and Lower, while representing in their own minds and to many Canadians the liberal wing of Canadian Protestantism, thus saw a future where their faith was not hegemonic demographically, ideologically or spiritually, as a future blockaded against postwar reconstruction and the reinforcement of Western democracy. Catholicism, once again, was the foil against which they compared their own “de-vitalized” faith tradition; Sisco and Lower, along with many other figures thus far, perceived a gradual decline of a dynamic Protestantism as the basis of English Canadian identity, a process with disastrous results. Their use of Catholicism, that old Protestant bogey, as the potential beneficiary of this decline in this period, and into the postwar era, speaks to the continuing presence and influence of anti-Catholicism in the intellectual and cultural firmament of Canada. WWII saw no decline of religious tensions between Protestant and Catholic in Canada in the face of the totalitarian threat, unlike in other nations; instead, there was an intensification of anti-Catholicism amongst certain Protestant Canadians. Canada remained divided, largely due to the presence of Catholic French Canada, which was perceived by English Canadians as monolithic, fervently reactionary and dedicated to the domination of the nation in the face of a declining Protestantism.
This fear of an emerging totalitarian state due to the crumbling of democracy was tangible in wartime Canada in the face of unprecedented government involvement in the economy and the concomitant slow but palatable formation of a state controlled social security system, including family allowances. In addition the emergence of mass culture and propaganda techniques in Canada that resembled those of the enemy raised the ire of some, as did the very real excesses of the DCR. The Catholic Church was seen as central to this transformation, from its supposed influence over the government in such policies as family allowances to King and his ministers’ refusal to institute full conscription, and even to the interning of “Catholic enemies.” During a debate initiated by CCF MP T.C. Douglas, which protested the raid of a Jehovah’s Witnesses meeting by the RCMP, the perceived dominance of the Catholic Church over the King government emerged once again. The discussion broadened into a debate concerning the actual subversive nature of the Witnesses, who had been banned under the DCR in 1940. It was widely believed by Witnesses that it had been banned for its explicit anti-Catholicism, not its millenarian theology or conception of laws, money and politics as “devil’s tools.” Alberta Social Credit MP George Ernest Hansell asked St. Laurent directly whether it was illegal or subversive to state that one’s church was the true church, as in the case of the Witnesses. In addition, Hansell queried St. Laurent concerning the stance of the Catholic Church, who allegedly believed all other religions were “satanic.” St. Laurent was offended by his challenge, but allowed Liberal MP Arthur Slaght to attack Hansell instead. According to Slaght the true reason behind the internment of Witnesses was the group’s rejection of the primacy of human law over
them.\textsuperscript{150} Another Alberta Social Credit MP, Victor Quelch, posed a reasonable question asking why Doukhobors had not also been interned due to the periodic violent outbursts of their Freedomite wing and that there was a difference between religious controversy and subversion.\textsuperscript{151} Quelch admitted that anti-Catholic tirades were regrettable, yet the law “does make one wonder whether the action against Jehovah’s Witnesses is largely on account of their attitude toward the Roman Catholics, instead of their attitude of a subversive nature.”\textsuperscript{152} Quelch and Hansell were thus convinced that the Catholic Church had enough influence over the government to persuade them to outlaw and arrest members of a religious organization that was unapologetically anti-Catholic. When Liberal MP Leo Richer La Fleche called Quelch’s statement “a shame,” Quelch answered that it was a sincere question being asked by Canadian citizens across the nation. Minister of Mines and Resources Thomas Crerar denigrated Quelch and his colleagues for raising unfounded suspicions that would fundamentally hurt national unity. Quelch concluded his remarks with the “suspicion is there. I am not planting it.”\textsuperscript{153}

The suspicion of French Catholic fascist tendencies and disloyalty was not just present in Canada. In a lengthy article in \textit{Life} magazine, rabid New Dealer and Roosevelt partisan Eliot Janeway accused Canada of failing to uphold the American diplomatic plan of spreading democracy and the New Deal throughout the world, despite the fact that America would not join the conflict for several months. This was due entirely to the “timid, unimaginative Mackenzie King Government” who “continues to be blackmailed by the crudely pro-Axis French Canadian minority (an ideal Nazi Fifth Column).”\textsuperscript{154} This article was condemned in the House by Lapointe when he responded to charges by
nationaliste Maxime Raymond that Canada had only joined the war because it was subservient to Britain. Lapointe believed that statements like Raymond’s allowed ignorant anti-French articles like Janeway’s to exist. Elizabeth Armstrong contributed to this discourse when she published her sympathetic *French Canadian Opinion on the War: January, 1940-June, 1941* for the Ryerson Press’ *Contemporary Affairs* series in 1942. Armstrong stated that while some elements within French Canada had supported Pétain’s Vichy government in France, the majority did not, and even those who supported it saw it as a puppet of the Nazi government and eventually reversed their position. Referring specifically to Janeway’s article, she denied that French Canadians had descended into acting as Fifth Columnists due to the patient attitude of the King government which privileged sincere national unity as opposed to aggressive jingoism. According to historian Paul M. Couture, in his study of the Vichy-Free France propaganda war in Quebec, the province in general was characterized by a profound ambivalence regarding the status of France. While many Quebeckers were elated at the success of the war hero and staunch Catholic Marshall Pétain ruling the “decadent” republic, the undeniable presence of Nazism prevented most from unrestrained enthusiasm. In fact, Britain and America both pressured King and his colleagues to maintain relations with Vichy, King’s “Vichy gamble,” in order to preserve communication with the collaborationist regime in the dark times of the war following the fall of France. In addition, 33 states had recognized Vichy France, including the USA, Canada and the Vatican, which convinced many in Quebec that it was a valid nation, if a troubled one. Louis Phillipe Roy epitomized this cautious acceptance of Pétain in a
reprinted and translated article in *Saturday Night*, where he opposed the Nazi influence in France, but accepted Pétain as its legitimate leader, as did Canada, and a possible “restorer” of the greatness of the nation. This sentiment for Roy did not mean that he was either disloyal or against the Allied cause. The situation was much more complex and the author strove to hold both opinions simultaneously.

Wartime did not lend itself to nuance and English Canada perceived Quebec to be a province full of fascist support and sympathy, using the occasional proclamations of open fascists like Paul Bouchard as evidence and pointing to D’Augustin Frigon, the head of French language CBC, who did use his position to broadcast Vichy propaganda more prominently than Free French polemics. J.V. McAree believed that Vichy sympathy was widespread in Quebec, emanating from the apparently extraordinarily influential elite Order of Jacques Cartier. Sheila Macdonald wrote in her diary that she was often informed by Canadians that French Catholics were zealously pro-Pétain, ultra-conservative and “pre-revolutionary” in their worldview. In a pamphlet for the *America Looks Ahead* series Frank Scott warned Americans that with the advent of the Vichy government, with its corollary revival of Catholicism, French Canada had re-established long atrophied sympathies for France. This affected America due to the vast French Canadian emigration there, which was resulting in the expansion of Catholic influence over American policy. This Catholic “bloc” was believed to be a great supporter of the “Pan-American” policy of non-intervention in Europe, allowing the authoritarian powers to engage in war against the democratic world, and form closer relations to the “Latin and Catholic peoples to the south[.].”
George Rutherford of Winnipeg echoed this sentiment, denying the argument of an article appearing in *Saturday Night* which claimed that Italians had transferred their loyalty to the Pope as he was the only man left in the nation unsullied by the taint of Fascism. Rutherford pointed to several examples of the Pope openly supporting the Fascist regime in order to survive, accusing the article of not “seek[ing] the whole truth” about the Catholic Church.\(^{166}\) In a letter to the editor of the *Globe and Mail*, one Samuel Hawthorne dismissed Villeneuve’s constant proclamations of loyalty to the war effort no matter the statements by certain politicians in Quebec, as the “isolationist attitude of the Roman Catholic Church is [not] a figment of our imagination.” This derived from the Pope himself, the most virulently anti-democratic, anti-British individual on the planet; the Vatican and thus official Catholicism in general, was not neutral in this war but pro-Axis.\(^ {167}\) The *Canadian Baptist* echoed this attitude when it articulated its sympathy for the Pope’s 1944 plea to protect the Papal estate at Castel Gandolfo and the sacred site at Cassino which were being shelled in the Italian conflict.\(^ {168}\) Yet even within this sympathy was a condescending evaluation of Catholicism, as they represented a subtle violation of “true” Christianity since for Baptists it was not the frame of a building that mattered but the spirit of Christianity, which could exist in the humblest hut; no building was worth endangering the lives of soldiers, an unfortunate by-product of trying to protect “irreplaceable relics of the childhood of our civilization.” Not even St. Peter’s Basilica itself could necessitate this sacrifice for what were in essence relics of the past: “there is a sadness of the soul that comes when men choose relics of their past in preference to their hope of the future that mere destruction of a building can never produce.”\(^ {169}\)
Even the calls for peace by the Pope in 1943 drew ire, this time in the *United Church Observer*, which viewed Pius XII’s proclamations as disingenuous and cynical since he had still not excommunicated either Hitler or Mussolini or explicitly condemned them. One letter writer saw the Pope’s call for peace as a sinister effort to undermine morale, noting that the Jehovah’s Witnesses, an inconsequential group, were imprisoned for similar sentiments. Indeed the Catholic Church had not complained when England was attacked, but only now that Italy was the site of conflict. A like-minded writer believed that Protestants needed to question Catholic actions during the war, particularly the perceived support (or at least neutrality) towards the Axis, even if it hurt Catholic citizens because silence would “result in disloyalty to the truth.” Clearly Catholicism was a suspect belief system, perpetuating authoritarianism inimical to Canadian democracy, which was itself based on the British Protestant tradition. For many Protestant Canadians, such an authoritarian force could not be permitted to control or influence the government, particularly at a time of such crisis.

The fear of Catholic control of the Canadian government reached its apotheosis with the infamous claims of T.-D. Bouchard in his maiden speech to the Senate. Bouchard has been characterized by Conrad Black as epitomizing the anti-clerical, business oriented wing of the provincial Quebec Liberal party, and he used a Senate discussion on implementing uniform history textbooks to launch into an anti-clerical diatribe. Bouchard positioned the Order of Jacques Cartier as an insidious group dedicated solely to the revolutionary overthrow of liberalism and the founding of a corporative Catholic state in Canada, possibly even annexing some of Ontario due to its
insatiable hunger for power and land. His speech contained numerous references to the medieval nature of the Catholic Church in Quebec, its static ultramontane proclivities and Castor political ideology. In essence Bouchard believed that the Catholic Church and its associated, often secret organizations, which included Duplessis’ UN, were determined to cause Quebec to regress into “the social and economic status of the Middle Ages” wrecking the multinational, modern and liberal nation of Canada which was formed through conciliation and Confederation. These enemies of liberalism exploited the emotional French Canadian attachment to their language to promote this vicious, narrow European form of clerical nationalism. They had even recently formed a new political machine to achieve their goals, the Bloc Populaire. Bouchard believed that the future of Canada itself as a united, modern nation was at stake. The solution in his mind was for French Canadians to become more exposed to English Canada in order to realize English Canadians were not the callous architects of French Catholic disenfranchisement as well as saving them from the foolish, ethno-religious nationalism of the clerical elite in their own province. In an article summarizing his views for Maclean’s, Bouchard counseled English Canadians that the majority of French Canadians and the majority of Catholics did not agree with this plot to control the country; this majority simply wanted to live in harmony with their neighbours. Bouchard warned good moderate English Canadians—in language suitably alarmist in the context of WWII and the concomitant suspicion that Catholics were sympathetic to fascism—that an aggressive and influential Catholic minority explicitly desired the founding in Canada of a state resembling Portugal, Ireland and Spain.
Bouchard’s charges reverberated throughout Canada, eliciting a diversity of responses from English Canadians. McAree dubbed Bouchard the contemporary Laurier for standing up to the dictates of the reactionary clergy and protecting the core principles of liberalism. McAree ominously added that recent events in Canada proved that Laurier’s earlier victory was only a “skirmish” as the overarching battle against clerical dominance had continued for decades, evidenced most recently by Bouchard. The paper later referred to Bouchard and Laurier as examples of “enlightened” French Canadians frustrated with the ignorant, authoritarian tendencies of their own people due to their subservience to a selfish clergy. When Bouchard was fired from his recently appointed post of president of Hydro-Quebec by order-in-council due to his inflammatory statements, the controversy was exacerbated. The Globe and Mail portrayed Bouchard’s silencing as the initial steps towards Canadian fascism, which Canadians needed to take seriously as there were “French” and “clerical” schools throughout the nation, unhesitatingly linking the rise of fascism with Catholic schools. Orangemen proclaimed Bouchard a future national hero for sacrificing himself for the cause of national unity, a sentiment echoed by the St. Catharines Standard and in a letter from John S. Blair to the Ottawa Citizen, referring to Bouchard as a courageous Canadian “bring[ing] into the open a movement which is like a malignant cancer, sapping the strength and endangering the existence of our national unity.” The Citizen staff editorialized that the firing of Bouchard was yet another example of the “fascist mentality” in French Canada in particular and in Canada in general, while the Owen Sound Sun-Times used Bouchard’s claims as proof to refute naïve English Canadians who
believed that, using Sinclair Lewis’ famous phrase warning about the possibility of
domestic fascism, “It Can’t Happen Here!”

The Orangeville Banner provided the most explicit anti-Catholic commentary,
however, noting that English Canada had “borne with the ill-considered attempts of the
French Roman Catholic Church to make canon law superior to the civil law” adding that
unless Quebec stemmed the spread of this organization English Canada would halt its
tolerance of French Canadian disloyalty in the war effort. In correspondence between
George Drew and George W. Bowness, concerning Drew’s August diatribe against
family allowances as a bribe to Quebec, Bowness agreed with Drew and the Banner
believing that it benefitted not only “the prolific and generally hostile French Canadian”
but also the plans of the Order of Jacques Cartier as revealed by Bouchard. The act would
“effectively hasten and facilitate ‘the revenge of the cradles’” in Canada, something
which Bouchard was trying to warn right-thinking Canadians about. An article in the
Liberal Winnipeg Free Press, which was quite hostile towards the anti-French nature of
opposition to family allowances and always caustic towards Drew, expressed this
concern with the changing politics of Quebec in “Quebec Analysis,” examining the recent
provincial election which resulted in the victory of Duplessis and his UN. The paper
directly attributed the popularity and very existence of the Bloc to the Jesuit intelligentsia
in the province, especially L’Action Sociale Populaire which was the “cradle” where the
Bloc incubated. In addition the Bloc was undoubtedly the intellectual extension of
Groulx’s extremist nationalism, the man who had been named by Bouchard as the leader
of the infamous Order. Beyond the article’s overall message that Duplessis now had the
chance to inculcate the “proper” form of provincial rights instead of the narrow nationalism of the Bloc, he also postulated a direct lineage between those favourite villains, the Jesuits, and the narrow, clerical-nationalists of the Bloc which Bouchard courageously warned Canada about.  

Extremist nationalism in Quebec during WWII is a controversial historical topic in Canada. John English provides an excellent account of Pierre Trudeau’s nationalist, sometimes anti-Semitic, activities during the war. Trudeau even referred to the formation of a revolutionary group of which he may have been a member that had been formed in protest to the domineering, conscriptionist attitude of English Canada. Yet English’s commentary that the “revolutionary” activities of Trudeau and some of his intellectual friends was immature and characteristic of youth “intoxicated” by nationalist rhetoric swirling around them is revealing. Indeed this seems to reflect some of the extremist components of Quebec society at the time; while extremism certainly existed in Quebec and was manifested in its most repellent form as virulent anti-Semitic diatribes and sympathy for the Axis, as Esther Delisle has tragically detailed, extremism existed throughout Canada remaining the preserve of the minority. Despite the unsubstantiated nature of Bouchard’s claims, English Canadian opinion was provoked by his exaggerations about the imminence of the clerical-nationalist/fascist threat in Canada. B.K. Sandwell, a paragon of Liberal respectability, entitled his article on the issue “Bouchard Speech May be First Gun in Quebec Anti-Clerical War.” “[H]e [Bouchard] has been made to appear as a martyr for the cause of liberal thought and broad Canadianism,” in Sandwell’s words, by raising the public’s knowledge of an influential
clerical-nationalist movement in Quebec. Sandwell even admitted that the size of the Order, which was small, did not matter as its fascist doctrines were dangerous enough. Another respected writer for *Maclean’s*, Blair Fraser, advocated moderation by English Canadians when interpreting Bouchard’s alarming claims, reflecting Fraser’s ubiquitous concern with promoting sincere understanding between French and English Canada in the service of national unity. Yet he undercut his own advice when he added that Groulx’s extreme anti-British, anti-participationist nationalism was taught in most schools and that while English perceptions of Quebec as “priest-ridden” and fulminating with violence capable of exploding into civil war were hyperbolic, they had some very real merit. Fraser’s solution to the problem was patronizing. He believed that industrial development of the province would eliminate these grievances as it would provide more prosperity, undermining racial and religious exclusionists, which was only possible by the creation of a viable, irreligious educational system focused on business, social science and which admitted the value of cultures outside of French Canadian Catholicism.

Lorne Pierce added to this chorus of establishment figures concerned about Bouchard’s claims in his treatise on Canadian identity, *A Canadian People*. Pierce wrote passionately in this book about the need for the two cultures to unite around the basic spiritual, artistic identity of Canada to prevent the encroachment of the American cultural colossus. Pierce himself, however, perpetuated a stereotyped portrayal of French Canadian Catholics, viewing them as simple-minded, hard-working and contented, but isolated from the advances of history which allowed them to be easily controlled by “despots” and businessmen. French Canadians were unable to see themselves as part of
the greater Canada, as English Canadians had cynically manipulated their simple desires for decades for political and economic gain, allowing their cultural leaders to convince them that harmful nationalist slogans such as “maîtres chez nous” and “la revanche des berceaux” were appropriate in a modern, democratic nation.\(^{199}\) Bouchard’s claims were truly about the danger of a nationalism that taught children to hate English Canada and the “foreign” concept of democracy. Pierce, for one, quoted these claims approvingly. Thankfully there were reforming voices in Quebec, according to Pierce, pulling the simple habitant away from the worship of the lifestyle of Maria Chapdelaine and the “poison” of the “revenge of the cradles” and into the modern world.\(^{200}\) These sources embody Caccia’s characterization of Sandwell’s vision of Canadian national identity. His was an idealized vision, expressed as a liberal democratic society where minority rights were important through mediation as opposed to social pressure. This mediation obligated the government to encourage a limited form of tolerance and recognition to prevent discontented minorities from disrupting the overall stability of this liberal democracy. Yet this concept thus also implied a certain level of homogeneity in what values were to be tolerated and entrenched in a liberal democratic society.\(^{201}\) It seemed that Bouchard’s warning, as extreme as it was, needed to be heeded by responsible English Canadians in order to save the stability of a nation fighting for its “way of life.”

The introduction of family allowances in Canada raised more precipitous fears of Catholic political dominance in the years 1944-1945, adding the older fear of numerical dominance. While much of the hostility towards family allowances came from Tory partisans (most infamously from Charlotte Whitton) and revolved around seemingly
genuine concerns about federal violation of provincial jurisdiction or the unstoppable rise of the “omnicompetent [sic] state,” scholars have also noted a significant strain of discourse denouncing family allowances due to its alleged support of large, Catholic families. Herbert A. Bruce, Tory MP for Parkdale and former lieutenant-governor of Ontario, adamantly opposed the plan, posing as its staunchest opponent in the House. Bruce agreed with PC leader John Bracken that it was a crass political bribe to Quebec due to the upcoming provincial election as it would benefit Quebec more than other provinces due to the tendency of Catholic Quebeckers to have larger families. Bruce went further than this charge, however, stating “If we are to encourage large families I think care should be taken that they are eugenically of the kind that will be most likely to improve our race. This bill will result in bonusing [sic] families who have been unwilling to defend their country.” This statement demonstrates not only a concern with the breeding capacity of the ignorant, Catholic Quebecker or their influence over the government, but the concomitant wartime problem of their refusal to adequately support the war effort. Bruce was roundly denounced by Quebec MPs such as Frederic Dorion and J. Emmanuel d’Anjou, with Prime Minister King himself labeling Bruce as a man from “‘a past era.’” The House voted unanimously to pass the family allowances bill, as Bruce was absent, and Bruce himself was suspended from the House for replying to King that the bill was “‘a bribe of the most brazen character.’” Despite this overwhelming result in favour of the legislation and the refusal of the Tories in the House to oppose the act, the Tory press portrayed Bruce as a manly hero, standing up for his principles and not bowing to political expediency. These opinions implicitly accepted
Bruce’s eugenically themed speech castigating Quebec’s role in the nation of perpetuating an effeminate, Liberal elite.\textsuperscript{209}

George Drew, recently elected Premier of Ontario, continued Bruce’s condemnations of family allowances filling the role House Tories were either unable or unwilling to play, due to the acceptance of social security by some and the desire of party luminaries to not appear as the old reactionary, imperialist Tory party.\textsuperscript{210} Drew repeated Bruce’s and Bracken’s charge that the family allowances bill was a political bribe to Quebec at a PC rally in Richmond Hill, adding ominously that it was simply one component in the King Liberals’ overarching plan to dissolve the British connection which would inevitably result in the predominance of Quebec over English Canada, particularly Ontario, which was footing the majority of the bill.\textsuperscript{211} For Drew the British connection was the guarantor of democracy; this British form of democracy was inextricably religious (read: Protestant), as it was the “age-long attempt of British people to interpret in temporal law applicable to our daily life the ethical standards of Christianity.”\textsuperscript{212} This concept of democracy would be threatened by the purposeful creation of a French Catholic majority within Canada. Drew boldly broadcast his views on August 9\textsuperscript{th}, 1944 in a controversial address entitled “Where Ontario Stands,” in which Conservative ideological opposition to federal intrusion into the provinces\textsuperscript{213} dovetailed with Drew’s caricatured perception of French Canada and his vehement promotion of conscription. Drew prefaced his discussion by positioning himself and his province behind the ideal of family allowances, but that he resented the fact that the federal government passed the legislation with no consultation with the provinces solely for the
political benefits it would accrue in Quebec. Drew dubbed this policy, and the silence that had accompanied it from most of the nation, appeasement, warning that Canada would pay for this policy “just as the people of the world are paying the penalty of appeasement in the international field” resulting in a nation based on the violation of mutual obligation and equality of advantage. Drew famously asked his audience, in a question that would haunt his career, “Are we going to permit one isolationist province to dominate the destiny of a divided Canada?” For Drew the answer was simple and obvious: eliminate any sense of special privilege for Quebec and stop the implementation of family allowances in order to save national unity. The vision of the Fathers of Confederation, in Drew’s opinion, could never be realized if this “arrogant usurpation of power” was allowed to be carried out unabated. Echoing Bruce, Drew questioned the loyalty of Quebec as a province, denying it any privilege since it “denie[d] an equal share of the obligation to protect their country in its hour of peril.”

Drew received support from correspondents who saw in family allowances another threat from the French Catholic Church to the integrity of the nation. “Standing up for Fair Play” sent him a poem entitled “Family Allowance” which opened with the stanza “Oh its great to be French/and to be so prolific/The money we’ll make/Will be something terrific,” closing with a verse rebuking the French Canadian for his sloth and fecundity: “We won’t have to work/What a heavenly life!/Its so easy on us/If hard on my wife.” Birth control activist A.R. Kaufman congratulated Drew for standing up against the “Quebec Parasites” benefitting from the sacrifice and taxation of the rest of the nation, asking whether secession from the Dominion might not solve the “Quebec problem.”
Others were more explicit in their language. One correspondent even questioned whether Drew truly understood the magnitude of “the power and activity of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy” in relation to the “Quebec problem” in Canada, while another stated that the passing of family allowances was playing into the hands of Quebec “which is no more or less than bowing to the dictates of the Roman Church.”

There is a constant equation of Quebec with the Catholic Church, something which occurred implicitly in much of the discussion over the French Canadian birth rate. Colin S. Macdonald epitomized this perspective when he praised Drew because Canadians had to prevent Quebec from controlling the nation, adding “when we say Quebec, we say ‘The Roman Catholic Church.’” Experience with French Canada was cited by two particularly venomous correspondents. G. Scott of Montreal believed that the legislation was simply designed to drain Canada of millions of tax dollars for “the super-breeders in this Province,” continuing “who are still living in the ‘Dark Ages.’” The ignorant French Catholic and the hierarchy cared nothing for the Allied war effort, according to Scott, but instead only wanted the perpetuation of their race and the creation of a Fascist province in Quebec.

George H. Ross was even more conspiratorial in his denunciations of the legislation which consisted of French Canadians refusing to bear arms in order to purposely cause English Canadians to perish in great numbers and allow the ever-increasing and prolific French Canadians to become the majority in the nation. This perhaps represents the tensions and conflict between English Protestants and French Catholics at its most severe, yet it also demonstrates the ability during wartime of some Canadians to link social
security legislation with the anxiety of a changing nation and the dominance of an “alien” ethno-religious group.

What makes the reaction to Drew’s speech even more revealing is that citizens supporting Drew were not limited to those expressing “vulgar” conspiracy theories, easily dismissed as bigots. The former mayor of Galt, Ontario sent him congratulations, as did the federal PC candidate for Huron-Perth. The publisher of the *Banff Crag and Canyon* thanked Drew for his statements, as did Gladstone Murray, while a representative of the Toronto Weekly News organization believed Drew had opened up a discussion that could prevent a civil war in Canada. A United Church minister, Rev. J.B. Townend, told Drew that he would now vote Tory after years of supporting the Grits. It is his postscript that is most important, however, in the context of this debate, as he assured Drew that he was not an Orangeman or staunchly against Roman Catholics, but that he was simply a concerned man who thought and read for himself. The connotation here is that any Canadian who had independent thought could not come to any other conclusion than that this legislation was designed to support the Catholic Church, a Church which was actively against the war effort. The Suffragan Bishop of the Anglican Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Toronto provided a more scholarly condemnation of Catholicism and French Canada for Drew, furnishing an excerpt from prominent nineteenth century New England historian, and noted anti-Catholic, Francis Parkman’s *Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV* in order to explain the nature of the threat in Canada. In this passage an official complained about the constant meddling of ecclesiastical officials in the running of New France with Parkman explaining that all one needed to understand to
comprehend New France was the relation between the French and their Church with the vaulting ambition of the clergy constantly distorting the development of society. The bishop was appealing to the idea that the Catholic Church had not changed throughout the years; Catholics and Catholicism was trapped in an ossified worldview that could not fit into the modern world. A. Logan from Pembroke also appealed to history, claiming that Drew’s speech and the courage of other Canadians could prevent Canada from being partitioned as Northern and Southern Ireland had been in the twenties. Logan was presumably referring to the benefits family allowances held for prolific Catholics, as he added that in Ontario the family allowances bill was “about as popular as was the Jesuit [sic] Estates Act,” the infamous bill of the 1880s reallocating funds to the Catholic order which elicited D’Alton McCarthy’s anti-Catholic Equal Rights crusade of the late nineteenth century. Logan assured Drew that he could count on the support of Anglophone Ontario in opposing Catholic Quebec’s machinations.

Drew was unsurprisingly forced to engage in damage control after this broadcast, claiming that he had always supported family allowances and denying that he was an old imperialist Tory bigot. Yet even in his denials and attempts to deflect the issue into one solely of provincial jurisdiction, he never wavered on his condemnation of Quebec’s war effort, maintaining that he refused to funnel millions of Ontario tax dollars to the “benefit of a Province whose Legislature representatives had gone on record opposing the effective use of military reinforcements. That was the simple and fundamental issue.” Drew was determined in his construction of a simplistic binary where Canada was either to be Quebec-dominated or fervently loyal to the British connection. His own
position was unequivocal, as expressed to friend and fellow Anglophile Hugh Farthing in an August 1944 letter denying any benefits from a “Quebec-dominated country”: “I would much rather see my children grow up as citizens of the United States than to be citizens of a Canada which was reduced to the low ethical and moral standard of the people of Quebec.”

The Conservative *Ottawa Journal* enthusiastically supported Drew’s charges noting explicitly that the average number of children per French Canadian family was 4.23 while the average in English Canada was a dismal 2.86, citing no sources. This fact was assumed by most of the critics of family allowances, demonstrating the centrality of anxiety towards Catholic fecundity in wartime. The Orange Order expressed this at a large meeting at High Park days before Drew broadcast his speech, adding that one-tenth of the “baby bonus” would go directly into the coffers of the Catholic hierarchy, acting as a form of government sponsored tithe. The speaker, R. Hardy Small, claimed that where Rome was ascendant, as in Quebec, Ireland and Spain, ignorance was inevitable along with hostility to free British institutions. The Church was “‘totalitarian at heart and always advocate that policy.’”

Significantly, Tory MP T.L. Church was present at the meeting, exploiting his audience’s temperament by calling for immediate conscription, which was demanded by Ontario, and denounced St. Laurent for violating the traditions of the Magna Charta through the DCR. Church, in language rife with symbolism at an Orange meeting regarding a French Catholic minister, concluded that under St. Laurent and Liberal policies “‘we are approaching … authoritarian State tyranny.’” An influential segment of the party had therefore fully embraced a Protestant British vision of the nation, portraying this vision as “authentically” Canadian
in its adherence to British values. The ruling Liberals, according to this worldview, were an effete dictatorship undeniably controlled by Quebec and the spoiled Catholic nationalistes that resided within. The party thus became more anti-French and anti-Catholic during the War, particularly in its latter stages with the controversies over conscription and family allowances. This was despite the earlier efforts of some within the party to shed this image, efforts embodied in the selection of the Catholic Manion as leader in 1938.  

The most explicitly anti-Catholic opposition to family allowances came from Silcox, who released a pamphlet for Ryerson Press’ Canada Must Choose series fittingly entitled The Revenge of the Cradles. Silcox was alarmist in tone, repeating the familiar charge that it was a clear bribe for the large families of Quebec, but also that the bill was “the most precipitate and indefensible piece of legislation which a civilized government has ever ventured to pass in wartime.” Silcox saw family allowances by this time as more than just the poorly planned result of the unchecked growth of the technocratic state. This devious revenge was enacted soon after the Conquest, relying on the “natural virility” of the French people. In the present day, however, the hierarchy specifically forbade family limitation or birth control of any form; they discouraged the emigration of French Canadians to the US, pressuring them to emigrate across Canada in essence representing the planned colonization of the rest of the provinces. This was coupled with the constant pressure from Catholic Quebec to stem any immigration from Britain in order to ensure French dominance in Canada as early as 1961. In a particularly vulgar phrase Silcox encapsulated English Canadian Protestant anger over the perceived
disloyalty of Catholic Québécois during wartime, savaging them for expecting benefits when they were unwilling, as Drew and Bruce claimed, to share in the equal burdens of wartime: “they breed while we bleed.” Even with all of this effort modern industrialism had undermined the desire of the Catholic Church to perpetuate large families and, paraphrasing Senator Bouchard approvingly, a system of “medieval fascism.” The hierarchy demanded, through their political influence, that the federal government subsidize large families at the expense of intelligent, small, Protestant ones ensuring that “morons shall inherit the earth” due to the decline in quality of the population along with paving the path for a French, Roman Catholic Canada.

Silcox was proud of this pamphlet, along with Charlotte Whitton’s companion pamphlet *Baby Bonuses: Dollars or Sense?*, released at roughly the same time and attacking family allowances with equal vehemence. He was in contact with Whitton concerning the hostility of one Father Saint Denis towards his open support of contraception and seemingly anti-Catholic attitudes immediately before the release of their pamphlets. Silcox placed his defence of contraception at this time in the context of defending women’s reproductive rights, a cause for which he had stood for years. In a letter to the editor of the *Ottawa Citizen* Silcox responded to Denis’ charges publicly while also providing publicity for his and Whitton’s pamphlets. Silcox attacked the Catholic Church for supporting the coercive power of the state to force intelligent families to support those too ignorant to limit their size. Silcox saw this as promoting totalitarianism, something which he undoubtedly saw as natural for the Catholic Church, stating that Denis was in fact upholding a practice that was “more consonant with
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communistic than with Christian social philosophy,” a charge which caused him to gloat to a correspondent about his cleverness. Silcox had thus eschewed any genuine sense of ecumenism by war’s end, a cause to which he once placed the future of the world itself in the face of materialism and totalitarianism. Instead his narrow, caricatured perception of Catholicism became more prominent in this period, exacerbated by the tensions of war and his apprehensions regarding the postwar world.

Charlotte Whitton became linked in the public mind to Silcox due to the almost simultaneous release of their pamphlets for Ryerson Press, which her biographers believe forever displaced her from the mainstream of social policy thinking. Whitton had long been one of the most vocal opponents of family allowances, often basing her opposition on a conservative (and Conservative, as she was a partisan Tory) antipathy to the bureaucratic, technocratic state usurping the responsibility of the individual citizen. In *Baby Bonuses: Dollars or Sense?* Whitton reflected Silcox’s anger, portraying family allowances as subsidizing the “mentally deficient,” creating a population prone to fascist manipulation. She agreed as well that the act was designed to placate the political demands of Quebec, placing the blame at the feet of the French Catholic Minister of Justice St. Laurent. Whitton was more subtle about her presentation of Catholicism, writing that most “New Canadians” had proved their loyalty to Canada during the two world wars except those of “particular religious attitudes” and French Canada, equating French Catholics with either ethnic pacifist groups or simply their non-French co-religionists. Whitton hyperbolically presented the passage of the allowances act, which was allegedly pushed through the House despite the unanimous vote for second reading,
as “Nazi in its ruthlessness” for not consulting the provinces. Whitton was expressing her anxiety over the nascent totalitarianism she saw in legislation not only being “forced” upon the citizenry, but in the creation of a docile population composed of the lowest classes.

Anxiety over the totalitarian influence of the Catholic Church and its increasing numbers bled into the even more combustible debate surrounding conscription and the perceived French Canadian apathy towards enlistment. Whitton maliciously added in *Baby Bonuses* that French Canada had completely opposed the war effort, benefitting from the death of thousands of true Canadians by gaining employment and breeding. Catholic French Canada was thus presented as an outsider not only from the nation but to the Empire, undeserving of any aid, benefit or sympathy. Family allowances to these figures were nothing more than the expression of a corrupt, increasingly totalitarian government influenced by an equally corrupt, totalitarian province/hierarchy, providing advantages to those who “shirked” their responsibility to the detriment of national unity. Drew was also forceful on these points throughout the war, denigrating the King government as a dictatorship hiding behind platitudes of national unity in order to placate those “elements” in Canada unwilling to sacrifice themselves for the nation. In a remarkable letter to a lawyer friend reacting to King’s recently announced plan to hold a plebiscite to decide whether the Canadian people would “free” the government from its promise to not enforce overseas conscription, Drew expressed his utter distaste with the vacillating politics of the Liberals. Drew believed that the time had come for a “showdown,” preceding Silcox’s language by over two years, between those who
believed in an open partnership with the British Empire and the prosecution of the war effort and those who clearly did not. Drew was furious, subtly framing the French Canadian refusal to enlist in the war effort in the wider context of a totalitarian government engaged in a policy of appeasement with a group hoping to callously benefit from the war:

I do not think the anti-conscription [sic] in Quebec is anything more than a symptom of a much more deeply rooted disease. I have no doubt whatever that with a few exceptions they are strongly anti-British and propose to follow a course which will result in an actual voting majority in Canada within a comparatively few years.260

Drew was thus convinced that French Canadian Catholics were engaged in a purposeful plan to take control of the nation through either refusing to enlist, by influencing the government and, with regards to family allowances, by increasing their numbers naturally. When his friend responded to Drew thanking him for his frank letter, William O. Langdon counseled that the most effective way to promote real national unity, and thus a united war effort, was the abolishing of the separate school entirely. This institution was a hindrance to the achievement of a homogenous population loyal to Canada and the British Empire. Langdon continued by placing suspicion on the fact that famed Catholic philosopher Jacques Maritain, “The chief publicity officer of the Catholics in the Western World,” had been in Toronto for a long period of time. This fact, along with stories of French Catholic desertion in the army, the boisterous rhetoric of French Canadian nationalists in the House and the continued presence of the ambassador from Vichy France in Ottawa caused Langdon to suspect Fifth Column activities amongst the French Catholic population in Canada.261
Conscription remained a controversy for the entire war. For example the *Globe* condemned Shields for proposing forming a “Protestant party” as a threat to national unity. Yet the editorial is careful not to mention that French Catholics had upheld their manpower obligation and based its opposition to Shields’ party largely on the fact that this was a poor response to another narrowly racial and religious party, the French nationalist Bloc Populaire. Abraham L. Feinberg of Holy Blossom Temple agreed with the editorial, dubbing Shields’ effort a “Bloc Protestant” in answer to the Bloc Populaire, which in this rhetorical strategy would represent a “Bloc Catholique.” For Feinberg the most effective way to meet the “political ‘infantilism’” of Quebec nationalists was engaging them at a higher level, not by descending to their childish level as Shields promoted. These editorials ignored the complexity of the political situation in Quebec along with the composition and ideology of the Bloc Populaire. Instead the periodic anti-imperialist or ardent *nationaliste* diatribes of MPs or members were seized upon as evidence that the party was simply a manifestation of the “spoiled child” that was Quebec, prone to emotionalism and fascist sympathies.

These statements express some of the anger over conscription in English Canada. The Tory party, not just some radical elements, further demonstrated its firm commitment to representing the British, Protestant nation in the latter stages of the war in this debate. The ardency of much of the conscriptionism reflected the widespread belief in English Canada, not only amongst members of the PC party, that Catholics, in particular French Canadian Catholics, were not totally loyal to the war effort and were actively influencing the government against fulfilling Canada’s obligations. Daniel Byers has provided a
nuanced analysis of the so-called Zombies, revealing that while more of them were from Quebec than any other province, the percentages were not drastically divergent. There were more unmarried young men in Quebec which caused them to be conscripted in larger numbers immediately for home defence and with the plebiscite of 1942 for potential overseas service. Yet stereotypes emerged immediately that French Canadians were not “pulling their weight” causing J.R. Ralston, the Minister of National Defence and his staff to focus disproportionately on conscripting young Quebeckers. In general the Zombies reflected the population of Canada regarding racial, religious and linguistic composition, while the armed forces themselves were not equipped properly to provide extensive French facilities or services, which caused isolation and further resentment amongst French troops beyond the periodic prejudice of a colleague or officer. None of this would have mattered even if it was published during WWII to those pushing for conscription. French Canada and the authoritarian, medieval Church that was presumed to be supreme within French Canada were disloyal and “true” Canadians had to guard against its incursions despite the fact that some Catholic leaders were viewed as so pro-war they were being denigrated as pawns of “les Anglais” by nationaliste sectors of French Canadian society. This was the sentiment the PC party tried to take advantage of throughout much of the war.

Conscription and the subtle interconnection of anti-Catholic themes played a central role in an important by-election in Ontario held in February, 1945 which reveals the Tory position on Catholicism and French Canada even more clearly. Since General Andrew McNaughton was brought into King’s cabinet in order to save the voluntary
system of overseas service after Ralston’s ignominious departure due to his demands for conscription, McNaughton needed a seat in the House. Some commentators referred to this by-election as historic, signaling a possible sea change in Canada’s manpower policy. King and the Liberals ran a strange campaign relying on the desire of the electors in this rural Protestant Orange riding to agree with them that the sole issue in the by-election was that McNaughton needed a seat to prosecute the war effort. The Tories, however, focused their energies on lambasting Liberals for their controversial conscription policy constantly appealing to anti-French and anti-Catholic themes, ensuring that the by-election would be fought over this issue. Saturday Night and even Time magazine noted this fact in January, 1945, causing a simple by-election to become perceived as a barometer of English Canada’s opinion on King’s manpower policy. The Tory candidate, mayor of Owen Sound Garfield Case, told a crowd in Oxenden that King was asking the “most British riding in Canada” to cover for his mistakes, adding that while the residents of North Grey were “under the British flag” they would not allow the Liberals to dictate their beliefs: “A vote for me … is a vote for the boy in the front line—a boy who comes from North Grey.” Case utilized his “insider” status in the riding, portraying McNaughton as a villainous anti-British outsider promulgating an alien policy of manpower recruitment amicable only to Quebec. This was an insult to North Grey, as Quebec was “lacking in courage, loyalty and resolve, a community which has deteriorated till we find them paying tribute to those who would hamper the war effort,” as he told an audience in Shallow Lake. John Bracken himself came to the riding and made what were eventually revealed as specious claims about Zombies throwing their
rifles overboard to protest serving overseas in order to pillory McNaughton’s manpower policy.277 Bracken repeated the Tory line of “equality of service,” a phrase Granatstein believes had been discredited by the gerrymandering Anglo dominated Union government of WWI and which now was being used by a moderate politician, “dipping into the same barrel of vituperation as that of men such as Rev. Shields.”278 Bracken had been told by former Conservative PM, R.B. Bennett, while in Britain to “Make the keynote of campaign British connection,”” as the ““reputation of Ontario”” was at stake.279 This is exactly what Bracken and the Tories did throughout the by-election, painting Liberal policies as borderline traitorous and certainly “un-British.”

Anti-Catholic sentiment was expressed most explicitly, once again, by Shields when he travelled to the riding. Shields attacked McNaughton viciously and personally in a speech he delivered under the auspices of the CPL at the Owen Sound City Hall, drawing attention to the fact that McNaughton had a Catholic wife, claiming that the Catholic Church often exercised its sinister influence through women.280 Shields linked this marital fact directly to McNaughton’s support of the voluntary manpower policy. It would allow Catholics to stay in Canada and breed while good Protestant Canadians were forced to go overseas and die for the cause of democracy.281 For Shields, very simply, ““a vote for McNaughton is a vote for the Roman Catholic hierarchy and for the further enslavement of Canada.””282 Shields’ incendiary speech garnered much opposition both within the riding283 and from outside of it, most sensationally by Alderman Joseph Matte of the Quebec City Council who called for Shields’ internment (once again).284 Privately, King himself confided to his diary that Shields’ statements were “cruel,” but reflected the
“unpatriotic” machinations of the Tories to inflame racial and religious hatred.\textsuperscript{285} By February 5\textsuperscript{th}, the day of the election, even King had become convinced that the combination of Tory patronage, corruption and anti-Catholicism was a serious challenge to McNaughton’s success.\textsuperscript{286}

Despite this hostility and initial confidence from King many commentators, then and now,\textsuperscript{287} have concluded that religious prejudice was central to Case’s victory\textsuperscript{288} and that Shields represented only the extreme wing of pre-existing Protestant opinion. Wilfrid Eggleston believed that McNaughton’s Catholic wife was central to Case’s victory in a staunchly Protestant riding, despite this being a “deplorable factor … in a country like Canada, but nobody denies [it is] often influential[].”\textsuperscript{289} Journalist John Marshall characterized North Grey as a “typically Old Ontario” area, intensely Protestant and fervently devoted to the British connection.\textsuperscript{290} What is important here is the assumption of the fact by many authors, the “unsurprising” reality that an important government minister running in a Protestant Ontario riding with a Catholic wife and a record of support for Quebec was doomed. McNaughton himself was convinced that attacking his wife’s religion decided the election,\textsuperscript{291} perhaps ignoring the additional factor of poor Liberal organization.\textsuperscript{292} Whatever the overall cause of the Tory victory, anti-Catholicism along with its corollary during wartime, anti-French Canadian sentiment, was a major factor. Catholics were perceived by many in Canada as disloyal to the full prosecution of the war effort, and the King government was understood to be hopelessly beholden to this “bloc.” Indeed when the by-election was over and preparations for the upcoming federal election were begun, King noted in his diary that North Grey had proven to him that the
campaign would revolve largely around “my friendship with Quebec and attacks on the Catholic influence.”

King and the Liberals would win the 1945 election despite the view of some that they were the party of French Canada, campaigning on an optimistic platform of reconstruction, social services and victory over totalitarianism. Yet it quickly became apparent that a new, powerful totalitarian threat loomed over the horizon, one perhaps even more threatening than Nazi Germany: the USSR. In the Cold War world that followed WWII virulent tensions between political, ideological and religious groups flared up once again. Martin E. Marty has provided a useful analogy in his study of American religion in the middle decades of the twentieth century. For Marty the various religious groups in America resembled the residents of Crete in ancient days, a people who were infamous for perpetually fighting each other until an external enemy appeared which caused them to briefly coalesce, then to inevitably splinter again after the threat dissipated but this time with more personal knowledge of their internal enemies. Marty believes this is exactly what occurred during WWII and the subsequent Cold War in America. Protestants, Catholics and Jews coalesced, or syncretised to use the Cretan metaphor once again, during the battle against the Axis, only to engage in conflict for the future of America once again in the Cold War. This latter conflict, however, was engaged in with more understanding of the “other.” In Canada WWII did not see as clear a syncretisation of forces as Marty describes occurred in the US, as demonstrated in this chapter. This was chiefly due to the presence of French Catholic Quebec as a distinct culture centralized in one province which did not embrace conscription. Resentment
towards French Canada’s perceived denigration of the war effort would linger for decades, heavily influencing postwar attitudes towards French Canadians and Catholicism. It also influenced the maintenance within the PC party of a fervent Britishness embodied in representing Canada as a Protestant nation, unlike in the Tory party in Britain. Drew’s selection as the leader of the federal party in 1948 signaled the party’s postwar acceptance of this wartime identity and furthered the PC party’s identification as the defender of the Canadian Protestant tradition for some years.

In the Cold War, however, the almost exclusive focus on French Canadian Catholicism which was apparent during the war disappeared, replaced by a wider concern with the role of the allegedly pro-Axis, reactionary, authoritarian Catholic Church in a world now polarized between two superpowers. Catholic loyalties were once again viewed with suspicion, as were the totalitarian inclinations of their religion, as English Canadians strove to reconstruct Canada as a modern, liberal, progressive nation firmly on the side of democracy. In a letter to Drew immediately before the 1945 federal election Hugh Farthing expressed this emerging fear of Catholic dominance in a changing world intermingled with the wartime resentment towards Quebec. Farthing saw the continuing prevalence of Quebec in Canada’s political, ideological and spiritual life, along with the apathy and materialism of English Canada as threatening to “reduce Canada to the national level of a Latin-American republic” in the postwar world; or, in other words a weak nation presumably controlled by a totalitarian Catholic Church. The consequences of becoming a weak Catholic nation in the world were perceived to be dire.
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every turn. Lower caustically attacked George Drew for these very reasons. Instead, the intellectual trajectory of liberal-progressive nationalists like Lower represents a subject that has been neglected in the study of postwar Canadian cultural and intellectual history: the prominence of anti-Catholicism as an organizing mental framework and cultural reference point for intellectuals, politicians, social activists and Protestant cultural leaders to delineate their vision for Canada in the modern world and to construct an English Canadian national identity. Unlike wartime, however, anti-Catholicism was not largely devoted to criticism of a particular ethnic or linguistic group or limited to nativist hostility to immigrants. Anti-Catholicism in the Cold War became “universalized;” it became partially detached from this past ethnic-linguistic-racial framework, being characterized by the comparison of the Catholic Church with the various Communist regimes in Europe due to its totalitarian, and thus alien, nature in a democratic country.

This vision rested upon a definition of the Catholic Church as ossified, trapped in a stagnant medievalism and unable to move with the rest of Canadians into the future. Catholicism was cast as a religion and system of thought with totalitarian tendencies, much like the enemy, the Soviet Union. Catholicism was believed to prohibit freedom of expression, thought and self-realization and breed disloyalty. Yet Catholicism was not solely cast as a medieval delusion. It was perceived as a threatening form of counter-modernity or, along with Communism, as a rival/alternative form of modernity, especially harmful when paired with the concern that Protestantism was declining in influence and vitality. Steven Pincus has discussed this phenomenon of rival modernities in the context of seventeenth century England and the “first modern revolution” of 1688. According to
Pincus, James II’s conception of modernity revolved around the nature of the state and was heavily influenced by the France of Louis XIV: Catholicized subjects but without a papal overlord along with a centralized, rationalized bureaucratic interventionist state under the absolute sovereignty of the king. His rivals, on the other hand, were influenced by the Dutch conception of the state. They agreed that only a modernized English state could compete in the European theatre, including centralization and interventionism. This group, however, advocated political participation, not absolutism, adding a modicum of religious tolerance and a devotion to encouraging English manufacturing, not the landed, agrarian empire they perceived in James’ regime. It was, therefore, not a conflict between pre-modern medievalists and modern capitalists but between two forms of modernity based on different conceptions of the state and political relationships. In Cold War Canada, the Catholic Church represented a similar phenomenon to Protestants striving to understand and influence the modern world. It was a highly organized, systematic, even totalitarian alternative to liberal democracy, which was often believed to be synonymous with Protestantism. Protestantism, however, as a faith tradition was perceived by some intellectuals and public figures to be in decline due to an increase in material comforts, the growth of the state and a general complacency amongst the population, furthering the anxieties of Silcox, Lower and Innis, for example, about what the world (and Canada) would look like without the traditions Protestantism entailed. In addition, during these years the Church itself was believed to have shifted, increasingly resembling a mainstream North American church. In this worldview this was not occurring because the Church was finally “protestantizing” after centuries of resistance,
but in order for the Church to gain more influence in a divided and confused world. In this tense atmosphere, who “won” this contest between systems was vital.⁶

A separate intellectual thread was present as well, concerned with how the Catholic Church would exacerbate tensions due to its inherently reactionary nature. Among many mainstream Protestant clergy and laity, the new ecumenical movement had gained currency in this postwar era and the surrounding discourse was infused with these perspectives of the Catholic Church. Ecumenism was seen as vitally important to curb the power of international Soviet materialism, but many Protestants feared the inevitable dominance and bullying of the Catholic Church in any ecumenical effort. Again, the belief that Catholicism was cloaking its true goal, domination, in “liberal” language and ecumenism was a powerful aspect of this discourse. The presence of this sentiment in Canada builds on Will Herberg’s belief, expressed in his influential sociological survey of American religion, *Protestant-Catholic-Jew: An Essay in American Religious Sociology*, that Protestant (and Jewish) suspicion of the Catholic Church’s involvement in ecumenical relations was a defining characteristic of American interfaith cooperation. Many Americans saw the Church as attempting “corporate aggrandizement” as opposed to true cooperation.⁷ These views all represented the Catholic Church as a monolithic and internationally powerful organization that threatened the freedom and stability of the Cold War order.

To further distinguish the anti-Catholicism of the Cold War era, it reflected the gradually shifting position of Canada in the world towards North America more than ever. The process of Canada becoming linked increasingly to the US at the expense of its
British connection has been noted frequently, but with regards to this discussion of anti-Catholicism and identity there was no simple transformation of Canadian discourse into American. Anti-Catholicism certainly reflected the American concern with totalitarianism, particularly when discussing the similarities of the Catholic Church and the Communist regimes, embodied in the alarmist writings of American Paul Blanshard. There remained, however, a strong British component to Canadian anti-Catholicism, expressed through such obvious means as loyalty to a Protestant monarch or, more subtly, by praising the protection that historic British institutions provided Canada throughout its history against absolutist incursions. Thus, while anti-Catholicism in Canada embraced the American intellectual concern over the competing totalitarianisms of Soviet Communism and Roman Catholicism in violating the sanctity of liberal democracy, this was often couched in familiar British language creating a particularly English Canadian anti-Catholicism during this period.

Anti-Catholicism in the postwar era was again not restricted to those figures that have often been associated with the reactionary fringe of Canadian society, such as the Orange Order or Rev. T.T. Shields into the postwar era. It was not limited even to more traditional conservatives representing the staunchly Anglophone wing of the Tories, such as Drew, as anti-Catholicism was present and influential within progressive and liberal circles. Lower, a self-confessed devotee of liberalism, most forcefully demonstrates this in this era. In C.P. Champion’s terms, Britishness was a concept shared by all of the prominent figures of the postwar era, even the King-St. Laurent Liberals that many Tories, such as John Farthing, Donald Creighton and Red Tories such as Eugene Forsey,
believed were relegating the British tradition to “other” status. According to Champion there was an unwavering belief in the intrinsic liberality of British institutions and traditions amongst the “Eminent Pearsonians,” and their reforms and intellectual positions actually promoted an alternative vision of Britishness, embracing tolerance and individualism while simultaneously reinforcing a uniformly liberal society. Catholicism did not fit into the framework of either concept of Britishness; it was instead viewed by some as a relic from a religiously foolish past. Paradoxically, Catholicism was not just a form of anti-modernity, but instead offered an alternative, perhaps counter-modernity at a systematic level. As Pincus has outlined, this Catholic form of modernity, especially how it was perceived by Protestant Canadians in this case, has to be taken seriously, not dismissed. It adds complexity to the teleological framework that positions Catholicism and Protestantism as inevitably at odds due to theology and relation to the modern world. Instead the Catholic was seen, and feared, as both pre-modern and (counter-) modern in their belief system, providing a united front, unlike Protestantism, against the materialism of the time. This was particularly threatening for many Protestant Canadians, as implicit within their anti-Catholic discourse was anxiety about the ability of Catholicism to infiltrate and perhaps undermine liberal democratic life, fooling the populace with falsely “liberal” rhetoric, facilitating and hastening the demise of Protestantism as a spiritual and political force. Anti-Catholicism cannot be seen as a fringe element in the worldview of English Canadians in the first half of the twentieth century, because it was an essential component of how self-identified liberal, progressive or conservative Canadians understood a changing world and Canada’s place within it. As Michael Gross’ study The
War Against Catholicism has demonstrated with regards to the Kulturkampf in Germany, anti-Catholicism was never simply about shedding the weight of an archaic institution but was integral to the formation of liberal identity. The “visionaries of a modern age” in Germany, who were dominated by an idealism bred in the Enlightenment, could only perceive a social order excised of the Catholic Church. In Canada this was also a complex process in the postwar period in which the Church was envisioned as both threat and rival. The sometimes-contradictory nature of Canadian Cold War anti-Catholicism is reflective of what Gross has labeled “the problem of anti-Catholicism as a prescription for modernity.” While the content of anti-Catholic discourse changed over time, anti-Catholicism was not an episodic aberration in an otherwise civil discourse in Canada either. What is remarkable about this sentiment is the consistency of anti-Catholic themes, rhetoric and tropes over time and throughout the intellectual, denominational and political spectrum.

The postwar period in Canada has been characterized in a multitude of ways within Canadian historiography. Magda Fahrni and Robert Rutherford have refuted Michael Gauvreau and Nancy Christie’s claim that this era necessitates a reconstruction of periodization as the initial postwar decade was largely transitional from older institutional traditions while the years 1955-1968 were those characterized by a perceived social consensus and mass consumerism. Central to Gauvreau and Christie’s framework is that “consensus” existed in perception and not in reality. Canadian society instead was much more complex and nuanced. Change was very gradual, occurring within existing social, political, economic and intellectual systems; it was not the simple competing
binary of tradition and modernity but instead a continuum underlying the rhetoric of radical change.\textsuperscript{17} Fahrni and Rutherdale have posited that the importance of the postwar era from 1945-1975 as a whole lies in patterns of conflict and dissent between social groups with the powers that promoted social and intellectual homogeneity, rejecting those historians who locate this era solely within the context of the politics and diplomacy of the Cold War.\textsuperscript{18} Although Fahrni and Rutherdale strive to undermine this Cold War master-narrative, they do reproduce a master-narrative based on the dialectic of dissent-hegemony. I will deconstruct this model by analyzing organic intellectuals, along with “fringe” religious figures and politicians, who were attempting to define a liberal nationalist consensus.\textsuperscript{19} This process itself reveals the constantly shifting nature of Canadian nationalism and its often contradictory elements. Despite differences, these historians (and this author) agree that closely beneath the surface of what other historians have viewed as a liberal consensus there was always negotiation concerning the meaning of even the most general values in society, such as liberal nationalism and democracy,\textsuperscript{20} and, in the context of this chapter, membership in a truly Christian society.

What is also demonstrated by this analysis is that the emergence of inclusive liberal nationalism in Canada was not as smooth a process as outlined by Jose Igartua in his 2006 study \textit{The Other Quiet Revolution}. While Champion’s anglophilia is problematic, his contention that conservative ethnic Britishness did not collapse suddenly in the 1960s in the face of encroaching liberalism and multiculturalism, as Igartua claims, is cogent for this analysis. There was no smooth transition in Canada from an ethnic, conservative nationalism to an inclusive liberal nationalism in the postwar era, much as
imperialism did not decay following the First World War, as Carl Berger posited in his *The Sense of Power*.\textsuperscript{21} Those who have promoted “autonomist nationalism,” such as Lower and Skelton, have proved influential, according to Phillip Buckner, in making any study of British identity in Canada seem imperialist. Yet in reality Lower himself, and Skelton as demonstrated in the first chapter, shared values and prejudices with these so-called “imperialists” while simultaneously challenging their dependence on the mother country for inspiration. In fact, according to Buckner, attacks on “imperialism” in the 1950s and 1960s by the Liberals were highly political, designed to undermine Quebec separatism and maintain the integrity of the Canadian nation and did not necessarily represent a widespread attitude hostile to Britain.\textsuperscript{22} The transformation of Canadian identity was a messy process in which proclamations of inclusivity were just as often based on British Protestant values, which were assumed to be “universal” in the face of parochial challenges from institutions such as the Catholic Church. This contingent universality thus defines the first two decades of the postwar era in terms of national identity, particularly in its relation to anti-Catholicism. English Canadian nationalism may have begun to be disentangled from the strict ethnic chauvinism of the Tories in WWII, but the process of formation of this more inclusive identity in the postwar era did not empty it of exclusionary tendencies or prejudicial opinions on those groups that still did not “fit.”

Cold War fear of Soviet Communism was based not only on its perceived threat to world peace but also because Communism was interpreted as the antithesis of the principles that the Western world had fought so hard to maintain in World War Two.\textsuperscript{23}
Dianne Kirby notes in her introduction to an edited collection that the “inherently” democratic aspects of Christianity were emphasized in this era in contrast to the materialism and totalitarianism of atheistic Soviet Communism.\(^\text{24}\) Yet this fear of totalitarianism, and its inevitable crushing of human expression and a functioning modern society, included within its orbit more than simple hatred of the Soviets. The Catholic Church became a target of explicit attacks and quiet suspicion within many circles due to a perceived similarity to the Soviet Union in structure and outlook, particularly in its international character and rigid hierarchy. This sentiment was prominent amongst the “vulgar” anti-Catholic organizations, publications and individuals, embodied in the militant Protestant Action, spearheaded by the future Toronto mayor Leslie Saunders,\(^\text{25}\) with a masthead sporting the Union Jack and reading “Militant, Independent, Courageous.” In one issue Saunders exposed what he viewed as the insidious Catholic conspiracy to subvert American liberties and that the Church’s public opposition to Communism was simply a ruse; Catholics could not assimilate into North American society as their Church opposed the fundamental liberties of the modern world, as evidenced by its doctrine and partnership with the fascist powers during WWII.\(^\text{26}\) In another editorial Saunders was even clearer in his views, stating that communism was more successful in Catholic countries due to their authoritarian nature. The Catholic Church was in fact a Trojan horse that had hoodwinked the public since its collusion with fascism, and indeed the free world needed to ignore the claims that it was the bulwark against international communism.\(^\text{27}\) Even his “Letters to the Editor” section was full of equations of the totalitarian Catholic Church with Soviet Communism, with a Mrs. Blake
proclaiming that the militant Protestant would always oppose dictatorship, whether Papal or Soviet, and, expressing a particularly Canadian aspect of anti-Catholicism, would thus not let the French language overtake Canada.\textsuperscript{28} The language increased in vitriol with a letter from Lay Preacher, who took Saunders’ advice for organized Protestantism to be militant and evangelical quite literally:

McCarthyism is the stepping stone to a Roman Catholic America. … It is the Catholics’ continual bid for power and we shouldn’t fail to use every weapon at our command. Comparing the Catholic church [sic] to communism, I’d prefer communism one hundred times. It is time that Protestants made it clear that we know we are being sold down the river, and unless this is brought to an end, we shall use every means at our disposal to bring before the people the shameful record of this antichrist and enemy of mankind. Too long have we hesitated to speak the whole truth and I myself am afraid, but would be willing to do my part in a campaign to at least enlighten the Protestants of the danger of our tolerant attitudes towards the Roman Catholic church [sic].\textsuperscript{29}

Contained within this brief letter are numerous tropes of anti-Catholicism that have existed for centuries, such as the perceived conspiracy by the Catholic Church to overthrow the civil power, the related idea that Catholics were thus inherently disloyal, and finally the accusation that the Pope himself was Antichrist spoken of in the Bible.\textsuperscript{30} What was different in the heated atmosphere of the Cold War was that the Catholic Church had a new enemy to be compared to and measured against and Protestant Canadians were more openly interested in Catholic transgressions of liberal democracy. Ultimately this rhetoric allowed the Church to be suspected of collusion and disloyalty.

This sentiment was not limited, however, to the “vulgar” element of Canadian society. C.E. Silcox was also a prominent, mainstream proponent of this characterization. The comparison of Catholicism with socialism and fascism noted earlier by Silcox would continue through this segment of his career, being a central point in a lecture he gave to the St. Andrew’s Young People in 1948, revealingly entitled “Why are We Protestants?”
In this lecture Silcox outlined one of his major concepts, the idea that Christians and Jews needed to cooperate in the Cold War world to stem the tide of materialism. He also emphasized that religious indifference, which he defined as the acceptance of the ridiculous and theologically untenable, was a threat to the integrity of Protestantism. For Silcox the weakness of Protestantism was its “sentimental and invertebrate liberalism and its bumptious and inadequate fundamentalism.” In this sense Silcox wanted to differentiate Protestantism from Catholicism and outline the former’s superiority in meeting modern challenges by promoting true cooperation as it did not rely on idolatry, sacerdotism, papal infallibility or the Immaculate Conception of Mary. Indeed in answering the eponymous question, “Why are we Protestants,” Silcox answered that it was first and foremost due to their families, but secondly outlined a broadly liberal view that placed Protestantism at the centre of democratic culture. Protestants had been raised in a society based on the principles of the Reformation in Western and Northern Europe. Most important was the Christian doctrine of man, which placed the individual in the centre of a democracy; if that was removed “the house is swept clean for occupation by the totalitarian, statist, devils.” According to Silcox, the Catholic Church was beginning to realize that its political role in the world was finally diminishing and thus was coming closer to Silcox’s ideal of the “non-idiotic” Protestant vision of politics, which followed Christ’s example of “rendering unto Caesar.” Yet Silcox was not entirely convinced, as he warned that Catholicism was in fact an underlying cause of much of the modern world’s ideological and spiritual crises, partially embodying the totalitarian spirit. Silcox asked his audience rhetorically “Can democracy and Catholicism really flourish side by
side?” He answered characteristically: “[f]or the most part, fascism and communism which the Church fears flourish in countries which have largely been informed by its authoritarian spirit. They are not so menacing in countries which have retained the Protestant respect for the individual and insistence on democratic techniques [.]”

It is this characterization of Catholicism as authoritarian in spirit and structure and disloyal to Canada that Silcox consistently referred to from the mid-forties and through to the early sixties. Implicit within this discourse, however, was the related anxiety that Catholicism was in fact “protestantizing” by shedding its old ultramontanism, consciously making itself appear more politically acceptable in a fiercely liberal democratic society. As previously stated in the Protestant Action article, the Church was attempting to “hoodwink” the public into believing that the Church was now “normal,” not a totalitarian aberration in the modern world like the Soviet Union. Indeed, this fear of “infiltration” of polite society by “alien” ideologies was present in attitudes towards both Catholicism and Communism. It was a major concern in the early Cold War among Protestant leaders, conservative and liberal, in the US and, regardless of its omission from the historiography, this sentiment was just as powerful in Canada, exacerbated by the residual hostility from the tense war years and the continued presence of Catholic Quebec.

Despite his protestations that he was attempting to promote Christian unity and a united front for liberal democracy, Silcox’s anxiety over the potential Catholic dominance of Canadian society in this period is palpable. The theme of the Catholic Church being inherently opposed to Canadian liberties and resembling the totalitarianism of the Soviet Union continued into a lecture series he gave, “Protestantism and Roman Catholicism:
Their Similarities and Differences,” which took place at the Yonge Street United Church in early 1955. In the initial advertisement for the series the Cold War context is explicitly stated, outlining how the “hot war” between Protestants and Catholics had been over for many years, which had resulted in increased tolerance and understanding. However, the cold war was not over between them, and this tolerance and understanding was dangerous as it produced religious indifference, something which Silcox feared as leading to irreligion and the acceptance of “foolish principles.” In the advertisement for the series mutual understanding is equated with discussing the faults of Catholicism and the books listed as helpful guides to Protestant-Catholic relations are noted anti-Catholic texts, such as Blanshard’s various books warning against the influence of the Catholic Church in the postwar world, a book about intermarriage by James Pike, the future author of the anti-Catholic tract *A Catholic in the White House* regarding the election of John Kennedy, and *What’s the Difference?: Protestantism and Roman Catholic Beliefs Compared* by Arthur G. Reynolds. In this latter book Reynolds claimed he was not trying to exacerbate tensions between the two Christian groups, yet states that Protestants rightly viewed Catholicism as a corrupted form of Christianity and that while they may respect individual Catholics, this did not mean they accepted Catholicism as equal to the truth of Protestantism. Reynolds continued to mend relations between Catholics and Protestants by referring to the pagan worship of Mary in the Catholic Church as well as its continuing abuse of spiritual power through the Vatican and its false positioning as the representative of true Christianity. What is clear in these recommended texts and in Silcox’s own
belief is that relations needed to be mended and ecumenism promoted, but not at the expense of the inherent superiority and truthfulness of Protestantism.

Silcox saw the Catholic Church in this new postwar world as an intrinsically authoritarian church that was able, and often had, paved the way for totalitarianism, in the form of Soviet Communism, Fascism or Nazism. In his introductory lecture of this series Silcox stated that with the exceptions of Estonia and East Germany, who were forced by a powerful military to conform, those countries that had been subsumed by totalitarianism were either Catholic or Orthodox, seemingly equating the two major non-Protestant Christian traditions. In a revealing edit, Silcox tried to moderate his language, conceding that one could not only blame Catholicism, which he has redacted in the original document and replaced with “authoritarian religion.” This is significant as it either signifies his desire to also attribute responsibility to Orthodoxy, or simply that for Silcox Protestantism was the only truly democratic faith. Even after this seeming thaw in his rhetoric, however, Silcox points to the fact that Hitler was a Catholic, that Mussolini was raised Catholic, that Yugoslavian strongman Tito was a Catholic, as were the horrifying Croatian fascists the Ustaše, and that Stalin himself had been raised in an Orthodox seminary. Silcox asked the rhetorical question, in a very similar vein to Saunders, “does not an authoritarian religion of the Catholic type, unless it is adequately challenged and continually modified by a religion of the Protestant type, inevitably tend to produce a state of mind which, when it finally rebels … carries over the authoritarian emphasis and seeks to secure its revolution by a new form of totalitarianism?” It was thus the role of Protestantism in the world to prevent spiritual totalitarianism from being
replaced by political or economic totalitarianism, or even vice versa. Protestant nations, such as Canada, the USA and Britain, had been forged religiously and intellectually from the traditions of the Reformation, and thus of true Christianity, freedom and democracy. They had challenged a hierarchically structured Church and now were better prepared than other nations to combat another totalitarian menace. While Catholics needed to be worked with, their religion was not to be respected, a fact that Silcox viewed as inextricable with ecumenism and cooperation. The anti-Catholicism present in this language is portrayed as progressive and as protecting democracy worldwide. Indeed Silcox closed his lecture by referring to the fact that the Archbishop of Chicago had refused to allow any Catholic from attending the meeting of the WCC, not addressing the fact that figures such as Silcox made the environment problematic for Catholics to attend. Instead he made yet another explicit proclamation comparing the Church and the USSR: “this refusal seemed … in the light of the world crisis … short-sighted, and it may prove calamitous for the Church itself as was the policy of the hierarchy which, in the first half of the sixteenth century, hastened the Protestant Reformation. To the Protestant mind, it resembles too much the technique practiced by the Kremlin.”

Silcox’s concern with Catholicism went even deeper, however, and was expressed in a particular reading of Western history. In a letter to the famous historian and communications theorist Harold Innis, Silcox detailed the perceived connection between the shallow Protestantism of the modern day and Catholicism. Silcox agreed with Innis’ sentiment from the lecture “The Church in Canada” that the church in recent years had completely lost its concern with ideas or philosophy, limiting itself to planning and
“pushing people around,” becoming in many ways another arm of the totalitarian state and its obsession with sociology and statistics. For Silcox the major problem of Western Christianity and its trouble with dealing with the new postwar world dated as far back as Constantine, when the religion he founded, specifically Roman Catholicism, became concerned with the society as a whole instead of just spiritual salvation. This resulted in a Christianity that was only concerned with social problems, such as liquor consumption, reducing itself to superficial social action as opposed to dealing with the fundamental problems of a hedonistic and divided world. Silcox’s ability to causally link his distaste for a reductionist social Christianity in the United Church and modern Protestantism with Catholicism is breath-taking in its historical scope and demonstrated the depth of his antipathy to the doctrines and structure of the Catholic Church.

Innis himself had a slightly different concern about the role of the Catholic Church in the Cold War world, namely that it was a destabilizing force with a hyper-centralized power base. While Innis’ antipathy to all concentrations of power has been noted in the scholarly literature as a major aspect of his intellectual framework, he specifically referred to Catholicism in letters to his friends and fellow academics. Carl Berger, in his celebrated analysis of the English Canadian historical tradition, provides such examples as Innis describing University of Saskatchewan economist and favourite disciple George Britnell as “a Catholic but the most liberal I have ever met!” qualifying Britnell’s Catholicism and Innis’ association with him within an acceptable context. Innis also once resigned over the bestowing of the Lorne Pierce medal to William Bovey for his French Canadians To-Day, ostensibly because he believed only
scholarly merit and not politics should decide the medal, but privately told Lower
conspiratorially that “French Canadian influences” had been behind the event.\textsuperscript{50} The
newspaperman George V. Ferguson recalled that Innis only referred to Catholics as
“Romans,” but Ferguson stressed that this terminology was due to his fear of the Catholic
concentration of power.\textsuperscript{51} In one professional exchange Innis was sent a list of people to
recommend to United College for jobs, one of them being M.P. O’Connell. O’Connell
was noted specifically as being a Catholic, but one who had married a Protestant and
often attended United Church.\textsuperscript{52} Innis had recommended him two years earlier to Gordon
Blake, head of the Department of Economics at that institution, acknowledging “I suspect
that, since he is an R.C., it would not be easy to appoint him.” Gordon responded that he
knew O’Connell quite well, continuing on a positive note that “[t]he matter of religion is
admittedly a problem, although possibly not an insurmountable one. From what I
know of
him I would say he was a good man.”\textsuperscript{53} Significantly Innis had been sent a letter some
years before this concerned with the fact that United College seemed obsessed with the
supposed left-wing tendencies of some of its faculty and that Canada was allegedly
becoming increasingly non-Anglo-Saxon and Roman Catholic.\textsuperscript{54} Innis never responded,
but perhaps Robert MacGregor Dawson’s statement at the end of his 1952 letter is telling,
namely that while O’Connell was a good man for the job, his religion, even tempered by
his wife, would not gain him any friends in that institution.\textsuperscript{55}

Innis’ concern over Catholicism far transcended professional concerns. In one
letter to friend and fellow academic G.S. Graham dated May 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1947, Innis expressed his
concern about the control that Americans were already exerting over Canada’s foreign
policy with regards to the Russians, adding ominously that “[o]ne day we shall have the
Roman Catholic Church and the French Canadians attempting to conscript us to fight
Russia. But that I hope will be in the distant future.”  

For Innis the Catholic Church, along with the aggressive USA and Soviet Union represented a destabilizing and reactionary force in an already tense world. Innis was notable for travelling to Russia in the immediate postwar period to attend the 220th Anniversary of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and was intensely concerned with promoting understanding between the two major powers and self-knowledge amongst what he saw as the “Anglo-Saxon powers.”

He feared that nationalism and other fanatical forms of ideology, including blind adherence to liberalism and capitalism embodied in the United States, were overtaking the world and that he was being forced into an acceptance of a so-called “third world” as opposed to the binary of Russian Communism and Western capitalism. In this atmosphere Innis had no sympathy and indeed scorn for the Catholic Church, as seen in a later letter to Graham discussing an upcoming visit to Canada by the latter: “It will be good for you to get a breath of fresh air in Canada—if there is any left by the time you get here. Our great menace is the ‘vendus’ [?] and the anti-communists in R.C. I was amazed at the return of anti-Catholicism evident in the United States. They seemed to have overplayed their hands on the Communist racket.” In this short phrase not only does Innis refer to the prominence of anti-Catholic feeling in the United States at this time, much of it provoked by the fact that Senator Joe McCarthy was himself a Catholic, but he accepted this premise and sentiment as it was the Church which was threatening the stability of the postwar world by acting as a reactionary force. Innis therefore was
dedicated to the elimination of fanaticism, ideological rigidity and the inevitable
prejudices that resulted, but accepted the fact that anti-Catholicism was a viable and
legitimate intellectual and cultural aspect of the Cold War.

Innis’ friend and correspondent Arthur Lower represents another aspect of anti-
Catholicism in Canada in the Cold War age. While Lower was concerned with
maintaining individualism in Canada in the face of the Soviet threat—much like Innis—he was primarily concerned with the maintenance of the liberal democratic tradition of
Britain in Canada and the concomitant fear of the growing immigrant and specifically
Catholic population of the nation breeding disunity. Lower’s complex and seemingly
contradictory worldview and his prolific pen make him a difficult figure to outline, as has
been demonstrated earlier. The same man who wrote the letter to Pickersgill that opened
this chapter could also write a letter to The Native Son of Winnipeg in 1944 condemning
the authors for using a source from the Orange Lodge, “the most anti-Canadian and one
of the most illiberal organizations existing on Canadian soil,” to oppose refugee
settlement in Canada.\textsuperscript{61} Lower’s commitment to nationalism was clear, but he held
liberalism, and thus Christianity in his mind, as the true basis of Canadian policies: “As
you know, I am a staunch supporter of anything that will forward the cause of Canadian
nationalism, but that nationalism must be liberal in its outlook[.] … True liberalism,
which comes close to true Christianity, must rank above nationalism.”\textsuperscript{62}

What is necessary to truly comprehend Lower’s position on Catholicism is an
analysis of his view of liberalism, which for him was fundamentally Christian. Lower’s
devotion to his conception of liberalism, particularly during the Cold War, is most
comprehensively detailed in his 1954 book *This Most Famous Stream: The Liberal Democratic Way of Life.* In this book Lower stated that liberalism was not simply an ideal formulated in the Renaissance that had eroded in the intervening centuries, only to be replaced by one form of collectivism, either Communism or Catholicism. Instead, liberalism was a deeply human phenomenon, equivalent to the “‘eternal spirit of man,’” transcending history and alone being able to appreciate the value of the individual not simply as a means but as an end. Lower’s conception of liberalism was very specific, however, being based on the English tradition. It was this tradition which had protected the world from tyranny throughout the ages and was doing so now against Soviet Communism; indeed the reason Lower wrote the book in the first place was to respond to the charges by the Communist world that the West did not have an ideological basis and did not believe in anything fundamental. For Lower the foundations of Western values lay in liberalism and in the liberal institutions originating in England centuries ago. Without these traditions there would be no “sure liberty” in the world. Thus the choice given to the reader was to believe in the Christian conception of man as worthwhile or to accept the reverse, which had resulted in the gas chambers.

Protestantism, of course, was central to Lower’s worldview: “[t]ake out English-speaking Protestantism and its derivatives from the modern world and the major creative force left is Russian Communism.” Added to this was his belief that it was not just Christianity that was necessary to preserve liberty, but that institutions were needed that were so historically grounded as to be natural. This argument thus explained how Tsarist Russia and Francoist Spain could have degenerated into dictatorships and also why only
the English-speaking nations could truly be considered to have maintained a liberal society, due to their courts and electoral traditions. Implicit within this intellectual vein, however, is the valorizing of nations with a Protestant tradition and the denigrating of those outside. At the root is Lower’s contention that what was needed was balance between authority and freedom, a concept dear to Innis’ heart, and that freedom for the Catholic Church throughout the centuries had meant only an increase in its power. This corruption of true liberty resulted in conflict over who had authority in the Christian Church, a dispute which contributed to the Reformation since the Papacy refused to accept any undermining of its authority. If various reform movements had succeeded, Lower speculated,

[the Catholic Church] might have found it possible in time to put itself clearly on the side of freedom, as Protestant churches have little difficulty in doing, and to have avoided many of those dubious and damaging associations which have always caused Protestants to think of it as an agency of illiberalism, reaction and despotism. But the constituted Church made its choice. Despite the fine, wide sweep of the philosophy which had been developed for it, it steadily pursued its way to the quasi-totalitarian structure which it has since achieved.

The Church quashed all forms of liberty and retreated further into authoritarianism with the proclamation of papal infallibility in the nineteenth century. “It was not to be the privilege of the Roman Catholic Church to show the modern world the way to liberty,” instead obedience and power became the sole concerns of the Church, which caused Lower to conclude that the “spirit of Roman Catholicism must be authoritarian.” Lower attempted to temper his condemnation of the Catholic Church, mentioning in passing that Catholicism cannot be construed as always and inherently authoritarian, since the Magna Carta did emerge from Catholic bishops. Yet this was in England, a country which had avoided the coming absolutism of the continent through its institutions, paradoxically
emerging from the very Church tradition Lower castigated as becoming authoritarian.\textsuperscript{74} Lower also allowed that in many traditionally Catholic societies, including Quebec, Catholicism had provided a bulwark against unrestricted capitalism, something Lower valued. By the late eighteenth and nineteenth century, however, Protestantism became obsessed with humanitarianism and eschewed much of the focus on material accumulation that once characterized it. A plethora of left-wing sects emerged, particularly Methodism, which in his mind finally represented what was truly liberal in the world, and thus Christian, at the same time as the Catholic Church was building totalitarian barriers.\textsuperscript{75} Present here again is Lower’s attempt to link liberalism to Christianity, specifically the Protestant tradition, as the only true alternative in our modern world to Soviet Communism, as it guarded both the dignity of the individual and against the excesses of the capitalist system. As he concluded in an explicit attack on Communism, but perhaps an implicit denial of the ability of modern Catholicism to represent the West’s way of life in the troubled Cold War world, “Genuine liberalism will always range itself against a stifling collectivism. … Liberalism will range itself against stifling collectivism because if justice means anything it must mean something to the individual and, under a ‘blue-print’ collectivism, the individual becomes a mere bit of machinery.”\textsuperscript{76}

Berger, in his aforementioned study, draws attention to the patronizing view of French Canadian society that Lower held, particularly when he portrayed them (admiringly) as not fitting into the Tawney-Weber thesis of linking religion with social and economic action and progress. In other words the French Canadian was often
impervious to the excesses of capitalism due to the fact that he was medieval and simplistic. A similar charge came from Richard Lunn in an article for the *Star Weekly Magazine* in 1959, where he criticized Lower’s *Canadians in the Making* and *This Most Famous Stream* as pulling Canada apart at the seams. According to Lunn, Lower overemphasized the contribution and greatness of the “Englishman,” allowing only him to be the bearer of liberty and democracy. The article (Lower’s clipping of which has across its top scrawled “cheap journalism”) continues that Lower gained his specific views of liberty and democracy from his Protestant Ontario roots and his English-born father, and that these views embody the expected prejudices of someone from Ontario. These were charges that Lower constantly rejected, believing that “vulgar” organizations such as the Orange Lodge were tearing Canada apart. He, on the other hand, was the purveyor of liberalism, not bigotry, which was to be the saviour of Canada. Lower was convinced that anti-Catholicism, along with unfettered ultramontane Catholicism, was intolerable in Canada as it undermined the balance necessary for the nation’s functioning.

This seemingly inexplicable blindness to the similarity of his views to that of the very people he abhorred can be understood in the terms of Alan Mendelson’s study of anti-Semitism amongst the Canadian elite. Mendelson attempts to revise the existing divide between what has been termed vulgar anti-Semitism and genteel anti-Semitism, which was held by many in the elite that he examines. These figures were aware that they held certain common views concerning Jewish people. Specifically, they believed that Jews shared characteristics that differentiated them from the rest of humanity and that their overall influence on society tended to be harmful and dangerous. They were able to
justify their anti-Semitism because they did not engage in the violence of “gutter” anti-Semites and their views were theorized with “intellectual rigour.”80 Lower and many of the other figures in this story were therefore able to understand themselves as the upholders of modern values of tolerance and liberty, and yet simultaneously view the Catholic Church as an insidious influence on Canadian society much like the Orange Lodge, the Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s and 1930s, and Saunders.

Some examples of this paradoxical attitude can be seen in Lower’s defence of Francis Parkman as a historian, particularly because he allegedly treated French Canadian Catholics with respect despite his own ultra-Protestant leanings.81 Thus, he confusingly defended a noted anti-Catholic historian82 for being respectful of Catholicism, a situation symptomatic of a figure whose intellectual framework perceives Catholics as needing to be tolerated in Canada despite their inherent illiberality. In his self-evaluation, he was not anti-Catholic, because he was a liberal; he therefore believed in tolerance and Canadian unity, but that the Church that was threatening this unity. This embodies what Gross outlined as the historical problem of utilizing anti-Catholicism as a means of formulating liberal identity and a particular conception of modernity. It causes the paradoxical attitude of defending religious liberty but denying the validity of Catholicism as a religious system “fit” for liberal democratic modern world. In a letter to Sister Mary Jean, who wrote to Lower believing that he was a Catholic, he emphatically stated “I am on the contrary … the very essence of a Protestant, in that the right of personal decision means everything to me.”83 This caricatured perception of Catholicism extended into his concerns during the Cold War as seen in another letter of his, sharing the opinion of
Silcox and others already mentioned that Catholicism and Communism were fundamentally linked by totalitarian natures. Lower denied that Quebec was closer to socialism than the other provinces, unless the correspondent was referring to communism, due to the tyrannical nature of entrenched premier Maurice Duplessis who had an open alliance with the Church. “[B]ecause of the authoritarian nature of the Roman Catholic church,” Lower continued, reflecting once again the Canadian interest in American developments, “I always contend that communism cannot get too far in Protestant countries because debate always blunts its points. Senator [Joseph] McCarthy, an Irish Roman Catholic, would not have debate. Neither does Quebec understand debate in the sense in which I use the word.”

It is in a letter to the Reverend Thomas Badge of the Norwood United Church discussing the recent public opposition the Reverend aired against an ambassador to the Vatican (a constant Protestant concern) where Lower’s anti-Catholicism tempered by his ultimate desire for Canadian unity is most clearly on display. Lower began his letter by affirming “I do not need to tell you that, on the general principles of the separation of Church and State, I am entirely in accord with you and also that I entertain … the usual Protestant fear and dislike of the organized Church of Rome.” Lower continued that he always kept his Protestant principles in mind when discussing public questions but tried to also keep in the forefront “(a) considerations of public policy, and (b) the spirit of Christian ethics.” Despite this pragmatism he reiterated that Protestantism was the foundation of English-speaking society and that he was writing a book on this very issue, presumably referring to This Most famous Stream. Lower contended that the issue of the ambassadorship had become a deeply political issue for
Protestants and Catholics, and though he cared little for preserving the unity of the faiths, he cared greatly for preserving the unity of the two races of Canada. The ambassador controversy, therefore, needed to be solved in this context.\textsuperscript{88} Lower’s anti-Catholicism was quite genteel, in the sense that he was able to grudgingly and publicly tolerate Catholicism as long as it aided in maintaining the unity and progress of Canada.

This evidence also counters George Egerton’s article claiming that the Cold War caused Christians in Canada, both Protestants and Catholics, to unofficially unite in their identity and membership within the liberal democratic world.\textsuperscript{89} While Egerton is accurate in observing that in the Cold War liberalism and aspects of Christianity became integrated, leading to an increase in tolerance, a concern for human and individual rights and ecumenical outreach, he oversimplifies the matter by not addressing continued denominational divisions and the central religious and political conflict between Catholicism and Protestantism.\textsuperscript{90} Catholics and Protestants did concur that international Communism was a great threat to humanity, but this did not preclude the continuation of religious strife in Canada. In addition the liberalism that he refers to was theorized by many Protestants to be the sole jurisdiction of their ecclesiastical tradition and did not include a retrograde Catholicism. As John T. McGreevy has written, concerning the immense popularity in America of Blanshard’s anti-Catholic tomes of the late 1940s and 1950s, the presentation of Catholicism as preventing self-realization and human development in the Cold War was a central component of liberal discourse, along with opposing racial segregation and totalitarianism. McGreevy concludes that it was the preservation and inculcation of individual autonomy, or “thinking on one’s own,” that
defined mid-century liberalism and religious loyalties were not to be allowed in the public sphere or to threaten national unity.\textsuperscript{91}

Significantly, Blanshard himself even expressed his gratitude at a positively received 1950 Harvard address that “‘the new movement against Catholic aggression is rising not on the … lunatic fringes of religion and fanaticism, but right in the hearts of American University leaders.’”\textsuperscript{92} Blanshard was using the objective and dispassionate tools of sociology to counter the “Catholic threat.” The sociological study of religion, particularly in America, was a popular means of both analyzing and constructing the normative religious atmosphere of the Cold War. Herberg provided what was perhaps the seminal academic study in which he posited that America had become a tripartite religious community, consisting of Protestants, Catholics and Jews, dedicated to the preservation of “The American Way of Life.” This “civic religion,” which Herberg believed was superficial due to its simplistic tendency to overvalue the simple “positive attitude of belief,” revolved around the preservation of democracy in the face of totalitarianism.\textsuperscript{93} Blanshard fit into this “neutral” model regarding religion and religious controversies instead of utilizing the vitriolic, emotional and violent discourse of the Klan or Saunders, much as earlier figures such as William Burton Hurd had used the language of demography. Gerhard Lenski was another American sociologist who used the discipline to provide a “neutral” evaluation of the harmful role of Catholicism in American society. For Lenski the major reason why Catholics were less represented in the upper classes was because their religion promoted obedience instead of intellectual autonomy, which for him was necessary for high achievement in the capitalist system.
Lenski’s perspective essentially repeats in different language Weber’s “Protestant Work Ethic” argument of the nineteenth century that posited that Protestantism facilitated the development of industrial capitalism due to its positive interpretation of work as part of God’s will. Lenski went so far as to conclude that no Catholic nation would achieve economic success in the contemporary capitalist world and that the growing prominence of Catholics in New England was a major reason behind its languishing economic status in the nation. This type of thinking was also common in Canada, with some distinguishing Canadian elements such as protecting British institutions or the importance of French Canada to the nation, demonstrating the increasing intellectual and cultural ties between Canada and the US in this period.

A.J. Wilson, the longtime editor of the official organ of the United Church, The United Church Observer (1939-1955), was another United Churchman dubious about ecumenical efforts towards the Catholic Church, perhaps justifiably feeling that the Church was being less than cooperative in its official pronouncements on the international scene. Wilson’s hostility towards Catholicism, however, was often evident in the pages of his periodical, demonstrated in two articles questioning the public outcry at the imprisoning of the Hungarian Cardinal József Mindszenty by Stalinist forces. Roman Collar, the pseudonym for Rev. Dr. C.C. Cowan, a minister in the Presbyterian Church and a staunch supporter of Shields’ CPL, raised the issue of whether the charges of treason and sabotage were true and that this instance was thus not an example of simple religious prejudice. The author proceeded to compare the Catholic Church to the Communists, advocating having no association with political and ideological groups that
would violate any of Roosevelt’s famous Four Freedoms. In his mind the Cardinal was being jailed for political reasons as the Church had long ago forgotten that its primary role was the preaching of the word of Christ, not being involved in worldly matters. Catholics unfortunately clung to the medieval idea that the Church trumped the state in all affairs and Cowan believed this alone should prevent Canada from allowing an ambassador to the Vatican.\textsuperscript{100} Wilson added to this by supporting the international community’s condemnation of the imprisonment of Mindszenty but compared the Church to the very Communists, and even fascists, it proclaimed to be opposed to by taking umbrage to the use of the term “goose stepping” by some when referring to his captors. Wilson believed that this “name-calling” somehow caused the Catholics to become the moral equivalent of the Communists.\textsuperscript{101} Wilson’s position regarding Catholicism is perhaps unsurprising when one takes into account his previously mentioned support of Shields’ militant CPL during WWII.\textsuperscript{102} One of Wilson’s most volatile outbursts against the Catholic Church was littered with Cold War rhetoric and the now familiar theme of equating Catholic totalitarianism with fear of Soviet Communism. In this editorial Wilson takes issue with the Catholic criticism of ministers visiting Yugoslavia, particularly since it was done over the CBC. “We hold no brief with Communism, indeed, we are not in favour of any kind of totalitarianism, economic or otherwise” writes Wilson, who brashly revealed the true core of the problem:

For the first time in history an established totalitarianism which had the field pretty well to itself has found its claim challenged by another totalitarianism. The fact that one is ecclesiastical and the other economic really matters very little. Naturally the ecclesiastical hierarchy does not relish the challenge but has accepted it and is determined to fight it to the finish, but we see no reason why the champions of Roman Catholic totalitarianism should be permitted to do their fighting over the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation at the expense of the Canadian taxpayer.\textsuperscript{103}
Once again the themes of Catholicism and Communism posing a totalitarian threat to a free, democratic world and as rivals for the hearts and minds of mankind is present, in this case contained within the editorial pages of the periodical of the largest Protestant denomination in Canada. This exact perspective was also voiced numerous times in the pages of the *Presbyterian Record*. Kenneth Glazer answered the eponymous question “Why I am a Protestant” by outlining how Protestantism had ushered in the advent of democracy and attention to individual rights so central to the modern world. Glazer berated Protestants for too often defining themselves against Catholics as opposed to what they represented. He quickly moved into a riposte of the militant anti-Communism of Catholicism, exhorting Protestants to read Blanshard’s work and Avro Manhattan’s conspiratorial *The Vatican and World Politics* in order to demonstrate that both Communism and Catholicism were totalitarianisms bent on world domination and thought-control. Glazer feared the Catholic Church because it strove for uniformity and he warned the reader against Protestants who were trying to foment the same type of One World Church. This viewpoint concerning the Catholic Church resembles the notion of totalitarianism popularized by Hannah Arendt in which this ideological perspective and system of governance was ravenously devoted solely to achieving global domination at any cost.

There is a similarity between the views held by many intellectuals and church figures in Canada at this time and the official periodical of an organization that many would not commonly associate with. The Prairie Bible Institute (PBI), located in the rural Three Hills area of Alberta, preached an intense fundamentalism characterized by biblical
literalism and was unconcerned with accreditation or serving mainstream churches, unlike its contemporary the Toronto Bible College (TBC). The anti-Catholicism that emerged from these institutions was reminiscent of the theological strain which had always existed in Canada but which had oscillated in influence. John Stackhouse has observed that the three major concerns outlined by L.E. Maxwell and his associate editors of the official organ of the PBI, *Prairie Overcomer*, were modernism, communism and Catholicism, and that similar to other fundamentalists, they viewed the problems as connected. Catholicism and communism in particular were forces to be reckoned with since they were bent on nothing less than global domination. In familiar language Maxwell stressed the ideological similarity of communism and Catholicism in a 1950 article, noting that “Communism can flourish best in prepared soil. The priest-ridden Russians … created a perfect soil for Communistic Bolshevism.” Yet Catholicism was not only portrayed as the unwitting ally of Communism, paving the way for its destructive materialism and authoritarian excesses. In addition these two totalitarian forces were portrayed as rivals in the world, and Canada as one of the battlegrounds: “Catholic Quebec is frightened to death of Communism. These two totalitarian powers vie for authority over the masses.” Ecumenism was sharply opposed in this literature, dubbed “ecumania,” identifying the attempted One World Church with the Whore of Babylon of the Book of Revelation, a classic anti-Catholic trope.

John McNicol, principal of TBC, added to this theological discourse when confronted by what he saw as the growing influence of both modernism and dispensationalism, a theological position he despised. In the aptly titled 1946 manifesto
“Fundamental but not Dispensational: An Answer to Criticism,” McNicol savaged those Protestants who accepted modernism or dispensationalism as allowing for the spread of the Roman Antichrist. The latter had done so by distracting Protestants from the true Biblical prophecy of Antichrist, which for McNicol was undeniably represented by the present Papal system, as they instead posited some future being. This had allowed the Papacy to “worm … its way into places of influence and power behind the politics of … these Protestant lands.” Modernism, on the other hand, had emptied Protestantism of its objective truth, based on Biblical inerrancy. It had created a population bereft with relativism, constantly searching for another external authority to fill the void that the certainty of the Bible had once did; this, for McNicol, explained the “high level” of conversion to Catholicism. Only fundamentalism could moderate between these two “extremes,” which both played into the hands of Antichrist from completely different perspectives. Dispensationalism and modernism (the latter embodied in liberal theology and the reigning mood of ecumenism) thus needed to be combated at all cost.

The Pentecostal Assemblies of God of Canada (PAGC), a group who openly advocated non-mainstream beliefs such as glossolalia and faith healing as late as the 1960s, also expressed this hostility to ecumenism due to its implicit or explicit connection with Catholicism. In a verbatim report of prominent British Pentecostal Donald Gee’s BBC broadcast statement, “The Pentecostal Churches and the World Council of Churches,” in the PAGC’s organ Pentecostal Testimony, Gee provided three reasons for the Pentecostal opposition to ecumenism, the first being theological, the second organizational and third (which he hoped he could list “without giving offense”), “the
drift of the Ecumenical Movement towards Rome."\textsuperscript{115} Gee was adamant, stating that many identified the Church of Rome with the Book of Revelation, and that even the threat of Communism was not worth losing certain fundamental Protestant principles.\textsuperscript{116} R.J. White, of Newbrook, Alberta, reiterated this point stating that of the three ecumenical trends of the modern day, the Pentecostal trend was the one most concerned with Jesus Christ, while the Roman Catholic trend was focused only on the redefinition of Catholic doctrine. White warned those involved in the devitalizing “World Council of Churches trend,” as it was inevitably preparing the way for a Christian North America dominated by radical sects, such as Jehovah’s Witnesses, Unitarians and Roman Catholicism, who did not hold Jesus as equal to God.\textsuperscript{117} Finally, Jack West, an evangelist writing in the monthly Home Missions column, outlined an apocalyptic vision of a spiritually destitute Christianity facing the equally dangerous forces of materialistic Communism and totalitarian Catholicism: “Communism and Catholicism threaten with sinister force on the horizons of our time. The realization that multitudes are drifting over the precipice of Hell adds to the total blackness of the national picture.”\textsuperscript{118} This twin concern with Communism and Catholicism and their shifting places in the Cold War world were of widespread and serious concern to many in the Canadian religious and intellectual realm.\textsuperscript{119} While a variety of intellectuals and church figures held an equal variety of positions on significant issues such as ecumenism and communism, the “Catholic problem,” namely that the Catholic Church and Catholicism were barriers to true liberty, freedom and Christianity in a tense materialistic world was always an important aspect of their worldviews.
Anti-Catholic thinking was not confined only to this diverse collection of figures; anti-Catholic tropes and themes were present in the work of political conservatives and monarchists as well. John Farthing was a thoroughly tory intellectual deeply concerned with the influence of Quebec and Roman Catholicism on Canadian society, along with the role of political traditions and institutions. Farthing was openly opposed to the Lowerian view of Canada (or at least his own interpretation of the Lowerian conception of the nation) which optimistically envisioned the progress of Canada from colony to nation.\footnote{120} His main concern with regards to Catholicism was that it undermined Canada’s relationship with Britain and therefore made Canada vulnerable to alternative ideologies, including communism. Farthing belonged to the Anglo community in Quebec: he was the son of the Anglican bishop of Montreal, the Right Reverend John Cragg Farthing, and attended McGill under Stephen Leacock, along with Eugene Forsey in the 1920s. Farthing was noted for militantly opposing what he viewed as the Keynesian consensus in the postwar era to the extent that he resigned from McGill due to its prominence at that institution and took a position as a master at Bishop’s College. He promoted what has been dubbed the tory sentiment within the PC party at the time, which stressed the role of the Crown-in-Parliament above all other factors as central to the functioning of the Canadian state.\footnote{121}

Farthing shared this strong monarchist sentiment with Davie Fulton, who ran for leadership of the PC Party in 1956 and who wrote the introduction for Farthing’s posthumously released book *Freedom Wears a Crown*.\footnote{122} While Fulton may have held his strong belief in a monarchy preserving the inherent freedom of the people of Canada and
ensuring slow, organic development due to his devout Catholicism, Farthing maintained and expressed his ideology in very different terms. Farthing, in his only published book, outlined that Canada and the British Commonwealth in general represented another option outside of American liberalism and Soviet Communism. Farthing refuted the reduction of modern man and society to purely materialistic components, what he dubbed “Newtonian man,” stressing the need to recognize the historical roots of society and thus emphasizing British traditions, especially the role that the British monarchy could play in preserving freedom. In Farthing’s world, liberty was not synonymous with freedom, as the former was rooted only in individualism while the latter was “the basic idea underlying the Christian tradition, which is still [the] source and substance [of Western civilization].” This Christian tradition was causally linked to the Reformation, which he viewed as being the progenitor of every significant political principle in the Western world. Instead of falling into the nihilism of the modern age due to what he agreed had been the failure of Newtonian man and resorting to the solutions presented by Marxists, the Americans or the “medievalists” (presumably referring to those movements in Catholic countries pursuing their own reform), Farthing advocated the return to the values and traditions of the Reformation expressed historically in England. The equation was a simple one for Farthing: the unity of the people under law and the Queen, represented as the Crown-in-Parliament in Canada, was the fruit of the Reformation and the realization of a Christian social order. The British tradition was the embodiment of Canada, and Farthing accused the “Kingsians” of degrading this by opposing “imperialism” and promoting a false Canadian unity.
It is within this false unity that Farthing’s concern with French Canada and Catholicism became most readily apparent, as he labeled men such as Lower\textsuperscript{129} “pure Canada cultists;” in other words, those who presented a pure Canada as being equated with French Canada.\textsuperscript{130} As French Canada could be reduced to a geographical certainty in Farthing’s mind, these “pure Canada cultists” were trying to promote an idea of Canada in which English Canada was forced to reflect Canadian geography only. The British connection, in any historical sense, was dismissed as bigotry and imperialism to be replaced with the pure Canadian unity of French Canada.\textsuperscript{131} The central myth of Canada’s new “one-party State,” where the role of the Crown-in-Parliament had been destroyed and replaced by dictatorial cabinet government unable to promote the true mutual cooperation between the two peoples that the monarchy could guarantee, was that dissension from this perception of unity was counterproductive and harmful.\textsuperscript{132} Yet implicit within Farthing’s work is a conspiratorial viewpoint of French Canadian traditions, something which Fulton had to address in his introduction, denying that Farthing blamed the contemporary crisis entirely on French Canadian nationalism.\textsuperscript{133} Farthing clearly outlined the only conditions on which this “pure Canada” idea could be accepted: “But since the pure Canadianism of French Canada consists precisely in traditions that have come to the French Canadian from France and from Rome … we can never realize a pure-Canada unity until all English-speaking Canadians have accepted, as have the French, these traditions.” Farthing continues that “[t]his is no fantasy but the only logical conclusion of the fallacious idea of unity on which we are now seeking to build our national life.”\textsuperscript{134} For Farthing the Canadian government under the Liberals was therefore unconsciously
promoting an idea of Canadian unity in which the English speaking component would have to renounce its traditions and instead accept those of French Canada, which of course included Roman Catholicism.

Farthing’s view of the Catholic Church and its central role in his worldview is revealed in a letter sent to Forsey concerning the removal of the terms “Royal” and “Dominion” from the title of Canada and certain institutions in 1952. In this letter he expressed his fear that “The power behind, seeking to upset the Throne, is the R.C. Church, which knows that if it can destroy the British tradition in this country it can then readily dominate the flabby unprincipled mass or mess that is then left.” Farthing believed that the Church was too extreme and blinded by its own hatred of Britain to not understand the stakes in the postwar world, namely that if it destroyed the British traditions of Canada they would inevitably be replaced with American republicanism and the considerable gains and power they had in North America would be lost. The Catholic Church, as the largest and most powerful political pressure group in the nation, was thus striving to destroy the British heritage and replace it with the French, supporting a form of South American republic where there was no substantial separation of church and state, an issue Silcox studied with great interest and which was expressed by Farthing’s brother in a letter to Drew mentioned earlier. Farthing continued in this letter to rail against the forces in Canada demanding these changes, along with the promotion of a Canadian Governor General, a reform which Forsey vehemently opposed as well, portraying them as “secret forces.” Farthing could not believe that there was substantial enough public support for these reforms to explain them and that any current
decline in their rhetoric was simply a “tactical retreat” drawing a direct comparison to Stalinist methods of obfuscating true motivations.¹³⁹ This also represents the previously mentioned anxiety that Catholicism, like Communism, was a Trojan Horse in the body politic, cloaked in normality while actually representing alien traditions. In his estimation, the hatred that Quebec and the Catholic Church held Canada’s British institutions would never abate, and thus English Canada needed to be vigilant to preserve the institutions and traditions that were left, strenuously restoring the freedoms guaranteed by the constitutional monarchical system in this otherwise materialistic world.

Farthing reassured Forsey that their strong shared position regarding the need for the monarchical tradition and a British Governor General was based on their intellectual bravery, and savaged the Liberal government’s position for its alleged vacuity: “it has all the garish attractiveness of a neon sign[,] … It is merely one of the manifestations of the dominant ‘modern’ mind of our times,” continuing “which, where it is not the expression of a basic, all-poisoning hatred (which the Roman Church can generate fully as effectively as Marx and Lenin) expresses a state of mental bewilderment, drift, confusion, fog and emptiness[,]”¹⁴⁰ Contained within this excerpt is again a comparison of the Catholic Church to Communism, but in this case it is accused of consorting with the various modern materialistic forces usurping Canadian liberty that were based fundamentally and exclusively in the British tradition. For Farthing it was not necessarily a racial or linguistic prejudice he held against French Canada but an aversion to the authoritarian tendencies of their dominant institution and the influence it was wielding in Canadian society. The Church was a threat to the hegemony of the Protestant “way of
life” Farthing valued so much; it was a dangerous rival in a world of competing ideologies. Farthing reiterated his anti-Catholicism in the closing paragraph of his letter, stressing the need to speak honestly and frankly: “I have no dislike whatever of French Canadians; but the absolute and absolutist imperialism of the Papacy and the Roman Church is something we can ignore only at the loss of everything that has ever been of value to the non-Roman world.”

The Catholic Church’s plan of gradually eroding guarantees of freedom needed to be openly discussed, and this plan was most evident in the King-Lapointe ideal of unity and the King-Byng affair which, according to Forsey and Farthing, destroyed the authority of the Governor General and thus diminished the role of the Crown in Canada. Always at the centre of the “Kingsian” conception of unity was its inextricable link to the decisive plan of the Catholic Church in Canada: “At the centre of all is King-Lapointe unity—or the R.C. domination of this country. English Canada needs to be awakened to the danger[.]” The danger was nothing less than the survival of the British way of life, as battling Soviet Communism with a society based only on the materialism, naturalism and ahistoricism of modern society was not sufficient. Canada needed to regain its true heritage of freedom that was grounded and expressed perfectly in the Britain of the Reformation era.

Farthing and Forsey agreed on a great deal, despite their seeming ideological polarization due to Forsey’s noted involvement in the founding of the CCF and membership in the radical FCSO in the 1930s and Farthing’s obvious sympathy for a conservatism anchored in an organic society, gradual change and the British monarchy. Forsey, however, wrote to H.C. Farthing, John Farthing’s brother, in 1957 that Freedom
*Wears a Crown* was a masterpiece. According to Donald Creighton, Forsey and Farthing both shared an intense distaste for what they viewed as the undermining of the intellectual and moral basis of Canada and its demoralization under the King and St. Laurent governments through the elimination of the symbols of the British connection. Creighton, who shared these opinions, outlined how Forsey and Farthing planned to write a book together along with Judith Robinson, a project that was never released but seems to have metamorphosed into Farthing’s aforementioned posthumous release. Forsey wrote a memorial for his friend when he died in 1954 praising his intellectual capabilities and his refusal to be subsumed by the moral nihilism and superficiality that was so rampant in the Liberal conception of modern society. As noted earlier, Forsey made his opinions towards the Catholic Church and its relationship to narrow nationalism and even fascism in Quebec quite clear throughout the 1930s, but this sentiment did not disappear in the postwar era. In a letter from Judith Robinson, editor of *The News* and sharing Farthing and Forsey’s tory sympathies, discussing suggestions Forsey had made concerning Farthing’s book, Robinson agreed with Forsey that “a frontal attack on that organization [the Roman Catholic Church] isn’t going to serve our purpose now.” For Forsey and Robinson, in a similar tack as Lower’s recommendations to the United Church concerning the report of the CCNWO during WWII, it would be better for Farthing to simply allow logic to make the inferences concerning the Catholic Church in Canada and not be explicit. Following this logic, however, did indeed make it difficult not to take “a poke at what he finds.”
Forsey’s hostility to Catholicism, and particularly what he viewed as its role in Quebec nationalism, is present in his memoirs, released in 1990. Forsey reiterated his argument made years earlier that the Padlock legislation issued by the Duplessis government was not disallowed by the federal government because it had the support of the Montreal business community along with the Catholic hierarchy, both very powerful and conservative forces in Canadian life.\textsuperscript{152} In Forsey’s worldview the Catholic Church in Quebec was harmful to the development of the Québecois because the clergy wanted their followers to be concerned with the afterlife and completely subservient, emphasizing the “revenge of the cradles” ideology discussed earlier, where French Canadians would out-breed English Canada and “swamp” New Brunswick and Southern Ontario. Forsey recalls how his contemporary Frank Scott told him that one of these nationalists elaborated on this plan stating “‘Nous allons arranger l’Ontario’ (We shall arrange Ontario); and I recall an article in \textit{Le Devoir}, when the Afrikaners took control of the Union of South Africa, that looked forward to the day when the \textit{Canadiens} would do the same for Canada.”\textsuperscript{153} Clearly Forsey’s view of the Catholic Church and its influence in Canada remained problematic into his twilight years.

This attempt to “arrange Ontario” in the postwar by the Catholic Church was also an important fear expressed by the ICC. The ICC was formed in late 1944 at Bloor Street United Church dedicated to researching the encroachment of Catholicism into the wider life of Canada.\textsuperscript{154} This organization was very broad in its denominational sweep despite the fact that it was almost exclusively centred in Ontario, including official representatives from the United Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Anglican Church,
the Canadian Baptist Federation and the Salvation Army. The membership included such influential church figures as George Pidgeon, moderator of the United Church of Canada and the initial chairman of the ICC, George Sisco, secretary of the general council of the United Church, J.R. Mutchmor and Rev. Canon W.W. Judd of the Anglican Church.\footnote{155} The “general committee” supporting its initial efforts to limit separate schools was also populated by prominent Protestants, such as Tory luminary Donald Fleming, who was a leadership candidate in 1956 and served as Diefenbaker’s minister of finance, prominent University of Toronto historian George W. Brown and the dean of the Ontario College of Education at the University of Toronto, A.C. Lewis.\footnote{156} In the brief authored by George Cornish of the University of Toronto to the Hope Commission, called to analyze the separate school situation in Ontario, in December 1945 the ICC was adamant in restricting the spread of separate schools. Its goal was to revert to the policies enacted in the 1860s, which limited the right of Catholic education. Even these policies, in the ICC’s perspective, were forced upon Ontarians then by “clerical authoritarianism and the solid French Catholic Block from Quebec[,]”\footnote{157} For the authors of the brief the main issue was that Catholic separate schools were not a right, unlike public schools which they believed were the basis of democratic society in general. The 1937 legislation, the ICC fumed, allowed separate schools to be formed without the presence of public schools, when in reality the legislation tabled by the Mitchell Hepburn government in 1935 and defeated in 1937 by an intransigent Protestant Tory party was designed to reform the corporate taxation policies to aid separate schools but also would have led to a minor windfall for public schools.\footnote{158} Nevertheless the ICC perceived this as an example of political pressure
and crass opportunism by the Hepburn government of the time, crippling the public school system and feeding into the hands of the Catholic Church which insidiously viewed matters only in selfish terms. In the minds of the ICC, replete with respectable figures from a wide variety of Protestant churches, this entire situation was nothing less than part of a sophisticated plot by the Catholic Church to create a papal state consisting of Quebec and eastern and northern Ontario. The ease with which separate schools were being allegedly constructed due to the failed 1937 legislation, a confusing proposition, was presented as evidence that northern Ontario was becoming a French state and that these schools were being used to hinder all self-respecting Anglo or Scandinavian Canadians from settling there. The ICC instead promoted these latter settler and immigrant groups as the appropriate and superior settlers, while the government of Ontario was disturbingly allowing this fertile land to go into the hand of the Roman Catholic clergy with the separate schools acting as “the most devastating instrument in their hands in achieving this revolution.”

Unsurprisingly the Brief used the spurious claims of Senator Bouchard as evidence. Bouchard’s theories, as discussed earlier, were a popular topic in wartime and in Saunders’ militant Protestant Action, a periodical dubbed “a bastardy smear-sheet” by Watson Kirkconnell. Bouchard’s claims provoked reaction as the fear that Catholics were inherently disloyal and were perpetually trying to extend their influence over the political process in Canada was a salient point for many, particularly with regards to Quebec’s perceived influence over the federal government. In a series of letters sent to “The Free Thinking People of Simcoe Centre” M.F. Beach, member of the militantly anti-
separate school group the Public Schools’ Supporters League also quoted Bouchard, repeating his claims as to the secret designs of an inherently anti-democratic and self-interested Church in its quest to gain further support for separate schools.\textsuperscript{164} For this organization, as well as the ICC whom it supported, Drew’s decision to allow a religious element in schools and to increase funding to separate schools represented favouring the Catholic Church for political expediency.\textsuperscript{165} Even a figure who many contemporaries and historians have understood to represent the Anglophone, anti-Catholic component of the Tories,\textsuperscript{166} who staunchly supported conscription throughout the war\textsuperscript{167} and who maintained a suspicion of Catholic French Canada for much of his career, was charged with collusion with the “totalitarian Fascist State in Rome, a state that is anti-British and anti-Democratic in its sympathies and support.”\textsuperscript{168} Separate schools and bilingualism were believed to threaten the functioning of Canada as a united, democratic nation; Drew was poisoning the country further with his opportunistic support of Catholicism and acceptance of liquor reform, what Beach referred to as Drew’s promotion of “Romanism and alcoholism,”\textsuperscript{169} reminiscent of nineteenth century nativist slogans protesting against the political and moral degradation of the inextricably linked “Rum and Romanism.”\textsuperscript{170} Drew was achieving nothing less than the inculcation and perpetuation of Fascism in Canada, as Beach directly equated Catholicism and the province of Quebec with this ideology. The people of Ontario in general, as Beach makes clear that he was not a member of the Orange Order or any other “fringe” Protestant group, needed to protect their heritage of Britishness and democracy.\textsuperscript{171} Even Wilson’s aforementioned letter accusing Catholics defending Cardinal Mindszenty of “Nazi tactics” mentioned Drew’s
suspect Protestantism by not declaring Protestant martyrs to Communism and focusing only on Catholic figures. In the 1949 federal election Drew’s attempt to cultivate a following in Quebec through Duplessis’ UN machine backfired as the Toronto Star ran a front page add two days before the vote telling Canadians “Keep Canada British/Destroy Drew’s Houde/Vote St. Laurent,” referring to the controversial mayor of Montreal Camillien Houde, despite the fact that Houde actually ran as an Independent in the election, decimating the PC candidate. Drew, who was believed by many to symbolize their vision of a proud, Protestant, British Canada was lambasted for any perceived compromise, no matter how minor, with the totalitarian, anti-British enemy in their midst, the Catholic Church.

Anti-Catholicism was multifaceted in this period. However unassailable Drew’s anti-communist and anti-Catholic credentials, he was not free from being suspected of sympathy with totalitarianism in Canada. Drew and his supporters demonstrated this complexity in the Tory milieu, which, as noted earlier, was not averse to similar accusations as to the inordinate political influence of the Catholic Church in Canada, despite his frequent alliances with Duplessis. Drew responded moderately to a letter from a disappointed campaign worker from Vancouver South in the failed 1953 election who concluded that English Canada voted Liberal because Canadians must enjoy the graft of the Liberals; in Quebec, they simply voted for Louis St. Laurent because he was French Catholic and the province was in the grip of the Church. Drew agreed that there were many “discouraging features about the election” but that the Tories maintained their proportionate position “against tremendous odds.” The dominance of the Catholic
Church in this election loss was a sentiment shared by one Mrs. G.H. Dresser, who complained to Drew about the result, blaming it on the “swamping” of Canada with central European Catholic immigrants and concluded by recommending Blanshard’s liberal, or “genteel,” anti-Catholic *American Freedom and Catholic Power*. Drew was non-committal, responding that whatever the causes of the Tory loss, “we must do everything within human power to keep alive the democratic system which is so greatly threatened today.” Drew thanked another long-time supporter and “dearest friend” for a letter of support in which the author blamed Displaced Persons (DPs) and the control of the Catholic Church for the electoral loss. This “dearest friend” also stated that soon the national anthem would be changed from God Save the Queen, an ambassador to the Vatican would be appointed and perhaps even a religious war in Canada was looming.

Drew was convinced that the victory was almost entirely due to the fact that St. Laurent was a French Canadian and thus automatically won Quebec—not that he was perceived as a Anglophile imperialist by many due to his wartime positions and his vicious opposition to family allowances—and that this would come back to haunt the Grits as the next leader would inevitably be an English Protestant. An English Protestant leader would be open to criticism, unlike a French Catholic, and in the Cold War context Drew believed that their leadership would have to be based on their stand towards Communism or autonomy, “which is not palatable to the people of Quebec.” Drew had expressed this belief in Quebec control of the federal government often during WWII and this continued into the postwar era. He wrote his friend Hugh Farthing immediately after the war that the major domestic question in Canada was “whether
Quebec was going to march shoulder to shoulder with the rest of Canada” or whether the federal government was to continue “appeasing” that specific, disloyal province.\textsuperscript{181} As Marc Gotlieb has described, Drew’s hostility towards Quebec was inextricably linked to his opposition to government centralization, as the strengthening of the federal government would result in power for Quebec over Ontario and Canada in general. “[I]f we did not stimulate British immigration into this country,” he told Farthing, harkening back to the “revenge of the cradles” theme, “then it would only be a … few years before we had an actual French majority in Canada.” This would destroy the British connection and therefore “the very thing we have fought which so many of us fought” in WWII.\textsuperscript{182} Discussing the upcoming Dominion-Provincial Conference, Drew restated his goals for the future of Ontario and for Canada: a less centralized federation, the “British partnership … and the maintenance of British stock in this province at any rate[.]”\textsuperscript{183} It is unsurprising that with views such as this Drew would not reject the claims of more vicious anti-French and anti-Catholics. In the 1949 election loss a supporter claimed that it was a divided and decrepit Protestantism that caused the Tories to lose, thus “Anglo-Saxon Protestantism” needed to be revitalized for a true victory for Canada.\textsuperscript{184} Later in the 1950s Drew agreed with another supporter that the Liberals were not paying attention to unemployment, ignoring the fact that this writer blamed his lack of job on the favouritism given to Catholics by the Liberal government throughout the nation.\textsuperscript{185}

Drew was unable, or perhaps unwilling, to distance himself too far from this core, Orange and Conservative Protestant base of the Tories for fear of facing the same attacks he received towards the end of his provincial political career. Anti-French prejudice and
anti-Catholicism in particular were sentiments and while Drew failed in his two bids for
PM, or even to limit the Liberals’ large majority, he refused to alienate the core of his
Protestant and often anti-Catholic supporters. In a revealing instance, Drew had to engage
in damage control when Léon Balcer, his Quebec lieutenant and president of the party,
was reported to have made comments supporting not only a new Canadian flag but that
ubiquitous Protestant fear of a diplomatic representative to the Vatican. Drew repeatedly
responded to concerned Orange Lodges that any statement made by Balcer was purely
personal opinion and “was certainly not a statement of the policy of our Party and has at
no time been discussed.”

Many Lodges shared this hostility. J.V. McAree, that voice of
wartime Anglophilia, used this opportunity to conclude that he was right about the
promotion of Balcer as a crass and “feeble” political move to placate Quebec. Clearly
there was no rigid consensus regarding who was defined as a true Protestant and what it
meant to be dedicated to the heritage of democracy, freedom and tolerance that this
identity entailed in Canada, not even for a staunch “Anglophile” such as Drew.

The ICC maintained its opposition to separate schools throughout its existence,
basing its support for the Drew provincial government’s controversial Hope Report,
which reiterated the legality of separate schools in Ontario but suggested curbing its
jurisdiction, on the fact that these were strictly legal institutions, but that the unwarranted
spread of the schools needed to be stopped. The ICC referred back to the Bouchard
claims and the threats the increasing Catholic influence held for the future of Canada.

In a 1951 document the ICC reaffirmed its attitude that the laws reached in 1863 were
final and could not be changed, unless Catholics continued to violate their seemingly
eternal validity. The Hope Report became a *cause célèbre* for the ICC, despite the fact that the subsequent Leslie Frost government immediately disowned its impolitic and potentially disastrous assertions that separate schools should be limited to grade six through a restructuring of the grading system when Drew moved to federal politics.\(^{190}\) Indeed Frost received over one hundred letters from Protestants demanding that he implement the suggested changes, many of them couching their support in language about the pedagogical advantages of restructuring the grading system to eliminate separate schooling in “intermediate grades.”\(^{191}\) Revealingly, members of the Commission included an Orangeman, Loftus Reid,\(^{192}\) who sent Drew anti-Catholic pamphlets during the commission, and president of the Association of Ontario Public School Trustees and Ratepayers, W.A. Townshend, who denounced the “‘dual system of education in this province’” while the Commission was in session.\(^{193}\) In the ICC’s opinion the danger was that the clergy, who often agreed to compromises, were in actuality planning to subvert them and this problematic ethical framework was revealing to Protestants as “an example of the kind of people with whom we have to deal.”\(^{194}\)

Even after the Hope Report was released and confronted, the ICC was certain that any progressive government in Ontario would adopt its positions, joining the modern world in educational policies. The authors warned, however, that if electors did not pay enough attention to legislation “it becomes easier for ‘any class of persons’ to secure legislation to meet its special desires. A heckneyed [sic] expression may be worth repeating here, ‘Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom.’”\(^{195}\) The rhetoric was toned down in a 1963 brief submitted to the Ontario government, yet the ICC still adamantly
opposed any extending of state funding to separate schools as it would foment disunity when what was necessary was a non-sectarian Christian education for all students to promote a Christian, democratic society. The implication of these statements is clear: Catholic separate schools were not conducive to the perpetuation of the ICC’s vision of a truly Christian, democratic nation. While the opinion and tone had become tempered since the 1940s and 1950s, signified by the lack of publicly acknowledging Catholic plots to overthrow Protestant Ontario and the fact that the Secretary Treasurer C.C. Goldring identified Communism, not Catholicism, as the greatest threat to the world in an open letter to the membership, the intellectual worldview characterizing Catholicism as inherently self-interested and anti-democratic remained. It was still a rival and threat to the ICC’s conception of modernity, as the Catholic Church posited a highly organized, totalitarian modernity in contrast to the liberal democratic modernity of Protestantism. Significantly, Goldring observed in his open letter that while it was positive that tolerance for “others” had increased amongst Protestants, it was also necessary that complacency and apathy were avoided so that the ICC could continue its “defensive” stance towards the Catholic Church in Canada.

Watson Kirkconnell managed to inflame passions often throughout his long public career, and this was no different in the debate he engaged in with the ICC concerning Protestant-Catholic relations in Canada. This brief exchange again signifies the complexity of Canadian anti-Catholicism and anti-Catholicism in the Cold War in particular as Kirkconnell did not approve of the ICC. While well-known for his strident public anti-communism, Kirkconnell was not without his concerns about Protestant-
Catholic relations. The way he and Silcox linked the issues was similar in that they both stressed the need for Christian unity in the Cold War in the face of Soviet materialism. For example Kirkconnell, despite his Baptist origins and belief in congregationalism, stressed the need for Baptists to join the WCC and participate in ecumenical affairs. This course of action was to prevent the small Orthodox representation, which was assumedly a puppet of Stalin, from inflaming Protestant militancy against Catholicism, causing the two great Christian bodies to fight each other instead of the real enemy, Soviet Communism. For Kirkconnell this great battle between Christianity and Communism trumped any conflict between Catholicism and Protestantism, and those that were being provoked by the anti-Catholic crusade of Stalin’s church were “blind to the underlying Communist plan for destroying all Christianity completely, one great community at a time.” Kirkconnell made it quite clear that the type of discourse promoted by the ICC was harmful to Canada and the Christian cause in the face of the “Red Crucifixion of Christian nations.” For Kirkconnell “honest Protestantism” did not need this type of “research.” He refused overtures from the ICC to engage in research for them concerning Catholic influence over foreign policy in Canada, responding frankly that he was “unsympathetic towards the work of your committee,” pointing to the need to stem “belligerent atheism and a murderous denial of all human values” embodied in Communism. This for Kirkconnell prevented him from “bit[ing] the Catholics in the leg”
concluding dismissively that the ICC’s methods and concerns were “fifty years out of date.”

Despite his proclamations of the need for Christian unity and understanding in the face of a supreme enemy and for keeping the very nation of Canada intact, Kirkconnell simultaneously maintained many of the same stereotyped and prejudiced opinions of Catholics as his contemporaries, particularly with regards to their more prolific breeding habits. In the same article in which he denounced the ICC for fanning the flames of religious bigotry in a dangerously polarized world, Kirkconnell repeated the “revenge of the cradles” fear in a detached manner pointing out that the ICC was not paying attention to the indisputable fact that the real conspiracy in our society lay in the Protestant home, not in the Catholic Church. In a manner resembling his previously discussed wartime article, “The Twilight of Canadian Protestantism,” Kirkconnell believed Protestants in Canada were committing “race suicide” while French Catholics were growing exponentially through their birth rate in addition to the large amount of Catholic immigrant groups arriving on Canada’s shores. Thus the Catholics in Quebec had to expand and were moving into Ontario and New Brunswick to gain a better quality of life; Kirkconnell alarmingly estimated that by the end of the century Canada would be fifty percent French Catholic and by the year 2100 roughly ninety percent.

In the 1960s Kirkconnell contributed an essay discussing the religious and philosophical gulf between French and English Canada to Mason Wade’s edited volume for the Committee of the Social Science Research Council of Canada, *Canadian Dualism: Studies of French-English Relations*. Kirkconnell believed that the major disputes at
the religious and philosophical level in Canada were due to perceived differences in the
growth of population, and that for true understanding to emerge between the populations in Canada harmful rumours, such as the fact that Catholic immigrants outnumbered Protestant ones or that illegitimacy was more prominent in Catholic communities than Protestant, needed to be contradicted. Instead Kirkconnell identified three major current issues separating the two religious groups in Canada: education, marriage and Canadian representation at the Vatican, which needed to be seriously dealt with. It is here that he revealed his broad sympathy to the ICC’s opposition to separate schools in Ontario, but that the ICC was too prone to “the excesses of anti-Catholic enthusiasts.” Kirkconnell was also clear that while these excesses existed, it was the remnants of the ultramontane wing in the Vatican that closed the door on true conciliation by proclaiming Mary’s assumption in 1950, adding to the insult of the Catholic perspective on mixed marriages which Protestants found, perhaps justifiably, unacceptable. Kirkconnell also viewed the desire by many to gain diplomatic recognition at the Vatican as a violation of one of the central tenets of Protestantism, the separation of church and state, and that this representation would possibly give political status and preferential treatment to the Catholic Church in Canada, a sentiment shared by many Protestants in Canada throughout the postwar era. It is here that Kirkconnell mentioned a conspiracy theory fuelled in the Cold War world that with the imminent destruction of Catholicism in Marxist Europe, “the Papacy may consider a transfer to Canada or the United States and may seek an even-fuller control over the political life of this continent – a control in which special political recognition of Catholicism would play a strategic part. Such rumours may be
unfounded, but they influence Protestant thought.” Kirkconnell utilized the very same type of rumour and conspiracy theory he previously condemned as a forceful reason why representation at the Vatican was opposed and religious conflict continued, couching it in the context of preserving national unity. Kirkconnell concluded, in language similar to Silcox’s discourse, that cooperation was central to defeating world communism “[y]et before that co-operation can be … given there needs to be a[n] … understanding by …

Protestants and Catholics – and, moreover, by the various ‘Protestant’ sects and cults – of the true nature and spiritual nobility of genuine Protestantism and of its reasons for disliking a form of church government that is the negation of democracy.” Kirkconnell clearly believed that Christian unity and ecumenism may have been necessary in an increasingly tense and materialistic world, but not at the cost of sacrificing what he viewed as the central values of Canadian society, which were based on a pure Protestantism. It was Protestantism that could preserve democracy and Kirkconnell did not want Protestants to lose sight of why there were, in his opinion, valid disputes between Protestants and Catholics. Along with Silcox, Lower, and the ICC, Kirkconnell wanted to promote a Canada based on the specifically and narrowly British values of tolerance, freedom and unity and this vision did not seem to include Catholicism. It was not the hostility of the ICC towards Catholicism that offended Kirkconnell but its aggressive tone and its apparent lack of concern about demographic issues.

The ICC continued on for many years, often struggling to stay afloat but continuing to release material and engage in the research Kirkconnell derided. Perhaps the most fascinating and revealing issue the ICC pursued during the 1950s in the context
of the Cold War was the “Bossy Case.” Walter J. Bossy was a naturalized Ukrainian Canadian who authored a bizarre collection of articles in the 1930s that advocated what he termed “Classocracy,” or the organic union of all classes in society under an indigenous Canadian and Christian “monarchy of toil,” in contrast to liberal-democratic neo-paganism and Soviet materialism.\textsuperscript{213} Bossy worked for the Montreal Catholic School Commission (MCSC) for sixteen years and founded the New Canadian Service Bureau (NCSB) in 1948, which was designed to help new Canadians, mostly Catholic, to adjust to their host society but which was ostensibly non-profit and non-partisan and thus tolerated by the school board. Bossy claimed that one Dr. Joseph Saine donated a sum to the NCSB, asking Bossy if he could help the federal Liberals in their Western tour as this area contained numerous new Canadians and that if he provided these votes for the Liberals in the 1949 election he would be promoted to the Senate. Bossy was subsequently fired by the board as he was now engaged in overt political actions and after the election was handily won by the Liberals, Bossy was told that the Grits were washing their hands of the whole affair. This caused Bossy to be hospitalized from the stress.\textsuperscript{214} At the December 15\textsuperscript{th}, 1955 meeting of the ICC, Rev. Ralph Latimer and W.W. Judd, both representing the Anglican Church, presented information concerning the “immigration problem” in Canada, with Latimer reading a confidential report he had compiled concerning the Bossy case as Bossy had requested financial aid from the ICC; he also claimed to have left the MCSC because he disagreed with Catholic designs on Canada.\textsuperscript{215} Latimer described how the Canadian Caritas, a French Catholic organization, had met and secretly decided that what was needed was not only a social agency for helping
immigrants in Quebec but that it had to “establish a provincial, political, organic council as the highest body, and a clearing station embracing all non-Anglo Saxons and non-French Christian Canadians in Canada.” Latimer’s major concern was revealed when he elaborated on a plan by the Catholic Church and the Quebec government to use these various groups, which were already mostly Catholic, as a potential minority to further the goals of the nationalistes in Quebec. According to Latimer the MCSC had been organized specifically to address the immigrant problem in Quebec under the watch of Bossy, as was the subsequent NCSB. When the huge influx of DPs arrived after WWII the goal of unity between the French Catholics and the new Canadians was pursued with great vigour with notables such as Cardinal Leger participating and Rene Gauthier, the head of the New Canadian Service Department, visiting Western settlements of immigrants to encourage cooperation.

Latimer continued, simultaneously expressing Cold War anxieties over the arrival of politicized DPs and the fear of the swarming of Canada with Catholic masses. In his opinion what these organizations that Bossy led were actually trying to accomplish was to gain the trust and allegiance of the new, intelligent, educated and politicized refugees and use them to convince the less educated, already settled immigrants of an earlier era to support the clerical nationalism of the Quebec clergy. The French press, politicians and clergy were thus moving “towards [the] cohesion of New Canadians in general with the Province of Quebec, the Roman Catholic Church, and national policies. … The Catholic hierarchy is behind these efforts and gives its moral and realistic support.” Latimer feared their success since the Church was highly organized and centralized in Canada and
the vast majority of the Catholic immigrants were without their own bishops and authority figures. This would result, in Latimer’s mind, in the fracturing of Canada, the prevention of the integration of immigrants and the expansion of power of the Catholic Church.  

Judd’s commentary on the Bossy case was measured yet still grounded in an intellectual framework that remains fundamentally distrustful of Catholics. Judd was sent to Ottawa to interview influential figures to prove the veracity of Latimer’s report. These interviews caused him to largely refute the claims of a clandestine Catholic plot to dominate Canada, along with the fact that Bossy seems to have been terminated solely due to the conflict of interest associated with his political involvement, and not because of his altruistic opposition to the policies of the Catholic Church. Judd admitted, however that he, the unnamed figures he interviewed and “most Anglo-Saxon non-Roman Canadians agree that there are always long range political views present in the policies of the Roman Catholic Church, whether French or other ethnic strains.”

Judd counseled that because there was very little evidence to unquestionably support Latimer’s claims, though he himself “wish[es] they could be so proved,” and that instead of publicly releasing these statements the ICC should concentrate on integrating immigrants in a more constructive way. This sentiment was echoed by another Anglican, Rev. James Craig, who shared the Bossy information with Bishop Wilkinson; both were unsurprised by the attempt by Catholics to try and create a unified majority in Canada, but they also knew from experience that releasing any statements, no matter how moderate, were often “misconstrued” by the public to seem prejudicial. Craig included in his letter a list from
the Department of Citizenship and Immigration where he scribbled beside various ethnic
groups whether they are Catholic or Orthodox, seemingly equating all non-Protestant
groups entering Canada. He and Wilkinson concluded that the promotion of British
immigration, as opposed to public animosity with the Catholic Church, was the solution
to these very real problems. Latimer responded to these sentiments by clarifying that he
never wanted to present these schemes as clandestine, comparing the open activities of
the various Catholic organizations to Hitler authoring Mein Kempf in that the public was
simply unobservant. Yet he agreed with Judd and Craig that no full frontal attack
should be made upon the Catholic Church, but that the ICC and Protestant churches in
general simply need to pay more attention to immigrants.

Assumed within all of this correspondence is the concept that Catholics were
trying to influence the progress of the nation and were a destabilizing force in the Cold
War world. They were not allowing immigrants from war torn and totalitarian nations to
integrate fully into the democratic, British way of life that Protestant Canadians valued
above all else. Indeed Latimer included a severe warning in his letter, similar to
Kirkconnell’s fears of a devitalized English Canadian Protestantism, regarding Canadian
inattention to immigration: “I believe this is typical of the British stock who rarely fight
until their backs are to the wall. I feel that the day will come in Canada when our backs
will be to the wall.” In the eyes of at least the ICC, Canadian Protestantism needed to
be vigilant, active and enthusiastic in its promotion and maintaining of the British,
Protestant way of life in Canada, as long as it did not allow itself to be publicly pilloried
by the Catholic Church or by public figures, such as Kirkconnell. With this ideal in mind,
there is no evidence that the ICC ever publicly supported Bossy or provided him with any funding despite its obvious sympathy and interest in his case and its suspicions concerning Catholicism.

The ICC also supported such characteristic anti-Catholic causes as opposing sending a diplomatic envoy to the Vatican in the 1950s and released a document containing a request by Pidgeon for ministers receiving it to read it to their congregations and encourage them to write to their MPs. He concluded this brief statement with an ominous warning of Catholic political influence: “The pressure to make this appointment to the Vatican is unremitting, and here, as elsewhere, vigilance is the price of safety.”

This cause was widespread amongst Protestants, as diplomatic representation for the Vatican was believed, as summarized earlier by Kirkconnell, to violate the separation of church and state and to privilege the Catholic religion. This was the “moderate” opinion offered by, for example, the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Canada. The popularity and currency of this issue is demonstrated by the number of letters written by various church figures to politicians and other public figures and the overwhelming support it garnered from the various Protestant denominations in Canada. The influence of the Cold War on this discourse is exhibited in a letter sent by the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in the late 1940s to Drew, then leader of the federal PC party. In this letter C. Ritchie Bell outlined the commitment of his church and of Protestantism in general towards unity in a world facing materialism and paganism, but warning that the appointment of any diplomat at the Vatican would create great disunity and hostility from Protestantism. Bell was apocalyptic in his
pronouncements, repeating Innis’ view that the Catholic Church was a destabilizing force in the tense Cold War world along with Silcox’ claims that communism and Catholicism were in fact not dissimilar. Bell claimed that Protestants for years had suspected that the extreme anti-communism of the Catholic Church would provoke a “Holy War,” one with catastrophic consequences for the entire world. In Bell’s opinion any diplomatic recognition at the Vatican would seem to ally “another largely Protestant nation” with the “crusade” of the Church. “This might induce a new bitterness,” he continued, “due to the obvious fact that the only countries capable of effectively curbing Communism are countries largely if not dominantly Protestant[.]” For Bell “countries where the Roman Catholic faith predominates are honeycombed with Communism.” He concluded his letter by stressing that Canada should not bow to the designs of a “colonial area of large Roman Catholic density,” clearly referring to Quebec and that this action would endanger national unity if not the existence of civilization in general.231 Drew responded in an anodyne and presumably prefabricated letter, seemingly unwilling as a national leader to endorse or deny such grandiose perspectives.232

In another letter to Drew from the Woodstock Loyal Orange Lodge the connection between Vatican diplomacy and the preservation of the British connection in Canada was made explicit. The author outlined the Lodge’s opposition to five “clauses” being introduced in the House at the time: the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council, compulsory bilingualism for the civil service ("as we feel all positions would be manned by Frenchmen (which would be regrettable)"), any change to the Union Jack or the national anthem and finally a representative to the Vatican as it would equate a religious
body with a temporal body.\textsuperscript{233} The ambassadorship was thus in the same category as other “anti-British” policies being enacted by the Liberals. Hostility to this appointment stretched throughout Protestant Canada, from the General Synod of the Church of England in Canada\textsuperscript{234} to St. Paul’s Presbyterian Church in Glace Bay, Nova Scotia. In the latter case the minister of the church wrote to an MP, an old friend, expressing his dismay as to how any bill regarding this issue could be raised without protest from Protestant members. He asked whether they were “asleep at the wheel? or [sic] are they prepared to sell us all out to Rome?”\textsuperscript{235}

Drew was not the only national figure to receive letters concerning this issue, as the leader of the federal Social Credit Party, Solon Low, received many. Unlike Drew, however, Low had a stock answer prepared for many of these statements that openly supported their hostility to the appointment: “I am in definite sympathy with your protests against the appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican and will do all in my power to present these views with strength, whenever the occasion arises.”\textsuperscript{236} Low responded with more candour and detail to two letters, one from the Rosetown Presbytery of the United Church of Canada in Elrose, Saskatchewan. The presbytery based its opposition on familiar Protestant grounds, namely that it was tantamount to privileging the Catholic Church in Canada, that it recognized the Catholic Church as a state and that it would injure national unity in Canada. The Cold War seeped into the discourse when the author stated that any motivation based on gaining international security information from the Vatican was false as it was secretive and, in fact, security leaks would result. More importantly the Catholic Church had not proven itself as the “bulwark against
Communism” that many claimed. Instead “freedom and democracy have flourished under Protestantism, and that Communism and Fascism have made their most serious inroads in countries dominated by authoritarian Churches.” Present here again is the Cold War theory that the Catholic Church and Communism were both totalitarianisms harmful to a peaceful world of truly Christian democratic nations. Low did not dispute this claim, couching his answer in national unity rhetoric instead of a fear of Communism, but still making his hostility to the appointment very clear. Despite the fact that he did not equate the Catholic Church to communism, the importance of this issue to Low was unequivocally expressed in his response to P.N. Gans, a member of the Knights of Columbus who forwarded a copy of their official letter supporting the appointment to him. Low was concerned that the Knights had not taken into account the fomenting of disunity that this appointment would cause as the vast majority of the Canadian people were against it: “I am not exaggerating one particle when I tell you that it would be the most contentious action the Government of this country could take today. If a diplomatic representative were appointed to the Vatican by Mr. St. Laurent’s Government it would split the Canadian population wide open so far as any semblance of unity is concerned.” This was not a sectarian or parochial issue in the minds of Protestants opposed to it. Instead, it was central to the perpetuation and functioning of a democratic and truly modern state such as Canada in the Cold War world. Revealingly, Canada did not gain diplomatic representation at the Vatican until 1969, with opposition continuing into the late 1960s and early 1970s when Pierre Trudeau made an explicit effort to transform the Department of External Affairs from an Anglophone enclave; one of the
changes was to institute representation at the Vatican despite budget limitations.\textsuperscript{241} John English notes that this angered many fundamentalists around the nation and Mitchell Sharp recalls in his memoirs that he agreed with Trudeau’s vision, believing that religious prejudice had greatly declined in Canada at this point but still urging Trudeau to promote an “unassailable Protestant” to the post in order to deflect criticism.\textsuperscript{242}

The ICC in fact enjoyed taking credit for preventing this appointment for such a lengthy period and in a revealing letter demonstrated that its real concern in the 1960s with regards to this issue was that ecumenical discussion was lulling Protestants to sleep while an aggressive Catholic plan for expansion was taking place.\textsuperscript{243} V.T. Mooney, one of the last members of the ICC and representing the United Church, wrote to an assumed ICC sympathizer inviting him to talk at an ICC meeting with the explicit intention of expanding the ICC from its Ontario stronghold and into Quebec and the Maritimes. Mooney took credit for hindering diplomatic recognition, elaborating that “[i]n a number of other smaller ways we have tried to advance ecumenicity and at the same time guard against persistent attempts to encroach on Protestant rights.”\textsuperscript{244} When Louis Foisy-Foley responded in a moderate tone, expressing his opinion that ecumenical relations were at their peak and that as a French Protestant in Canada this had always been his goal, Mooney felt the need to assure him that at the ICC’s meetings there were no reporters and he would be able to speak completely freely. Mooney is unable to comprehend the fact that ecumenism was a sincere goal for some, even when it included conversations with the Catholic Church.\textsuperscript{245}
By the early 1970s even the members of the ICC knew that it was finished, yet within the correspondence of this period there is bitterness toward Protestant Canada’s inability to perceive the importance of its task throughout the decades. Mooney admitted that the Anglicans were about to pull out of the ICC, along with the Presbyterians, but he tried to maintain its unity for the provincial election, revealing that “I think the Protestants will be pretty weak-kneed if they let the Catholic zealots, in the name of ‘ecumenicity,’ take more and more privileges in education.”

It was not ecumenism per se that the ICC was opposed to, but the perceived sacrificing of Protestant values to the altar of Catholicism. The new chairman James Craig wrote to Latimer, who was now a member of the General Commission of Church Union, that “we are not opposing the extension of separate schools because we are anti-RC; we are opposing it because we believe in ecumenism.”

Another demonstration of the ICC’s, and perhaps the United Church’s, problematic perspective on ecumenism was that Secretary of the General Council Rev. Ernest Long was not only a member of the ICC but was involved with many other ecumenical organizations, such as the Central Committee of the WCC. According to United Churchmen Rev. W.G. Berry Rev. Long allegedly opposed the inclusion of the ICC into the WCC not because it was an anti-Catholic organization but because involvement would dilute the work of the ICC. Despite its constant proclamations of tolerance and hatred of being castigated as a vulgar anti-Catholic institution, within ICC correspondence into the 1970s members continued to discuss Catholics in prejudicial terms. For example, Catholics supposedly comprised a larger proportion of the criminal population of Canada due to their authoritarian church and parochial education, not
poverty. The continued presence of the ICC at Royal Commissions and even its existence, as it necessitated funding from the various denominations that comprised it, illustrates that the issues the ICC were focused on were important to not only the members but to many Canadian Protestants.

The ICC also helps one understand Canadian anti-Catholicism in this period through its troubled relation to the CCC, the major example of the respectable ecumenism in the Cold War supported by men such as Kirkconnell. The CCC was formed in 1944 and included in its initial membership all of the major Protestant denominations in Canada. Its two main objectives were to organize cooperative programs between the various member denominations and to engage Canada with the international ecumenical movement, which culminated in 1948 with the founding of the WCC.

The CCC rejected the ICC’s attempts to become formally integrated into its structure, as the ICC was adamant that the CCC recognize the third and most important aspect of its work, to “work to protect Protestant rights and interests from any encroachment which appears to be prejudicial to such rights.” Wilfred Butcher, the General Secretary of the CCC, wrote to Mooney that the organization was going through restructuring and could not possibly absorb the ICC, ending his letter with the provocative statement that its inclusion in the CCC would create “dangerous and mischievous [sic] confusion.” Mooney responded perplexed and hurt as in his mind the ICC had proven itself as an assiduous watchdog of the constant pressure by the Catholic hierarchy to promote its own devious interests and that without the support of the CCC the ICC would collapse. The ICC was unwilling to alter its program at all and, in fact, Chairman W.G. Berry gave a presentation
to the Department of Ecumenical Affairs of the CCC where he suggested that the ICC
should perhaps become a standing committee within the CCC. He feared that if the CCC
took over its “controversial” agenda of opposing education and an envoy to the Vatican,
these issues would be “‘soft-pedalled’ in the interests of ecumenicity[.]”256 R.M. Bennett,
another member of the CCC, did not seem to have the same scruples concerning the ICC
as he was a member,257 sending a collection of editorials to Mooney all discussing
attempts by Catholics to expand their educational rights in Ontario; Mooney thanked
Bennett for securing an American clergyman for the last ICC meeting. This meeting had
addressed, yet again, movements for an increase in Catholic education, adding a
characteristically ominous warning: “The movement here is just part of a North American
campaign.”258

Elements within the CCC undoubtedly shared these opinions of the Catholic
Church despite its proclamations of ecumenical tolerance and liberality and the
intelligent, sophisticated reports and theological discussion that often characterized the
organization.259 Firstly, there are numerous copies of the minutes of the ICC contained in
the papers of the CCC, demonstrating that the ICC was at least noticed by some as an
organization of note concerning ecumenical affairs.260 In one report regarding “Civil and
Religious Liberty” presented to the United Church of Canada General Council and
contained in the files of the CCC, the authors, Chairman Ernest E. Long and Secretary
Ivor D. Williams, passionately condemned the ludicrous and harmful stereotyping by
narrow nationalists from both the English and French communities. Long and Williams
believed that this treatment of the “other” was part of the irrational mentality that had
resulted in McCarthyism, and opposed Protestant characterizations of Quebec as fascist and the Church authoritarian.\textsuperscript{261} When discussing the recent censorship of the film \textit{Martin Luther} by Quebec authorities, however, they expressed the fear that these actions resembled those of the Catholic authorities in “countries like Spain.” Indeed tolerance had its limits in their minds, as in “a land like ours, where Roman Catholicism is an important element in the national life, our discussion of freedom must take account of the fact that the Roman Church has no clearly defined doctrine favouring liberty of thought or expression.”\textsuperscript{262} In this atmosphere, it was warned, Protestants needed to be vigilant concerning their liberty. When the Vatican announced the doctrine of the Assumption of Mary the CCC distributed copies of the speeches of the Archbishop of Canterbury and York who explicitly condemned the action and accused it of hindering ecumenical relations.\textsuperscript{263} One Rev. H.E. Wintemute of a Toronto Baptist Church sent a letter to Rev. Dr. W.J. Gallagher of the CCC ridiculing the doctrine and pointing out that even the Vatican was having difficulty persuading theologians as to its efficacy, “[o]f course, they do not admit having made any mistake[.]”\textsuperscript{264} In an anonymous memo from the late 1960s, the author asked how Catholics could have been engaged in an irregular form of Holy Communion for centuries by not receiving the wine, calling into question whether Catholics were receiving Holy Communion at all according to the Bible.\textsuperscript{265} In an undated and unsigned document contained in the CCC files the “Implications of Diplomatic Representation at the Vatican” was explored, addressing the fears that Catholics view the Church as a “society above all others” and that an envoy would recognize the fact of the Vatican state and its centrality within Christendom, using these relations to further its
unchanging goal of recognition as the leader of nations.\textsuperscript{266} What truly concerned the author was the role that the Vatican had assumed as the defender of Christianity against Communism; its staunch position and existence as a political as well as religious organization promoted the status quo where it is strong “increase[ing] rather than decreas[ing] the danger of war.” Much like Innis, the report concluded that the Catholic Church was destabilizing an already tense world, contributing to the self-righteousness of the West which had prevented it from constructively dealing with “social and economic evils.” The answer must be “no” to official diplomatic relations, as spiritual forces, especially a militantly anti-Communist organization such as the Catholic Church, should not be manipulated for political ends.\textsuperscript{267}

By the mid-to-late 1960s Canada was split not only over these various debates, but also the debate regarding the place of Quebec within Confederation. While this dissertation cannot examine this important historical process at any length, in earlier years this debate was couched in language of an ardently British Canadian nationalism accusing French Canada of betraying the \textit{largesse} of the Mother Country, being inherently inferior or disloyal. Mainstream discussion of Catholicism was no longer as hampered by the theological anti-Catholicism of Shields or Oswald Smith, nor was it the stark nativism or anti-French Canadian sentiment of the Depression or WWII. By the mid-to-late 1960s Canadian anti-Catholicism was expressed largely through the lens of the intellectually inferior Catholic unable, and unwilling, to grasp the obligations of democratic society due to their poor education. An example of this is Forsey’s 1962 article “Canada: Two Nations or One?” Forsey savaged the idea of separatism, reconfiguring Confederation or
even recognizing Canada as being founded by two peoples. Forsey admitted that while some French Canadians understood that Canada was one nation in a political, legal and constitutional sense, they were also under the faulty impression that they were being “short-changed” in this technologically advanced society. Forsey elucidated a caricatured vision of the French Canadian by outlining how business and government were constantly looking for qualified French Canadians, but that their religiously dominated educational system did not provide enough education in technology and science. Forsey blamed the French Canadian religious educational system for the Québécois being underrepresented in positions of power and authority even in their own province. He was asserting that Catholic education was inherently inferior in a modern society, expressing his anti-Catholicism in a subtle form. Not present is even the patronizing respect and paternalism that intellectuals such as George Grant expressed in the 1950s and 1960s for the Catholic Church’s ability to preserve pre-modern traditions in the face of liberal homogenization and global Americanization. In Forsey’s mind it was simply a force dividing the nation.

Forsey’s article does point to the fact that “older” Canadian anti-Catholic concerns, such as the prominence of this religion within a major ethnic group in Canada, were still present, but more subtle and in a state of transition. Another demonstration of this mindset comes from Hugh MacLennan, author of the seminal Canadian novel Two Solitudes, in correspondence with Lower. In a 1964 letter MacLennan reported to Lower that the Québécois students in his class at McGill, particularly those crying “libre,” were “remarkably infantile.” This was due to the Québécois inferiority complex as they felt inadequate in the modern world. Close to the surface in the lengthy correspondence
between MacLennan and Lower is always the belief that the French Canadian was simply too primitive to truly “fit” into the world, resulting in youthful anger. This was most striking following the October Crisis when Lower blamed the recent violence of the Front de libération du Québec (FLQ) and nationalism in general on the Québécois’ “authoritarian education … unsympathetic to the ‘mundane’, the practical, the empiric, the commonplace … little related to reality.” In his response, MacLennan easily understood Lower’s reference to “authoritarian education” as meaning that education in Quebec was “clericalized” in its focus. This, for MacLennan, coupled with the “fact” that most Québécois were of vague indigenous heritage, explained the FLQ. It was not based on intellectual nationalism, but on blind fury: “a furious drive of the Territorial Imperative always stronger in the primitive. At the moment this further divides the soi-disant nation.”

Catholicism was thus not completely severed from the problem of French Canadian nationalism in the minds of these men who had come of age in the years of this story. Yet what these statements demonstrate is not the simple perpetuity of ethnically charged anti-Catholicism into the 1960s or 1970s, systematic prejudicing against Québécois for their religion, or its total disappearance, but instead the nonlinear transformation of conceptions of Canadian identity in this period. Britishness was undoubtedly still an important component of English Canadian identity, as was Protestantism. Pronouncements of it, however, became increasingly measured, implicit or even rejected within mainstream public opinion. For many during the first two decades of the Cold War, including liberal Protestants, Orangemen or dispassionate social scientists,
the Catholic Church and its multitude of flaws was an internationally influential organization and was thus a threat to the progress of the democratic world. This “universalized” sentiment, namely that the Church was viewed as inherently incapable of existing within the liberal democratic world, did not disappear, but once again shifted along with other manifestations of anti-Catholicism into the present day.
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Forsey opposed this doctrine so fiercely that he left the newly formed New Democratic Party when they endorsed it at their founding convention. Forsey, *A Life on the Fringe*, 205-206.


Forsey’s charge was reminiscent of Canadian National Railway representative Donald Gordon’s infamous and inflammatory claim in 1962 that there were no qualified French Canadians to occupy executive positions. Graham Fraser, *Rene Levesque and the Parti Québécois in Power* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2001 [first edition, 1984]), 35.

This sentiment is perhaps most clearly demonstrated in Grant, *Lament for a Nation*, 61-62: “The only Canadians who had a profoundly different tradition from capitalist liberalism were the French Canadians, and they were not generally taken into decision-making unless they had foregone these traditions. Their very Catholicism did not lead the best of them to be interested in the managerial, financial, and technical skills of the age of progress.” Champion refers to Grant and other Tories such as Forsey as often being characterized as paternalistic towards French Canada throughout their lives. Champion, *Strange Demise*, 187.

Hugh MacLennan to Lower, March 2nd, 1964, file 32, box 7, AL. Forsey shared this patronizing view of French Canadians as children in a letter to his political idol, Arthur Meighen, denouncing French Canadian nationalists and those opportunistic politicians afraid to confront them: “‘It was time to speak out and treat French Canadians like men instead of spoiled children. As long as we go around hush-hushing for fear we’ll wake the baby, of course they’ll behave like babies.’” Milligan, *Eugene A. Forsey*, 218. Originally in a letter from Forsey to Meighen, December 26th, 1951, Meighen Papers.
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Some of this undoubtedly has to do with the fact that Quebec’s religious character changed rapidly following the 1960s.
Conclusion

“[T]he greatest criminal organization outside the Mafia:” Anti-Catholicism in Post-1960s Canada

Although this project ends in the 1960s, anti-Catholicism persisted well into the 1970s and even has echoes into the twenty-first century. Post 1960s anti-Catholic discourse fractured along three key lines: one is the older, ethnically charged anti-Catholicism, embodied by the “BMG group,” which castigated Quebec as a backwards, aggressive, priest-ridden province still hindered by the past influence of the hierarchy and embodying a tradition alien to a fundamentally British Canada. The second is the even more marginalized theological anti-Catholicism of the tiny CPL, which has remained active since Shields founded it during WWII and is largely isolated, having little influence in Canadian public affairs (unlike its larger corollary in the United States, the ardently fundamentalist Bob Jones University).¹ The third is a form of socio-cultural anti-Catholicism that is still present in the mainstream and often centres on the alleged socio-cultural and sexual backwardness or distortedness of the Church in the modern world.

BMG Publishing² released a series of conservative tracts during the contentious debates over official bilingualism and reaction to the election of the separatist Parti Quebecois (PQ) in 1976. These tracts directly linked the Catholic Church to the efforts of French Canadian nationalists to undermine Canada’s integrity. Perhaps the best known of these works was written by Lieutenant Commander (Retired) Jock V. Andrew entitled Bilingualism Today, French Tomorrow: Trudeau’s Master Plan and How it Can be Stopped.³ In this diatribe against official bilingualism Andrew claimed that Trudeau’s
policies were part of a conspiracy designed to create a unilingual French nation.\textsuperscript{4} Andrew’s concerns with the “francization” of Canada intersected with his anxiety around the concomitant elimination of its British heritage through coercive bilingualism and French immigration.\textsuperscript{5} Anti-Catholicism was indeed central to these concerns.

Winnett Boyd, onetime PC candidate for York-Scarborough in the 1972 federal election and co-founder of BMG, pointed specifically to French traditions as a source of anxiety because of the French proclivity for authoritarianism and state control of industry which “are alien to the British traditions on which the country was founded.”\textsuperscript{6} Andrew noted that Catholicism was inextricable from this alien tradition. According to Andrew, Trudeau and his Francophone ministers had been secretly sending agents through all Canadian communities containing French Canadians in order to foment “militant racism” against English Canadians. In Andrew’s account, these agents were predominantly French Catholic priests operating under the guise of an organization called the Richelieu Society. Andrew linked this activity directly to the clergy’s past goal of “out-breeding” the English in order to gain control of the nation, through a “revenge of the cradles.”\textsuperscript{7} This “breeding-project” was so successful that French Catholics had usurped Quebec and were now, through immigration, governmental influence and bilingualism, ready to spread their dominance through the entire nation.\textsuperscript{8} Andrew could not ignore the fact that the Church was declining in public influence in Quebec, stating that the French were no longer a “Church-controlled race” due mostly to technological developments, but that the absolutism of the Church was difficult to shed, allowing Catholicism to linger in the province.\textsuperscript{9} Andrew also equated the planned expansion of French language schools across
Canada to existing separate schools, suggesting that the increasing need for Canadians to speak French in order to get jobs resulted in more people attending Catholic schools where French instruction was available, inevitably causing Canadians to convert to Catholicism. He was convinced that language policy and language schools would result in “every last English-speaking Canadian … marr[ying] a French-Canadian … promis[ing] to bring the children up in the French language. Or am I now getting mixed up with religion? Maybe it’s the same thing.”

According to Andrew, the French language and Catholicism were indeed synonymous as alien intrusions into Canada.

Andrew was not alone in this extremism. One anonymous correspondent with Andrew posited that the Catholicism of many non-French Canadians facilitated a French takeover of Canada; this “spiritual link” explained not only the easy transformation of Canada into a French nation but also the alleged large donations of Canadians to the terrorist Irish Republican Army, an organization promoted secretly by Canada’s insidious French Catholic government in spite of English Canadians and their British ancestors. Sam Allison provided an even more radical anti-Catholic argument against bilingualism and French influence in Canada in another BMG book aptly titled French Power: The Francization of Canada released in 1978. Allison saw in the separatist dream for an independent Quebec and in the Trudeau government’s plot to create an entirely French country an underlying pre-Conquest ideology, steeped in authoritarianism, intolerance and Catholicism. The “spiritual authoritarianism” which many nationalistes and French Canadians were raised in had seeped into civil society causing Quebec to appear more “like South America than North America.” While Allison attempted to moderate his
viewpoints by pointing out that it was political “ultranationalism” operating through the Church as opposed to Catholicism itself that caused Quebec to be backward and authoritarian, he quickly descended into racial theories that had much in common with anti-Catholicism.\textsuperscript{15} Allison referenced the familiar “revenge of the cradles” idea as the central socio-economic aspect of the “tyrannical” Catholic Church in Quebec. This produced an uneducated, unhealthy surplus population which was not only easily exploited by Anglophone employers because they made up a large pool of cheap labour but that were also physically diminutive and inferior to other Canadians.\textsuperscript{16} Allison thus blamed the Catholic Church for fostering an inferior race of French Canadians, born and raised to be bitter towards the Anglophone elite who simply embraced true Canadian—that is British—values of democracy, freedom and self-restraint.

While Andrew’s conspiratorial diatribe may have sold well and elicited support amongst some aspects of the disillusioned Anglophone population in Canada,\textsuperscript{17} the aggressively ethnic English Canadian nationalism of the BMG authors was no longer considered intellectually respectable, as demonstrated by its relegation to a specialty publishing firm largely dedicated to protesting Trudeau’s “insidious” vision of a bureaucratized, authoritarian French-speaking Canada.\textsuperscript{18} This does not mean that it was not present in society at all. Norman Webster’s book review of Andrew’s \textit{Bilingual Today} for the \textit{Globe and Mail} is an excellent example of this tension. Webster dismissed the book as the work of a “madman” dedicated to provoking civil war, going so far as to compare it to \textit{Mein Kempf}, and expressed concern about its very existence and popularity. Webster recalled attending a meeting of school trustees who were trying to promote
French language education and who were met with vehement opposition on financial grounds. Webster notes, however, that one man informed him that French language schools were in fact opposed because they were the first step to the French colonizing the nation and “out-breeding” true Canadians. Webster’s fear that “nuts” were gaining in influence, or had never been curtailed, is characteristic of mainstream Canadian sentiment in the 1970s by which time nationalist discourse had become largely void of explicit references to Britishness or chauvinism; they instead attacked those manifestations as regressive and divisive.

The second vein of anti-Catholicism after the 1960s was theological anti-Catholicism, embodied by the CPL. The CPL, according to its website, is dedicated to the “defense and confirmation of the Gospel” in Canada. The “real Gospel,” according to the CPL website, was given to the modern world with the Protestant Reformation and Protestants in Canada today must be encouraged to understand this heritage. “Canadians at large must not be allowed,” the site continues, “to be taken in by the pretensions of the Roman Catholic religion to be the ‘Church’ in Canada; or to think there is no … difference between Roman Catholicism and true Biblical Christianity.” The bookstore also advertises infamous anti-Catholic tracts such as *The Priest, the Woman and the Confessional* by Charles Chiniquy and *Murder in the Vatican* by Avro Manhattan and produces a fiercely anti-Catholic periodical entitled *The Protestant Challenge*. Even this strain of anti-Catholicism has changed with time; despite the focus on Roman Catholicism on the website and in the literature, the new alien religious “threat” of Islam is also present. Nevertheless this organization and manifestation of anti-Catholicism,
while distasteful, is no longer as influential within the mainstream intellectual or cultural firmament of Canadian society.

Despite the relegation of theological anti-Catholicism and significant appeals to a chauvinistic understanding of Canada as a British Protestant nation to less mainstream venues, these strains are not wholly detached and often overlap. For example, in 1977 the Canadian Cistercian Order, based in Oka, Quebec, applied to the Cavan Township Council just outside of Peterborough to have a farm rezoned in order to found a monastery. The application was denied with Councilor Joe Thompson proudly announcing that “'Cavan is a Protestant township and it shall stay like this.'” Councilor Alex Ruth added that this was an overwhelmingly popular decision according to the phone calls the council had received protesting the religious order.24 Thomas Lord, a resident of the area, was outraged, recalling a town meeting he had attended which debated whether a separate school should be built in the area. In one discussion a man was reported as saying that if this happened “'that perhaps the Cavan Blazers should ride again,'” referring to a Protestant vigilante group of the nineteenth century that operated in the area and forced Catholic settlers out by burning their property.25 In a revealing statement reflecting the tension in Canada at the time over the recent election of the separatist PQ in Quebec along with the residue of an older ethnic nationalism and anti-Catholicism, a local was quoted as agreeing with council because “'To be quite honest, I’d rather see the Frenchmen stay where they are,'” despite the fact that the Cistercians applying were mostly English-speakers.26 A major difference in this example from previous ones, however, is that press reaction was uniformly negative across the country.
along with much of the public’s reaction, condemning the Council for representing bigotry in Canada that was supposedly gone. In fact the Canadian Civil Liberties Association filed a protest and the Ontario Human Rights Commission investigated the ruling to ensure that prejudice was not the primary reason for refusing the application.27 The Cavan Township Council was embarrassed and appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board to allow the Council to include a new anti-discrimination clause in its zoning by-laws. The Council even invited the Cistercians to reapply to prove its dedication to equality. The Cistercians decided to build elsewhere anyway, saddened by the obvious anti-Catholicism.28

Despite the negative reaction to the “Cavan incident” in the 1970s, anti-Catholicism in a different guise is often not as maligned. The final strain of anti-Catholicism is largely emptied of ethnic, linguistic or theological hostility. It is still present in the mainstream and often centres on the alleged socio-cultural and sexual backwardness and distortedness of the Church in the modern world. This form is best characterized by Mark Massa who has dubbed the set of beliefs underlying it “social-scientific anti-Catholicism.” Anti-Catholicism in this sense is a process of “boundary-making” by non-Catholics, perceiving religion as being thoroughly privatized; yet Catholicism has consistently refused this conception of society and the rigid divide between public and private religion it entails into the twenty-first century. Therefore, while public culture in North America has often attempted to become or appear fully secularized, the Catholic Church had stubbornly continued to assert its authority over moral matters which it sees as natural, raising the ire of many within this public culture.29
For example, Michael Enright, the onetime host of CBC Radio’s *As It Happens*, and a Catholic himself, embodied this when he told Michael Posner of the *Globe and Mail* in 1997 that he perceived the Catholic Church as “‘the greatest criminal organization outside the Mafia.’”³⁰ While Enright did apologize publicly,³¹ and never specified which crimes he was specifically referring to,³² what is more revealing than this statement is the lack of comment or context by the interviewer or the lack of any detriment to Enright’s career for making a sweeping, prejudicial statement in a prominent national newspaper. A more severe example of this strain of anti-Catholicism occurred when Catholic bishops in Canada publicly opposed the Governor-General Adrienne Clarkson sending congratulations to two recently married same-sex couples in Toronto. While this is a controversial issue in many countries and the position of the official Catholic Church concerning LGBTQ issues is certainly open to criticism, the reaction to these bishops’ public stand, by letter writers to the *Globe and Mail* for example, often degenerated into anti-Catholic stereotypes. Henry Rogers of Scarborough attacked the Catholic Church for acting as a crassly political organization, a common anti-Catholic trope, ridiculing its “charitable status” due to this transgression of its “proper role” in society. Brendan Foley of St. John’s repeated this sentiment asking “Is Canada a theocracy or a pluralist democracy?” Foley, embracing the belief that the Catholic Church was alien to the democratic nature of Canada, added the rhetorical question “Do we have citizen bishops or ayatollahs in cerise?” referring to the authoritarian Islamic regime in Iran, a comparison the CPL would certainly endorse.
John Saddy of London, Ontario, perhaps best summarized this recent strain of anti-Catholicism when he appealed to the centuries-old stereotype of Catholic priests and officials as sexual perverts, a trope that is also contained in some of the rhetoric surrounding the recent revelations regarding the Church obfuscating the fact that a small group of priests were committing sexual assault and acts of pedophilia for decades around the world. Clearly, according to Saddy, anyone comfortable with their own sexuality would have no problem with same-sex marriage, something impossible for a celibate clergy engaged in systematic hypocrisy: “when the world’s largest employer of homosexuals and lesbians, the Roman Catholic Church, condemns gay weddings, it is the epitome of hypocrisy.” This writer confusingly seems to be equating joining the priesthood or becoming a nun with unprofessed homosexuality, a sweeping generalization which in itself castigates homosexuality as an abnormal development while simultaneously defending the rights of same-sex marriage. Celibacy, or homosexuality for that matter, simply did not fit into this correspondent’s vision of the modern world and anyone who chose it was clearly perplexed about their own, “natural,” sexuality. Philip Jenkins notes that the trope of the priesthood as refuge for the homosexual, interpreting this as evidence that the Catholic Church promoted depraved sexuality, was a prominent theme in sensationalistic nineteenth century anti-Catholic literature. When adapted to contemporary society this stereotype has become used to promote a defence of sexual pluralism while rebuking the hierarchy for hindering the “psychosexual development” of its clergy; the Church thus acted as a form of “institutionalized closet.”
Anti-Catholicism in Canada provides an analytical framework through which to analyze the complex and constantly shifting nature of English Canadian nationalism and conceptions of identity. This study has demonstrated how a wide swath of Canadian intellectuals, politicians, organizations, Protestant leaders and “everyday” Canadians constructed their vision of an ideal Canada through the first several decades of the twentieth century in opposition to its perceptions of Catholicism. It has countered the claims of other historians that Canadian nationalism sharply transformed in the 1960s from a conservative, ethnic nationalism to a progressive, “universal” civic nationalism. Instead, I have posited that this dichotomization is itself the result of a normative framework created by academics and civic nationalists that reflects a particular historical bias. Civic nationalism in Canada was exclusionary and contained many of the elements of an older ethnic nationalism demonstrated by the continuing perception of Catholicism as an alien/rival religious/social system that did not “fit” into the ideal liberal Canada. Values that were believed to be “universal,” such as liberty, freedom and parliamentary democracy, were distinctively Protestant values with observable British roots. Thus civic nationalism was based on a contingent universalism still anchored in the earlier language of British Canada.

While this is the core pattern revealed by studying Canadian anti-Catholicism in this period, anti-Catholicism itself shifted and was never one-dimensional. There have always been those anti-Catholics who focus on theology, others on the inherent disloyalty or authoritarianism of Catholics and others who have been concerned with the sexual and moral distortedness and perversity of the Church and its followers. What connects these
discursive threads is a caricatured vision of the Church and Catholicism as a monolithic institution and system that was harmful to its adherents and to society in general due to its foolish, even totalitarian, teachings that prevented individual “self-realization.” All the different forms of anti-Catholicism constantly overlapped in this study. Those leftist intellectuals adhering to an allegedly secular concern with the Church’s fascist leanings during the Depression still referenced the language of those theological anti-Catholics who perceived in the pope not just Antichrist but saw in the Church an inherently anti-Christian, anti-individualist institution which rejected the enlightening and truly Christian reforms of the Reformation. It is this inability to completely sever the various forms of anti-Catholicism that makes it such a fruitful historical topic; anti-Catholicism reveals the complex processes and influences that underlie visions of the nation as well as those that underlie visions of an ideal citizenry.

Canadian anti-Catholicism in the twentieth century was no exception as it shifted in its composition yet maintained the central narrative of the Catholic Church. During the first three decades of the century theological anti-Catholicism remained significant, influencing “progressive” efforts to reform society by shearing the regressive, Catholic elements from its body politic, particularly concerned with the corruption of democracy caused by new, Catholic immigrants and Catholic Quebec’s role in the governing of the nation. The progressivism of this era was deeply British in its ideological makeup, with Protestantism serving as a major component. Catholicism was defined as a threat to the unity of the nation and as hindering the development of an improved, scientifically-based liberal democracy. The intersection of progressivism and chauvinistic Britishness reached
its apotheosis in Borden’s wartime Union government of 1917-1918. French Canada and immigrants were openly excluded, perceived as unable to appreciate the responsibilities of a democratic society during crises. Several supporters and members of the government expressed openly anti-Catholic sentiments during this period, particularly with regards to the Catholic Church’s alleged plot to prevent Catholic Canadians from enlisting or be conscripted in order to dominate the nation. After the war immigration became the major concern, fearing a nation consisting of people inferior in every way to Anglo-Protestants, including their Catholicism (or Orthodoxy). While nationalist exhortations became less fervently Anglophile than during WWI or before it, Carl Berger’s belief that imperialism was a casualty of the First World War needs revision. The British connection remained absolutely central to English Canadian identity and in anti-Catholic sentiment in particular.

Concern with the influence of Catholicism over society continued into the Depression although the locus shifted from immigration, which largely stopped during this period, and towards the breeding habits of Catholics. The debate over birth control symbolized this with the Catholic Church being castigated as preventing the implementation of this cause célèbre of progressive thought in Canada. The Church was, of course, only engaging in this battle to further its own influence in society by prompting Catholics to have larger families to “out-breed” good, sturdy, Protestant Canadians. This “revenge of the cradles” was also a major component of the discourse regarding Quebec in this period, along with the belief that French Catholics were more prone to support fascism or authoritarianism in general, due to their domineering and anti-democratic
Church. At the forefront of this discussion were many figures that would become key public members of the mainstream left in Canada, such as F.R. Scott and Eugene Forsey and exemplify the prominence, indeed centrality, of anti-Catholicism in leftist and progressive thought in this period.

The outbreak of the Second World War saw the politicization of anti-Catholicism, represented by a wing of the Progressive Conservative Party coalescing around George Drew. Hostility to Catholicism remained concerned with the influence a corrupt, Catholic Quebec held over a weak, crassly political Liberal government; conscription exploded as a national issue once again, with the Church being charged with disloyalty and sinister plots to dominate the nation by preventing Catholics from being conscripted. Yet central to wartime anti-Catholicism was the fear of an encroaching managerial state, which perhaps helps explain why it manifested itself so strongly in political Conservatism as some particularly Anglophilic Tories represented themselves as the preservers of the British traditions of independence, parliamentary government and individual initiative. The acrimonious debate over family allowances, for example, was about more than the traditional “revenge of the cradle” fear. Family allowances became linked by some Protestant Canadians to the authoritarian tendencies of the Liberal government that was becoming increasingly dominated by “Catholic interests.” The Tories, while of course representing a diversity of opinion, maintained this concern into the Cold War period.

As stated earlier, the Cold War era saw the gradual “universalizing” of anti-Catholicism in Canada as it was not as clearly linked to a specific immigrant or ethno-linguistic group any longer. The discourse slowly became emptied of overt ethnic
rhetoric. Instead it focused on the conflict of values between the liberal democratic world and Catholicism, which was now compared to the new totalitarian threat, the Soviet Union. Catholicism and Communism were both seen as rival forms of (counter-) modernity, with Catholicism presenting a systematic alternative to the liberal democratic ideal of the world. Catholicism was not simply an ossified medievalism any longer, but was to be monitored as an internationally powerful, potentially destabilizing, force in a tense world. In the face of this organized mainstream Protestantism expressed the desire for ecumenism to meet the totalitarian threat of the Soviet Union; through an analysis of the material, however, it is also clear in Canada that this threat was not perceived solely to be the Soviet Union but also a hierarchical Catholic Church.

Postwar anti-Catholicism also provides the historian with the opportunity to revise earlier research into national identity in this period. Anti-Catholicism as expressed in respectable, mainstream venues became “universalized;” it was not, however, completely severed from the conservative, ethnic nationalism of a previous era. Instead, these forms of nationalism blended into each other and civic nationalism, while ostensibly dedicated to tolerance and liberty, repeated much of the discourse of an earlier nationalism obsessed with the British connection. It was this Britishness itself that had become universalized in the minds of Canadian nationalists as values of universalism were based distinctly in the British tradition in Canada, including an implicit devotion to a Protestant conception of world history and socio-cultural relations. As Raphael Samuel has discussed, exhortations of pluralism have never prevented “British characteristics” from being exclusionary. Catholicism was still perceived by many as an alien faith that did not respect the
normative civic values of Canada, such as democracy, freedom and tolerance. It perpetuated sectarianism, parochialism and, in the case of French Canada, aggressive nationalism. To oppose Catholicism into the 1960s and 1970s was therefore to oppose intolerance and narrow-mindedness. While the older, “vulgar” anti-Catholicism may have declined in respectability in the mainstream, as it did in the United States, it was not confined to the margins as Allitt believes it was in America after 1960. Even Allitt admits that these prejudices undoubtedly still exist amongst Americans, but that its decline in the public sphere undermines its cultural and intellectual currency. Anti-Catholicism did not disappear from Canadian discourse; it has constantly shifted in composition reflecting the symbiotic relationship anti-Catholicism has shared with another organizational framework essential to how Canadians have viewed their nation and the world: who is an ideal Canadian and how can this ideal be cultivated and protected. For many Canadians over the years, the answer to this question did not include Roman Catholics.
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